U.S. Customs and Border Protection Valuation Encyclopedia (1980 – 2015)

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

An Informed Compliance Publication

June 2016

NOTICE:

This publication is intended to provide guidance and information to the trade community. It reflects the U.S. Customs & Border Protection (CBP) position on or interpretation of the applicable laws or regulations as of the date of publication, which is shown on the front cover. It does not in any way replace or supersede those laws or regulations. Only the latest official version of the laws or regulations is authoritative.

Publication History #0536-1616
First Issued: 1990
Revised: January 2001, January 2004, December 2010, May 2016

PRINTING NOTE:

This publication was designed for electronic distribution via the CBP World Wide Web site ((http://www.cbp.gov) and is being distributed in a variety of formats. It was originally set up in Microsoft Word 2003®. Pagination and margins in downloaded versions may vary depending upon which Word version or printer you use. If you wish to maintain the original settings, you may wish to download the .pdf version, which can then be printed using the freely available Adobe Acrobat Reader®

PREFACE

On December 8, 1993, Title VI of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103-182, 107 Stat. 2057), also known as the Customs Modernization or "Mod" Act, became effective. These provisions amended many sections of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws.

Two concepts that emerged from the Mod Act are "**informed compliance**" and "**shared responsibility**," which are premised on the idea that in order to maximize voluntary compliance with the laws and regulations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the trade community needs to be clearly and completely informed of its legal obligations. Accordingly, the Mod Act imposes a greater obligation on CBP to provide the public with improved information concerning the trade community's rights and responsibilities under CBP's regulations and related laws. In addition, both the trade and CBP share responsibility for carrying out these requirements. For example, under Section 484 of the Tariff Act as amended (19 U.S.C. §1484), the importer of record (IOR) is responsible for using reasonable care to enter, classify and determine the value of imported merchandise and to provide any other information necessary to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection to properly assess duties, collect accurate statistics, and determine whether other applicable legal requirements, if any, have been met. U.S. Customs and Border Protection is then responsible for fixing the final classification and value of the merchandise. An IOR's failure to exercise reasonable care could delay release of the merchandise and, in some cases, could result in the imposition of penalties.

The Office of Trade, Regulations and Rulings, has been given a major role in meeting the informed compliance responsibilities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. In order to provide information to the public, CBP has issued a series of informed compliance publications, and videos, on new or revised requirements, regulations or procedures, and a variety of classification and valuation issues.

The Valuation and Special Programs Branch has prepared this **Customs Valuation Encyclopedia (1980-2015)** to assist the trade community. We hope that this publication, together with seminars and increased access to U.S. Customs and Border Protection rulings, will help the trade community to improve, as smoothly as possible, voluntary compliance with customs laws. The decisions in this summary are organized by subject and by date of issuance of the decision. In order to reduce the volume of the 2015 edition, excerpts have only been placed in the subject categories where they are most applicable and exact duplicate entries in various categories have been deleted, noting only a citation and location of the full excerpt. Additions from the previous edition are indicated in the color red. Most of the newer decisions (after 1989) are available in their entirety at the CBP website in the Customs Rulings Online Search System (CROSS) at the following link: http://rulings.cbp.gov/. In the search box, type the decision number and the blue "W" symbol at the top of the decision if the entire decision is not displayed. Please note that over the years, decisions were given a six digit number, then they were preceded by the letter "W", and they are now preceded by the letter "H". It is important to use the exact letter and numbers in order to retrieve the decision in CROSS.

The material in this publication is provided for general information purposes only. Because many complicated factors can be involved in customs issues, an importer may wish to obtain a ruling under CBP's Regulations, 19 CFR Part 177, or to obtain advice from an expert who specializes in customs matters, for example, a licensed customs broker, attorney or consultant. Reliance solely on the information in this publication may not be considered reasonable care.

Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be addressed to the Executive Director, Regulations and Rulings, Office of Trade, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), 90 K Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20229.

Alice A. Kipel
Executive Director, Regulations and Rulings
Office of Trade

This page
INTENTIONALLY
left blank

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCC	Customs Co-operation Council
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
FTZ	Foreign Trade Zone
GAAP	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GSP	General System of Preferences
TAA	Trade Agreements Act
TD	Treasury Decision
U.S.C.	United States Code

Table of Contents

ASSISTS **15**

INTRODUCTION 15
APPORTIONMENT OF ASSISTS 20
ASSIST DEFINITION 24
COMPONENTS WHICH ARE DESTROYED, SCRAPPED, OR LOST 26
CONSUMED IN THE PRODUCTION 27
COSTS OF ACQUIRING ASSISTS 28
DEPRECIATION OF ASSISTS 30
DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY 30
DRAWBACK ON ASSISTS 32
ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, ARTWORK, DESIGN WORK NECESSARY FOR THE PRODUCTION 32
H235895 DATED AUG. **22, 2014.** 41
EQUIPMENT 42
FREE OF CHARGE OR AT A REDUCED COST 43
INSPECTION SERVICES 45
MANAGEMENT SERVICES, SALARIES 45
MATERIALS, COMPONENTS, PARTS, AND SIMILAR ITEMS INCORPORATED IN THE IMPORTED MERCHANDISE 47
OFFSETTING OVERPAYMENT OF DUTIES 49
PAYMENT TO SELLER 49
PRORATION OF ASSISTS 50
SUPPLIED BY THE BUYER 50
TESTING COSTS 51
TOOLS, DIES, MOLDS, AND SIMILAR ITEMS USED IN THE PRODUCTION 52
TRANSPORTATION COSTS 55
USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PRODUCTION OR THE SALE FOR EXPORT 56
VALUE OF ASSISTS, I.E., COST OF ACQUISITION OR COST OF PRODUCTION 58

BUYING COMMISSIONS **60**

INTRODUCTION 60
BONA FIDE BUYING COMMISSIONS 65
COMMISSIONS PAID TO AGENT FOR ACQUIRING ASSISTS 70
CONTROL OVER AGENT 70
DEDUCTING BUYING COMMISSIONS 72
DUTIABLE AS PART OF THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 73
FACTORS TO CONSIDER 75
IDENTITY OF SELLER 78
TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES 80

CANCELLATION PAYMENTS **92**
INTRODUCTION 92
CONTRACT TERMINATION FEE 92
GOODS NOT IMPORTED 92
LIQUIDATED DAMAGES AND/OR PENALTIES 93
MINIMUM QUANTITY CANCELLATION CHARGES 94
COMPUTED VALUE **96**
INTRODUCTION 96
ASSISTS 100
COST OF FABRICATION 100
ELECTION BY IMPORTER BETWEEN COMPUTED AND DEDUCTIVE VALUE 102
ELEMENTS OF COMPUTED VALUE 103
MERCHANDISE OF THE SAME CLASS OR KIND 105
PROFIT AND GENERAL EXPENSES 106
SEVERANCE PAY 111
CONDITIONS OR CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH A VALUE CANNOT BE DETERMINED **112**
INTRODUCTION 112
TRANSACTION VALUE INAPPLICABLE 114
CONFIDENTIALITY **116**
INTRODUCTION 116
CONSIGNMENTS **117**
INTRODUCTION 117
TRANSACTION VALUE INAPPLICABLE 117
TRANSACTION VALUE OF IDENTICAL OR SIMILAR MERCHANDISE 121
COUNTERTRADE **122**
INTRODUCTION 122
PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 124
CURRENCY CONVERSION **125**
INTRODUCTION 125
COMPUTED VALUE 125
FORMULAS USED IN DETERMINING THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 126
DEDUCTIVE VALUE **129**
INTRODUCTION 129
DEDUCTION FOR COMMISSIONS 133
DEDUCTION FOR USUAL PROFITS AND GENERAL EXPENSES 133
DUTIES CURRENTLY PAYABLE 135
ELECTION BY IMPORTER BETWEEN DEDUCTIVE AND COMPUTED VALUE 135
RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS 136
RESALE IN THE UNITED STATES 137
SALES TO UNRELATED PERSONS 140
SIMILAR MERCHANDISE 140
SUPERDEDUCTIVE VALUE 141
TRANSPORTATION COSTS 141
DEFECTIVE MERCHANDISE **143**
INTRODUCTION 143
ALLOWANCE IN PRICE 148
DEFECTIVE PARTS RETURNED TO THE U.S. 153

DEFECTIVE MERCHANDISE IMPORTED 153
IN-TRANSIT DAMAGE TO IMPORTED GOODS 155
PRICE RENEGOTIATION 155
SUBSEQUENTLY IMPORTED MERCHANDISE DISCOUNTED 155
WARRANTY PROVISIONS 156

DIRECT COSTS OF PROCESSING 158

INTRODUCTION 158
DIRECT COSTS OF PROCESSING OPERATIONS 158

DISCOUNTS 160

INTRODUCTION 160
EARLY PAYMENT DISCOUNT 163
PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 164
QUANTITY DISCOUNTS 167
RENEGOTIATION OF PRICE 168

DUTIABLE VALUE 170

INTRODUCTION 170
APPRAISED VALUE VERSUS DUTIABLE VALUE 170

DUTIES AND TAXES 171

INTRODUCTION 171
APPRAISED VALUE 173
CURRENTLY PAYABLE 173
DEDUCTION FROM TRANSACTION VALUE 173
IDENTIFIED SEPARATELY REQUIREMENT 175
OFFSETTING OVERPAYMENT OF DUTIES 176
SPECIAL SAFEGUARD DUTIES (SSG) 177

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES 178

INTRODUCTION 178
ASSISTS 179
DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS 179
MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEE 180
VALUATION 180

FORMULAS IN DETERMINING THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 183

INTRODUCTION 183
PRE-DETERMINED FORMULA AGREED TO BETWEEN PARTIES 184
CURRENCY CONVERSION 187
PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 187
PROVISIONAL PRICE 189
SUFFICIENT INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO DETERMINE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 190

GENERALLY ACCEPTED ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES 191

INTRODUCTION 191
APPORTIONMENT AND DEPRECIATION OF ASSISTS; 19 CFR 152.103(E) 192
COMPUTED VALUE 193
INTEREST EXPENSE 194
REJECTION OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEM 194
REPAIRS 194
START-UP COSTS 194
ZERO-VALUE ASSISTS 194

IMPORTER'S OPTIONS 195

INTRODUCTION 195
COMPUTED VALUE VERSUS DEDUCTIVE VALUE 196
ELIMINATION OF TRANSACTION VALUE 196

INDIRECT PAYMENTS 197

INTRODUCTION 197
ADVERTISING EXPENSES 198
COMPENSATION FOR ASSISTS AS INDIRECT PAYMENTS, ... 198
PART OF THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE AS AN INDIRECT PAYMENT, ... 199
H235895 DATED AUG. 22, 2014 – SEE ASSISTS, ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, ARTWORK, DESIGN WORK NECESSARY FOR THE PRODUCTION. 200
REDUCTION IN PURCHASE PRICE FOR SETTLEMENT OF A DEBT 200

INSURANCE COSTS 202

INTRODUCTION 202
DEDUCTION FOR COST OF INSURANCE FROM CIF PRICE 202
PRODUCT LIABILITY INSURANCE PAYMENTS 203

INTEREST CHARGES 204

INTRODUCTION 204
PRE T.D. 85-111, JULY 17, 1985 204
T.D. 85-111, DATED JULY 17, 1985; TREATMENT OF INTEREST CHARGES 205
CLARIFICATION REGARDING TREATMENT OF INTEREST 207
ASSISTS 207
COMPUTED VALUE 208
FINANCING ARRANGEMENT 208
SEPARATELY IDENTIFIED FROM PRICE 210

INVOICING REQUIREMENTS 212

INTRODUCTION 212
INCONSISTENT DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT TIME OF ENTRY, T.D. 86-56 212
SEPARATELY IDENTIFIED FROM THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 215

LEASE TRANSACTIONS 216

INTRODUCTION 216
ELIMINATION OF TRANSACTION VALUE 218
REASONABLY ADJUSTED TRANSACTION VALUE 218

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT 219

INTRODUCTION 219
ACCUMULATION PROVISION 219
CHANGE IN TARIFF CLASSIFICATION 220
DE MINIMIS RULE 222
REGIONAL VALUE CONTENT 223

NOTICE 229

INTRODUCTION 229

PACKING COSTS 231

INTRODUCTION 231
ADDITION TO PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 232
HANG TAGS 235
PACKED READY FOR SHIPMENT TO THE UNITED STATES, SEAWORTHY CONDITION 235
PACKING COSTS UNAVAILABLE 236
U.S. PACKING 237

POST-IMPORTATION CHARGES **239**

INTRODUCTION 239
CONSTRUCTION, ERECTION, ASSEMBLY, OR MAINTENANCE CHARGES SUBSEQUENT TO IMPORTATION 239
POST-IMPORTATION SERVICES 242
POST-IMPORTATION TRANSPORTATION 242
PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 242

PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE **243**

INTRODUCTION 243
ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS MADE BY THE BUYER TO THE SELLER; TOTAL PAYMENT 247
ADVERTISING/MARKETING COSTS 262
ALLOWANCE IN PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 262
ASSEMBLY OF MERCHANDISE 263
BENEFIT OF SELLER 264
CANCELLATION PAYMENTS 267
CHARGES IDENTIFIED SEPARATELY FROM THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 267
CHARGES INCIDENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL SHIPMENT OF THE IMPORTED MERCHANDISE 268
DIRECT OR INDIRECT PAYMENTS 272
DISCOUNTS 275
INSPECTION CHARGES 276
INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO DETERMINE THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 277
INTEREST CHARGES 279
INVOICE PRICE 279
PAYMENTS TO A THIRD PARTY 281
PAYMENTS UNRELATED TO THE IMPORTED MERCHANDISE 282
POST-IMPORTATION SERVICES 283
PRICE RENEGOTIATION 283
PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE 286
SELLING COMMISSIONS 286
TESTING COSTS 286
TIME OF PAYMENT 287
USER FEE 287
U.S. RETAIL PRICE 287
U.S.-SOURCED MERCHANDISE 288
WAREHOUSING CHARGES 288

PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE **289**

INTRODUCTION 289
ADDITION TO THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 291
TRANSACTION VALUE, SUFFICIENT INFORMATION 295

PROHIBITED APPRAISED VALUES **297**

INTRODUCTION 297
TWO OR MORE VALUES 297

QUOTA CHARGES **299**

INTRODUCTION 299
FREE-QUOTA PRICE MANIPULATIONS; T.D. 86-56 300
PAYMENTS FOR QUOTA MADE DIRECTLY TO THE SELLER 300
PAYMENTS TO UNRELATED THIRD PARTIES 302
QUOTA HOLDER ACTING AS "STRAW" SELLER 304

REBATES SUBSEQUENT TO IMPORTATION **306**

INTRODUCTION 306
DISCOUNTS 307

FORMULA USED IN DETERMINING TRANSACTION VALUE 307
FREE-QUOTA PRICE MANIPULATIONS; T.D. 86-56 310
POST-IMPORTATION REFUND 310
PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 313
PRICE RENEGOTIATIONS 313

RECONCILIATION 315

RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS 316

INTRODUCTION 316
CONTROL 320
DEFINITION OF RELATED PARTIES 321
EXAMINATION OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE SALE 321
REJECTION OF TRANSACTION VALUE 343
SALES TO UNRELATED BUYERS 349
TEST VALUES 350
TRANSFER PRICES 352

REPAIRS 356

INTRODUCTION 356
PRICE RENEGOTIATIONS 356
REPAIRS IN THE UNITED STATES 356
WARRANTY PROVISIONS 357
VALUE OF REPAIRS FOR MERCHANDISE DAMAGED IN-TRANSIT 358

RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE 359

INTRODUCTION 359

RIGHT OF APPEAL 361

INTRODUCTION 361

ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND LICENSE FEES 363

INTRODUCTION 363
DIRECT COSTS OF PROCESSING 365
PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE 365
PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE 375
RELATED TO THE IMPORTED MERCHANDISE AND AS A CONDITION OF THE SALE 376

SALE FOR EXPORTATION 403

INTRODUCTION 403
ASSEMBLY OF MERCHANDISE 410
BONA FIDE SALE 411
IRREVOCABLY DESTINED FOR EXPORTATION TO THE UNITED STATES 429
SALE FOR EXPORT TO THE UNITED STATES DISTINGUISHED FROM DOMESTIC SALE 434
SALE WHICH MOST DIRECTLY CAUSES MERCHANDISE TO BE EXPORTED TO UNITED STATES 435
TERMS OF SALE 437
TIMING OF SALE 439
TRANSACTION VALUE ELIMINATED DUE TO LACK OF SALE 440
TRANSACTION VALUE DETERMINATION 443
THE IMPORTER HAS FAILED TO REBUT THE PRESUMPTION THAT THE PRICE THE IMPORTER PAID, AS SHOWN ON THE INVOICES PRESENTED TO CUSTOMS AT THE TIME OF ENTRY OF THE MERCHANDISE, SHOULD SERVE AS THE BASIS OF TRANSACTION VALUE. THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED DOES NOT ESTABLISH THAT THERE WERE SALES FOR EXPORTATION TO THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN THE SUPPLIER AND THE ALLEGED MIDDLEMAN. THE TRANSACTION VALUE SHOULD BE BASED ON THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE BY THE IMPORTER. 451

SELLING COMMISSIONS 474

INTRODUCTION....474
ADDITION TO PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE....475

SEQUENTIAL ORDER....480

INTRODUCTION....480
HIERARCHY OF VALUATION METHODS....480

SOFTWARE....484

INTRODUCTION....484

TRANSACTION VALUE....487

INTRODUCTION....487
ASSISTS....488
CONDITION OR CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH A VALUE CANNOT BE DETERMINED....488
CONSIGNMENTS....489
COUNTERTRADE....489
HANG TAGS/LABELS....490
L....491
IMITATIONS ON USE OF TRANSACTION VALUE....491
PACKING COSTS....492
PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE....492
PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE, I.E., APPROPRIATE ADJUSTMENT....493
RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS....494
RESTRICTIONS ON DISPOSITION OR USE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE....495
ROYALTY AND LICENSE FEES....495
SALE FOR EXPORTATION TO THE UNITED STATES....496
SELLING COMMISSIONS....498
UNRELATED PARTIES....498

TRANSACTION VALUE OF IDENTICAL OR SIMILAR MERCHANDISE....499

INTRODUCTION....499
CONSIGNMENT TRANSACTIONS....503
EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES AT OR ABOUT THE SAME TIME....503
IDENTICAL OR SIMILAR MERCHANDISE....505
RELATED PARTIES....508
SUFFICIENT INFORMATION....508
TRANSACTION VALUE READILY AVAILABLE....509
TWO OR MORE VALUES....510

TRANSPARENCY....511

INTRODUCTION....511

TRANSPORTATION COSTS....512

INTRODUCTION....512
DEDUCTIVE VALUE....514
ESTIMATED FREIGHT COSTS VERSUS ACTUAL....514
FOREIGN-INLAND FREIGHT CHARGES....516
FREIGHT AND RELATED CHARGES INCURRED IN TRANSPORTING ASSISTS....519
INTERNATIONAL FREIGHT DEDUCTION....520
POST-IMPORTATION TRANSPORTATION....529
VESSEL LOADING CHARGES....531

TREATMENT....533

USED MERCHANDISE....534

INTRODUCTION....534

DEPRECIATION ALLOWED FOR USED MERCHANDISE 534
ELIMINATION OF TRANSACTION VALUE 534
WASTE MATERIAL 536

VALUE IF OTHER VALUES CANNOT BE DETERMINED 538

INTRODUCTION 538
COMPUTED VALUE 539
DEFECTIVE MERCHANDISE 543
FOREIGN TRADE ZONE 544
PREVIOUSLY ESTABLISHED TRANSACTION VALUE, REASONABLY ADJUSTED 544
SEQUENTIAL ORDER 545
USED MERCHANDISE 549
WASTE MATERIAL 551
19 U.S.C. § 1500 553

VERIFICATION 557

INTRODUCTION 557
INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE 558
19 U.S.C. § 1500 558

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION 561

"YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT" 562

TABLE OF CITATIONS 563

HEADQUARTERS RULINGS 563
CASES 578
TREASURY DECISIONS 579
NOTICES 580

ASSISTS

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1) states:

The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to . . . the value, apportioned as appropriate, of any assist; . . .
The price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise shall be increased by the amounts attributable to the items (and no others) described in paragraphs (A) through (E) [assists paragraph (C)] only to the extent that each such amount (i) is not otherwise included within the price actually paid or payable; and (ii) is based on sufficient information. If sufficient information is not available, for any reason, with respect to any amount referred to in the preceding sentence, the transaction value of the imported merchandise shall be treated, for purposes of this section, as one that cannot be determined. (Emphasis added)

The definitional section of the TAA, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h), defines assists as the following:

> (1)(A) The term "assist" means any of the following if supplied directly or indirectly, and free of charge or at reduced cost, by the buyer of imported merchandise for use in connection with the production or the sale for export to the United States of the merchandise:
>
> > (i) Materials, components, parts, and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.
> > (ii) Tools, dies, molds, and similar items used in the production of the imported merchandise.
> > (iii) Merchandise consumed in the production of the imported merchandise.
> > (iv) Engineering, development, artwork, design work, and plans and sketches that are undertaken elsewhere than in the United States and are necessary for the production of the imported merchandise.
>
> (B) No service or work to which subparagraph (A)(iv) applies shall be treated as an assist for purposes of this section if such service or work –
>
> > (i) is performed by an individual who is domiciled within the United States;
> > (ii) is performed by the individual while he is acting as an employee or agent of the buyer of the imported merchandise; and
> > (iii) is incidental to other engineering, development, artwork, design work, or plans or sketches that are undertaken within the United States.
>
> (C) For purposes of this section, the following apply in determining the value of assists described in subparagraph (A)(iv):
>
> > (i) The value of an assist that is available in the public domain is the cost of obtaining copies of the assist.
> > (ii) If the production of an assist occurred in the United States and one or more foreign countries, the value of the assist is the value thereof that is

added outside the United States.

(Note: In the Customs Regulations, 19 CFR 152.102(a)(3), a third method of determining the value of "engineering, development, artwork, design work, and plans and sketches that are undertaken elsewhere than in the United States and are necessary for the production of the imported merchandise" is provided, see 19 CFR 152.102(a)(3)(iii), infra.)

The same language regarding the addition of assists to the price actually paid or payable and the definition of assists may be found in the Customs Regulations, 19 CFR 152.103(b) and 19 CFR 152.102(a), respectively. In addition, 19 CFR 152.103(c) regarding "sufficiency of information" states: "Additions to the price actually paid or payable will be made only if there is sufficient information to establish the accuracy of the additions and the extent to which they are not included in the price."

The regulations provide the following with respect to the valuation of assists [19 CFR 152.103(d)]:

> Assist. If the value of an assist is to be added to the price actually paid or payable, or to be used as a component of computed value, the port director shall determine the value of the assist and apportion that value to the price of the imported merchandise in the following manner:
> (1) If the assist consists of materials, components, parts, or similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise, or items consumed in the production of the imported merchandise, acquired by the buyer from an unrelated seller, the value of the assist is the cost of its acquisition. If the assist was produced by the buyer or a person related to the buyer, its value would be the cost of its production. In either case, the value of the assist would include transportation costs to the place of production.
> (2) If the assist consists of tools, dies, molds, or similar items used in the production of the imported merchandise, acquired by the buyer from an unrelated seller, the value of the assist is the cost of its acquisition. If the assist were produced by the buyer or a person related to the buyer, its value would be cost of its production. If the assist has been used previously by the buyer, regardless of whether it had been acquired or produced by him, the original cost of acquisition or production would be adjusted downward to reflect its use before its value could be determined. If the assist were leased by the buyer from an unrelated seller, the value of the assist would be the cost of the lease. In either case, the value of the assist would include transportation costs to the place of production. Repairs or modifications to an assist may increase its value.

With respect to determining the value of assists described in 19 CFR 152.102(a)(1)(iv), i.e., "engineering, development, artwork, design work, and plans and sketches that are undertaken elsewhere than in the United States and are necessary for the production of the imported merchandise", 19 CFR 152.102(a)(3) states:

> The following apply in determining the value of assists described in paragraph

(a)(i)(iv) of this section: (i) The value of an assist that is available in the public domain is the cost of obtaining copies of the assist. (ii) If the production of an assist occurred in the United States and one or more foreign countries, the value of the assist is the value added outside the United States. (iii) If the assist was purchased or leased by the buyer from an unrelated person, the value of the assist is the cost of the purchase or of the lease.

The Customs Regulations describe how assists may be apportioned. Section 152.103(e) provides for the following:

> Apportionment. (1) The apportionment of the value of assists to imported merchandise will be made in a reasonable manner appropriate to the circumstances and in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The method of apportionment actually accepted by Customs will depend upon the documentation submitted by the importer. If the entire anticipated production using the assist is for exportation to the United States, the total value may be apportioned over (i) the first shipment, if the imported wishes to pay duty on the entire value at once, (ii) the number of units produced up to the time of the first shipment, or (iii) the entire anticipated production. In addition to these three methods, the importer may request some other method of apportionment in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. If the anticipated production is only partially for exportation to the United States, or if the assist is used in several countries, the method of apportionment will depend upon the documentation submitted by the importer.
> (2) Interpretative note. An importer provides the producer with a mold to be used in the production of the imported merchandise and contracts to buy 10,000 units. By the time of arrival of the first shipment of 1,000 units, the producer has already produced 4,000 units. The importer may request Customs to apportion the value of the mold over 1,000, 4,000, 10,000 units, or any other figure which is in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

In Article 8, paragraph 1(b), the Agreement provides for an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods for the value of assists. (Similar language as statute and regulations).

Article 8, paragraph 3, states that "[a]dditions to the price actually paid or payable shall be made under this Article only on the basis of objective and quantifiable data."

Regarding valuation and apportionment of the assist, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(ii), subparagraphs 1 through 4, correspond with the Customs regulations regarding valuation and apportionment of assists. [19 CFR 152.103(d) and (e)]

In addition, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(iv), provides the following:

> 1. Additions for the elements specified in Article 8.1(b)(iv) [engineering, development, artwork, design work, and plans and sketches . . .] should be based on objective and quantifiable data. In order to minimize the burden for both the importer and customs administration in determining the values to be added, data readily available in the buyer's commercial record system should be used in so far as possible.
> 2. For those elements supplied by the buyer which were purchased or leased by the buyer, the addition would be the cost of the purchase or the lease. No addition shall be made for those elements available in the public domain, other than the cost of obtaining copies of them.
> 3. The ease with which it may be possible to calculate the values to be added will depend on a particular firm's structure and management practice, as well as its accounting methods.
> 4. For example, it is possible that a firm which imports a variety of products from several countries maintains the records of its design centre outside the country of importation in such a way as to show accurately the costs attributable to a given product. In such cases, a direct adjustment may appropriately be made under the provisions of Article 8.
> 5. In another case, a firm may carry the cost of the design centre outside the country of importation as a general overhead expense without allocation to specific products. In this instance, an appropriate adjustment could be made under the provisions of Article 8 with respect to the imported goods by apportioning total design centre costs over total production benefiting from the design centre and adding such apportioned cost on a unit basis to imports.
> 6. Variations in the above circumstances will, of course, require different factors to be considered in determining the proper method of allocation.
> 7. In cases where the production of the element in question involves a number of countries over a period of time, the adjustment should be limited to the value actually added to that element outside the country of importation.

Judicial Precedent:

Texas Apparel Co. v. United States, 698 F. Supp. 932 (1988), aff'd, 883 F.2d 66 (1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 1024, 110 S.Ct. 728 (1990).

The merchandise in question was appraised on the basis of computed value pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(e). The appraised value included an addition for the cost of sewing machines, including their repair parts and cost of repairs, as an assist under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h) (1) (A) (ii).

The plaintiff contends that the inclusion of the cost of the sewing machines as an assist is in error. The plaintiff claims that the sewing machines are not "tools, dies, molds, and

similar items used in the production of the imported merchandise" as provided for in the statute.

The court ruled that the Customs Service's interpretation of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A)(ii) as including "items directly related to the production of merchandise, such as a sewing machine to the sewing of wearing apparel, cannot be said to be contrary to the goals and intent of the new valuation code. Including the value of the sewing machine, which is essential to the fabrication of the apparel, fairly and accurately reflects the cost of producing the imported merchandise." Customs' interpretation distinguishes between equipment which works on the merchandise contributing directly to its manufacture and machinery which is not used directly in the production of the merchandise itself, e.g., air conditioners.

The sewing machines in question are similar to "tools, dies, molds, and similar items used in the production of the merchandise," and the cost or value of the sewing machines, repair parts, and the cost of repairs were properly included in the computed value of the imported merchandise as an assist.

(Case affirmed by Aris Isotoner Gloves, Inc. v. United States, 14 Ct. Int'l Trade 693 (1990).)

Chrysler Corporation v. United States, 17 Ct. Int'l Trade 1049 (1993).

The importer purchased engines from a foreign seller. The agreement between the parties required a minimum number to be purchased, otherwise shortfall and application charges were to be paid to the seller. The Court stated that these fees were in the nature of a contractual "penalty", and the financial responsibility was triggered by the failure to purchase engines. The fees were not part of the price actually paid or payable for the engines. In addition, the importer made payments to the seller for tooling expenses and claimed these payments as assists. The Court agreed with Customs that the payments made for tooling expenses are not assists but rather, are part of the price actually paid or payable. The statutory requirements for an assist are not met because the seller is not supplied with the actual tooling. The tooling expense was allocated over the number of engines intended to be produced rather than the actual number of engines produced.

Merck, Sharp & Dohme Int'l v. United States, 20 Ct. Int'l Trade 137 (1996).

The merchandise at issue, Indocin, was manufactured by a company in Holland that is related to the importer. The manufacturer produced the Indocin using assists provided by the importer. The importer claims that Customs erred in appraising the merchandise because instead of determining the value of the assist based upon its cost of production, Customs used the value declared on the invoice. The importer claimed that the invoice price is not the assist's cost of production, but rather, the cost of production is found by examining the business records that the importer presented to the Court The government's position was the Merck did not prove the accuracy of its claimed cost of production figures because it did not provide source documentation (e.g., detailed cost

records regarding the manufacture of the assist) to substantiate them. Absent sufficient proof of its claimed cost of production, the government contended that the assist should be based on the value provided at entry. The Court held that the testimony of the importer's witnesses and the documentary evidence presented by the importer, were sufficient to prove the cost of production of the assist, and that Customs erred in using the price declared on the invoice to determine the value of the assist.

Salant Corp. v. United States, 24 Ct. Int'l Trade 24 (2000), Pl. mot. for relief from judgment denied, No. 01-24, slip op. (Ct. Int'l Trade Mar. 1, 2001).

The issue in this case involves the inclusion of waste or scrap material in the definition of assists. From 1984–1995, Customs position was the scrap or waste in a cut, make, and trim (CMT) operation was not considered an assist within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A). However, in 1995, Customs changed its position and maintained that fabric waste generated in a CMT was in fact part of an assist as "merchandise consumed in the production of imported merchandise." The plaintiff in this case challenged Customs' inclusion of the value of material supplied by the plaintiff to the manufacturer but scrapped or wasted during the manufacturing process, within the meaning of an assist pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A). The plaintiff/importer supplied rolls of fabric, free of charge, to the manufacturers of men's shirts pursuant to contracts for the cut, make, and trim (CMT) of the shirts. During the manufacturing process, a portion of the fabric is scrapped as waste material. The Court determined that the plain meaning of the phrase "merchandise consumed" in the production accurately describes the waste or scrap material in this case, and that Customs' position to include the waste fabric within the definition of an assist was correct.

Headquarters Rulings:

apportionment of assists

19 CFR 152.103(e)(1) and (2); GATT Valuation Agreement Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(ii)

General purpose machinery may be apportioned on a yearly basis at the depreciated cost as reflected on the books of the importer, assuming the depreciation is determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
542302 dated Feb. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 18).

If the entire anticipated production using an assist is for exportation to the United States, the total value of the assist may be apportioned over the first dutiable shipment if the importer wishes to pay duty on the entire value at one time. The assist is not part of the transaction value of future shipments of articles produced from that particular assist.
542361 dated July 14, 1981; overruled on other grounds by 544858 dated Dec. 13, 1991.

The value of an assist must be apportioned reasonably in accordance with generally

accepted accounting principles. The value of an assist may not be apportioned entirely to the first entry of merchandise where the entry is duty free.
542519 dated July 21, 1981 (TAA No. 35).

In a situation involving a patent, a proportionate share of the development cost added to the invoice price of each shipment until the entire development cost has been amortized is a reasonable method of apportioning the cost of development. The amount added to each entry is based upon the number of units expected to be produced for sale to the United States according to a reasonable forecast. This method is reasonable in light of the circumstances and is in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
543806 dated Mar. 12, 1987.

544194 dated May 23, 1988 (Cust. B. & Dec. , Vol. 22, No. 25, June 22, 1988) – See Assists; drawback on assists.

The value of the assist in this case is equal to the cost of its acquisition, plus the transportation costs incurred in transporting the assist to the place of production. If the anticipated production is only partially for exportation to the United States, then the method of apportionment depends upon the documentation that is submitted by the importer with respect to the merchandise.
544238 dated Oct. 24, 1988.

544337 dated Apr. 9, 1990. - See Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, apportionment and depreciation of assists

Tooling was supplied free of charge by the importer to the unrelated manufacturers in China for use in the production of the imported merchandise. Duty on the entire value of the tooling assist was paid. Subsequently, the importer seeks to have the method of apportionment changed, whereby the value of the tooling is apportioned over its useful life. At the time the payment was made, the importer had the option of selecting a different method of apportionment of the assist. Instead, the importer chose another acceptable method. The method of apportionment of the value of the assist cannot be amended retroactively after liquidation of the entry.
544494 dated June 28, 1993.

The importer proposes to apportion the value of assists according to a depreciation schedule that is approved by the IRS for income tax purposes. However, the proposed apportionment method is not reasonable or appropriate to the circumstances and is therefore unacceptable for appraisement purposes. There must be a connection between the apportionment method selected and the imported articles. The proposed apportionment method is unreasonable because it is based solely on the estimated useful life of the assist, and there is no link between the apportionment method and the imported merchandise.
545031 dated June 30, 1993.

The importer purchases lead crystal mini-vases from an unrelated seller. There is a mold

cost associated with the purchase of the vases which is part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. Two purchase orders submitted by the importer indicate the number of vases associated with the mold payment. Therefore, the mold payment should be apportioned over the entire amount of vases imported. The mold payment should not be apportioned to a single shipment because no evidence of the parties′ intention to apportion to a single shipment has been presented. If there are additional purchase orders or agreements which indicate that additional vases are also involved, apportionment should be adjusted accordingly.
546771 dated Mar. 27, 1998.

The importer declares the cost of the cut, make, trim work, the cost of fabric, and the cost of the fabric used to produce the 2nd quality merchandise at the time the 1st quality merchandise is imported. As a result, the cost of the fabric associated with the second importation has already been declared as a dutiable assist on the first entry. The subject fabric is an assist within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A). The value of the fabric must be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise pursuant to section 1401a(b)(1)(C). The value of the fabric may be apportioned over the first shipment of the 1st quality merchandise pursuant to 19 CFR 152.103(e).
547611 dated Mar. 22, 2001.

When the value of an assist is not known at the time of the first entry in a series of entries, the entire value of the assist may not be apportioned to the first entry, either through reconciliation or a supplemental information letter. When the amount of the assist in not known at the time of entry, 19 CFR 152.103(e) does not allow the apportionment to one unliquidated entry while the related entries are liquidated. Without knowing the value of the assist, it is impossible to determine a method for apportioning the assists on the first entry.
548242 dated Feb. 19, 2003.

Design work that is indirectly supplied to the foreign manufacturer by the importer is supplied free of charge, is used in the production of the imported merchandise, and is necessary for the production of the merchandise. The “design work” is an assist, the value of which is to be added to the price actually paid or payable. The anticipated production is partially for exportation to the United States; however, the importer has submitted a “per garment design charge” apportionment that is reasonable and appropriate to the circumstances, and is in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
548316 dated July 16, 2003, <u>modified</u> by W548547 dated Mar. 7, 2006 - <u>See</u> Assists, management services, salaries.

548540 dated July 28, 2004 – <u>See</u> Assists, assist definition.

Where all of the imported goods at issue are classified in the same HTSUS provision, the importer may apportion its assist costs in a monthly declaration such that all assists will be declared on the first entry of the month following incurrence of the costs, provided that such apportionment is in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

H015975 dated Sep. 13, 2007.

BIC leases equipment to an unaffiliated manufacturer for an annual rental payment of $5,000. After depreciation over the period of the lease, the machinery will have a value over $5,000. The machinery constitutes an assist and the value that exceeds the annual $5,000 fee may be apportioned.
H044163 dated Jan. 13, 2009.

H031244 dated Apr. 10, 2009 – See Assists, assist definition.

H057714 dated May 13, 2009 – See Assists, assist definition.

Fabric is provided free of charge to vendors and allocated to specific style numbers and purchase orders. The company was able to change the declaration of the value of the assists from apportioning the value over the entire anticipated production to declaring the entire value of the assists on the first dutiable shipment as per 19 CFR 152.103(e)(i).
H049855 dated June 26, 2009.

The cost of fabric or leather and associated transportation costs for furniture company is an assist and can be apportioned to the first shipment of the next month provided that it is done in accordance with GAAP.
H086246 dated Mar. 2, 2010.

The importer imports a variety of service parts from a foreign manufacturer. The importer sells tooling to the foreign manufacturer for use in producing these service parts. The foreign manufacturer charges the importer an amortization amount based on sale estimates over a depreciation period for the tooling with adjustments for any difference between the forecasted quantities and actual quantities (these charges are referred to by the importer as under-amortized tooling costs). The importer made a reasonable effort to forecast the quantities over the amortization period in order to minimize the extent to which additional payments or credits would be required. The importer's method of allocation is reasonable and consistent with previous Customs decisions. The price actually paid or payable already includes the allocated tooling payments and no further adjustments are needed on the basis of the under-amortized tooling costs.
H088115 dated Apr. 19, 2010.

The total amount of R&D costs relating to the production of the imported telecommunications equipment was not fully ascertainable until after entry. The importer may apportion the value of the assist R&D costs expensed in any fiscal quarter to the first entry of the next fiscal quarter from each foreign manufacturer, when the R&D expenses are known. This calculation of the value of the assist will occur within 30 days after closing a quarter, and the total value of the assist will be declared on the first shipment of the next month after the close of the quarter. If the importer has dutiable entries in addition to its duty-free entries, the proposed method of declaring the assist will no longer be acceptable.

H190269 dated Feb. 20, 2014.

Apportionment of foreign design and engineering costs using a formula to calculate a "cost factor" consisting of dividing the actual costs of non-U.S. purchased engineering services costs by the cost of goods sold (less the actual costs of all engineering services) and applied on an entry-by-entry basis was found to be reasonable and acceptable given that the imported goods at issue were primarily duty-free.
H231836 dated Jun. 19, 2014.

H255442 dated Oct. 9, 2014 – See Assists, testing costs.

The importer provides assists to foreign suppliers and subcontractors in the form of payments for research and development and payments for parts, fasteners, and related consumables. Importer stated that it was difficult to directly apportion the assists because they could not be linked to any particular shipment of parts. The assists may be apportioned by taking the total value of assists for the previous quarter for each foreign vendor and apportioning it pro-rata to the total value of goods entered under each HTSUS subheading from that vendor for the previous quarter.
H264394 dated May 22, 2015.

assist definition

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A) and (B); 19 CFR 152.102(b); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(b)

If a cost item is not specifically included within the assist definition, it will not be added as an assist.
542106 dated May 15, 1980 (TAA No. 2); 542122 dated Sep. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 4); 542412 dated Mar. 27, 1983 (TAA No. 20); 543631 dated June 8, 1987; 544060 dated Jan. 30, 1988; 544315 dated May 30, 1989; 544353 dated Oct. 24, 1989.

Defective watches are returned to the U.S. importer for repair. The defective watches are then exported from the United States to the importer's related party in the Philippines for repair and return. The watches are then repaired and re-sold back to the importer at prices that cover the cost of repairs plus a mark-up. Under these circumstances, the defective watches acquired by the importer and sent to the related party for repair are considered assists. The value attributed to the defective watches in this case is equal to the costs incurred in transporting the watches to the related party's plant.
544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989, modified by 548557 dated Oct. 20, 2004.

There are three positions at the related-party foreign manufacturer which are filled by U.S. nationals whose costs are not included in the transfer price and are not covered by the royalty agreement between the parties. The services performed by the technical designer and the technical designer manager constitute assists because they are part of the development of the merchandise and are necessary for its production. The value of these assists includes fringe benefits received by these two individuals. The services performed

by the quality engineering/quality control coordinator are not assists because these duties are not necessary for the production of the imported merchandise. Certain "secondary" testing is not necessary for the production of the merchandise and does not constitute an assist. The assists may be apportioned on the basis of the percentage or amount of the services related to the imported merchandise if done in accordance with 19 CFR § 152.103(e) and provided certain documentation is provided to the port.
548540 dated July 28, 2004.

Defective watches, returned to the U.S. importer for repair, are exported to the importer's related party in the Philippines for repair and return to the U.S. After repair, the watches are sold back to the U.S. importer at a price that covers the cost of repair and a mark-up. HQ 544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989, held that the defective watches sent to the importer's related party for repair are assists and the value attributed to the defective watches is the cost of transporting the watches to the foreign location. HQ 548557 modifies HQ 544241 and holds that the defective watches are not assists. HQ 548557 also overturns the portion of HQ 544241 concerning the value of the defective watches in their purported capacity as assists.
548557 dated Oct. 20, 2004, <u>modifying</u> 544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989.

Even though the importer will own the tools, because it is paying the foreign manufacturer to produce the tools and fixtures rather than supplying the actual tools and fixtures to the foreign manufacturer, they do not constitute assists under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A). Nevertheless, because the importer is making payments to the foreign seller for the tools and fixtures, these payments would still be considered dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable to the seller as direct payments to the seller.
H044417 dated Jan. 14, 2009.

USPC purchases and imports wearing apparel manufactured by its wholly-owned African subsidiary, and/or by unrelated third party manufacturers in Asia. The imported merchandise is designed by the subsidiary with the assistance of two USPC employees who are domiciled in the U.S. USPC does not compensate the subsidiary for the design work undertaken by the subsidiary. The design work performed by USPC's two employees in the U.S. does not constitute an assist under 19 U.S.C. 1401(a)(h)(1), but the design work performed by the subsidiary is an assist. It was acceptable to value the assist by allocating the total annual salaries paid to its employees engaged in design work to all relevant products produced during a calendar year, but was not acceptable to allocate the entire value to the first duty-free entry of each calendar year.
H031244 dated Apr. 10, 2009.

The importer supplied U.S.-origin gold bars at no cost to unrelated foreign manufacturers who used the gold in producing gold jewelry for the importer. The gold bars fit the definition of an assist and their value must be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H057714 dated May 13, 2009.

Payments made by importer to parent company pursuant to a Technical Assistance

Agreement related to the design and development of accessories produced in the U.S.by domestic manufacturers are not dutiable under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b). However, technical assistance performed by the parent company under the said agreement, outside the U.S., free of charge, and necessary for the development of the imported merchandise by foreign manufacturers constitutes an assist.
H047284 dated June 22, 2009.

The importer plans to hire an independent on-site footwear commercialization/ production engineer. Services to be provided by the engineer include: 1) serving as importer's eyes, ears, and voice inside a contract manufacturing environment (factory); 2) last development assistance and communication link to approved last suppliers; 3) tooling initiation and optimization; 4) assisting factories in optimizing production through the commercialization process; 5) helping to create standards for fit, function, and testing to keep all shoes consistent for importer's products; 6) a consistent monitor of the construction of importer's product from commercialization pre-production stage to shipping; 7) evaluate and recommend tools, machinery and systems for footwear production; and 8) establish/enforce process controls for manufacturing operations. In consideration for these services, the importer will pay the engineer a monthly salary plus reimbursement for business telecommunications costs and travel costs associated with required travel to various supplier/manufacturer/sub-supplier facilities. The work to be provided by an independent on-site footwear commercialization/production engineer constitutes an assist. Therefore, the value of the assist is included in transaction value as an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
H057735 dated July 15, 2009.

Advertisement flyers and assembly instructions are not dutiable assists.
H248853 dated Feb. 7, 2014.

The extended warranty is not an assist. Since the agreement to purchase the extended warranty was entered into after the transaction for the purchase of the merchandise had been completed and after the merchandise had been imported into the United States, it is not included in the price actually paid or payable of the imported gear boxes. Therefore, the payment for the extended warranty is not included as part of the dutiable value of the imported merchandise.
H253493 dated Sep. 14, 2014.

components which are destroyed, scrapped, or lost

Components which are destroyed, scrapped, or lost, and which are not physically incorporated into the imported articles are not assists.
543093 dated Apr. 30, 1984; clarified by 543398 dated Aug. 27, 1984; 543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988.

Excess fabric that is not utilized or otherwise incorporated into the final imported merchandise is not considered to be an assist.
543924 dated May 29, 1987.

545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995; Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995; modifies or revokes 544662 dated Mar. 18, 1994; 544758 dated Feb. 21, 1992; 543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988; 543623 dated Nov. 4, 1985; and 543093 dated Apr. 30, 1984 – See Assists, consumed in production.
547018 dated Sep. 10, 1999 - See Assists, consumed in production.
.

consumed in the production

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A)(iii); 19 CFR 152.102(a)(1)(iii); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(iii)

A microorganism furnished to the seller, by the buyer, to produce a certain product is "consumed" in the production of the imported merchandise. The microorganism loses enzymatic activity and eventually must be replenished. This required replenishment implies consumption of the microorganism. Accordingly, the microorganism is to be treated as an assist. The value of the assist is the cost of its acquisition that, in this case, includes a fee paid in a sub-license agreement entered into in order to utilize the technology.
543943 dated Dec. 8, 1987.

Seeds, pesticides and herbicides are all materials that are consumed in the production of the merchandise and are assists under section 402(h)(1)(A)(iii).
544655 dated June 13, 1991.

The buyer supplies a cell culture to the foreign seller. The imported merchandise produced from the cell culture consists of monoclonal antibodies. The cell culture is "consumed" in the production of the antibodies and therefore, constitutes an assist. The value of the assist is the cost of producing the assist plus the cost of transporting it to the foreign producer.
545135 dated Aug. 27, 1993.

Even though waste or scrap (of a material, such as a bolt of fabric or sheet of plastic, or of discrete components, such as circuits, CPU chips, or semi-conductors) which results from, or during, the production of imported merchandise is not physically incorporated in that merchandise, such material or components are consumed in the production of the merchandise and may constitute assists. Accordingly, once it is determined that material or components meet the definition of an assist, then Customs considers, among other things, the accounting records of the supplier of the assists to determine the value of the assist. Information regarding where scrap or waste results from, or during, the production of the imported merchandise is considered.
545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995; Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995; modifies or revokes 544662 dated Mar. 18, 1994; 544758 dated Feb. 21, 1992; 543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988; 543623 dated Nov. 4, 1985; and 543093 dated Apr. 30, 1984.

Waste or scrap which results from, or during, the production of imported merchandise may constitute assists to be included in the Customs value of that imported merchandise. (General Notice of Customs Relating to Assists, Customs Bull., Vol. 29, no. 51, 12/20/95.) Determinations concerning the valuation of assists are to be based upon objective and quantifiable data, including the accounting records of the supplier of the assists. The importer's proposed "average efficiency" in this case does not reflect the fabric utilization and efficiency for all the imported merchandise at issue. Therefore, the "average efficiency" cannot be considered as objective and quantifiable data for purposes of determining the fabric waste.
547018 dated Sep. 10, 1999.

Waste used lacquer thinner was imported after being recycled in Canada. HQ 543859 determined that the returned solvent would be appraised on the basis of transaction value based on the amount actually paid or payable to the Canadian recycler plus the value, as an assist, of the used solvent that was shipped to the recycler. Upon reconsideration, it was determined that there was no sale and the recycled lacquer may have to be appraised under the "fallback" valuation method. Further, it was determined that the used lacquer thinner sent to Canada did not fall into any of the definitions of an assist, but was merely recycled and thus was not consumed in the production of the imported merchandise.
548569 dated Oct. 20, 2004, modifying 543859 dated Mar. 13, 1987.

costs of acquiring assists

The cost of acquiring an assist is limited to its purchase price plus actual transportation costs. The cost of procuring an assist, i.e., receiving inspection, and warehouse costs are not part of the value of an assist.
542144 dated Feb. 4, 1981 (TAA No. 16); see 542412 dated Mar. 27, 1983 (TAA No. 20); modified by 544323 dated Mar. 8, 1990.

Costs incurred by the buyer in selecting financing and warehousing fabric which is furnished without charge to the foreign sellers are not to be included as part of the cost of acquiring the fabric.
542367 dated June 18, 1981.

542948 dated Nov. 29, 1982 (TAA No. 55). – See Assists, engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production.

Costs associated with purchasing, receiving, inspection, warehousing, production control, design engineering, accounting, and sales functions are not assists. The cost of acquiring an assist is limited to the purchase plus transportation costs. The cost of procuring an assist is not part of the value of an assist.
542412 dated Mar. 27, 1983 (TAA No. 20), modification of TAA No. 16; see TAA No. 46).

544192 dated June 16, 1989 – See Assists, engineering, development, artwork,

design work necessary for the production.

The term "procurement assists", i.e., costs associated in procuring an assist, is not a term defined in the TAA. The TAA simply defines what materials or services are considered assists. Therefore, costs incurred for activities such as warehousing and packing items which are subsequently sent to the seller for use in production for the merchandise are either to be considered as assists or as a part of the value of an assist.
544323 dated Mar. 8, 1990; modifies TAA No. 20 dated Mar. 27, 1983.

Commissions paid to an alleged buying agent for obtaining various piece goods/assists are part of the costs of acquiring the materials, components, and parts incorporated in the imported merchandise. Therefore, the payments made by the importer for acquiring piece goods are considered part of the costs of the assist.
544423 dated June 3, 1991, aff'd by 544843 dated Oct. 31, 1994.

544976 dated Mar. 17, 1993. - See Buying Commissions, commissions paid to agent for acquiring assists.

545266 dated June 30, 1993.- See Buying Commissions, commissions paid to agent for acquiring assists.

Buying commissions paid to a *bona fide* buying agent for acquiring merchandise to be imported are not dutiable. Where the agent has the dual role under an agency agreement of procuring assists as well as the finished merchandise, any commissions paid to the agent arising out of such an agreement are not dutiable. However, commissions paid to an agent whose sole obligation is to acquire assists for the buyer, are part of the cost of acquiring the assist and are added to the price actually paid or payable. In this case, the agent performs no services other than supplying trim, piece goods, accessories and production supplies to the manufacturers of the finished articles. Consequently, "commissions" paid to the agent are dutiable, either as part of the price to an independent seller, or, as part of the cost of acquiring the assists.
544843 dated Oct. 31, 1994; aff'g 544423 dated June 3, 1991.

The cost or value of an assist is the buyer's cost of acquisition. In this case, the buyer is required to make progress payments and continuing royalty payments for coding services and the code itself. The creation of the code or program constitutes an assist with regard to imported video game cartridges. The progress payments and the continuing royalty payments for the coding services represent the cost of acquisition of the assists provided to the manufacturer.
545279 dated Nov. 30, 1994.

545851 dated May 8, 1995. - See Buying Commissions, commissions paid to agent for acquiring assists.

The importer imports lamps and lighting fixtures, of Chinese manufacture, into the United States, and sells the merchandise to U.S. retail stores. The importer contracts with a third

party to provide the manufacturer with component parts for use in the manufacture of the lamps and fixtures. At the time of entry, the importer has not rendered payment for the component parts. The component parts constitute assists and the value of the assists is the cost of their acquisition including transportation costs. It is inconsequential whether, at the time of entry of the merchandise, the importer has yet to actually pay the third party producer for the amount owed for providing the component parts. The parts constitute assists regardless of whether their cost of acquisition has been paid at the time of entry.
547070 dated Dec. 21, 1998.

548626 dated Apr. 18, 2005 – See Assists, free of charge

depreciation of assists

19 CFR 152.103(d)(2); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(ii)

542302 dated Feb. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 18). - See Assists, apportionment of assists.

In determining the value of fabric furnished without charge to an unrelated assembler, the cost of acquisition to the importer (from an unrelated party) must be used, and not the depreciated cost as reflected on the importer's books.
542356 dated Apr. 13, 1981 (TAA No. 24); 542477 dated July 27, 1981.

If a mold that is supplied free of charge to the foreign manufacturer is depreciated to zero on the books of the importer in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles, then the value of the assist will be limited to the cost incurred in transporting the assist to the place of production.
543233 dated Aug. 9, 1984.

543450 dated June 25, 1985. - See Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, apportionment and depreciation of assists.

544243 dated Oct. 24, 1988; 544256 dated Nov. 15, 1988 - See Assists, transportation costs.

Depreciation is taken into account in determining the value of an assist that has been previously utilized in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The value of the assist should also include the costs of transporting the assist to the place of production.
548667 dated Oct. 5, 2005.

directly or indirectly

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A); 19 CFR 152.102(a)(1); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(b)

542166 dated Feb. 12, 1981 (TAA No. 17). - See Interest Charges, assists.

Money paid by the related party buyer to the foreign manufacturer to cover the cost of developing a master disc for use in production of video discs which are then sold to the related party buyer is not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and is not included in transaction value.
542361 dated July 14, 1981; overruled by 544858 dated Dec. 13, 1991.

Additional amounts paid by the buyer of specific merchandise to the manufacturer to produce tools necessary to produce the merchandise constitute part of the price paid or payable.
542812 dated July 19, 1982.

Payments made by the ultimate purchaser in the United States, through the importer, to the manufacturer are not considered assists. However, these payments are part of the price actually paid or payable as indirect payments.
543324 dated Aug. 8, 1984.

A payment made to a Japanese manufacturer whereby the manufacturer designs and develops a prototype industrial robot is not an assist. However, the payment is dutiable as part of the part actually paid or payable to the seller as a direct payment.
543376 dated Nov. 13, 1984.

543293 dated Jan. 15, 1985; overruled by 543574 dated Mar. 24, 1986 - See Indirect Payments, compensation for assists as indirect payments.

Materials that are incorporated into the final imported products and are supplied by the ultimate U.S. purchaser are dutiable as assists. The assists are supplied "directly or indirectly" at a reduced cost to the seller and are dutiable as an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
543439 dated May 6, 1985.

543574 dated Mar. 24, 1986; overrules 543293 dated Jan. 15, 1985 - See Indirect Payments, compensation for assists as indirect payments.

543882 dated Mar. 13, 1987; aff'd by 554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989 - See Indirect Payments, compensation for assists as indirect payments.

543983 dated Dec. 2, 1987. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect payments.

543967 dated Dec. 17, 1987.- See Indirect Payments, compensation for assists as indirect payments.

The buyer of the imported merchandise does not supply the designs, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the designs cannot be considered assists. Inaddition, because

there is no indication that the buyer makes any additional payment to the seller concerning the design work, the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise embodies the total payment made to the seller for the merchandise.
545462 dated Aug. 9, 1994.

drawback on assists

Apportioning the value of an assist on the first entry, in a series of entries, and subsequently claiming drawback on that first entry is not in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and not authorized by the TAA.
544194 dated May 23, 1988; Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 22, No. 25, June 22, 1988.

engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h) (1) (A) (iv); 19 CFR 152.102(a)(1)(iv); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(iv) and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(iv)

Design work undertaken in the U.S. is not an assist. Design work undertaken in the United States and furnished free to a U.S. manufacturer of bare printed circuit boards that are later assembled abroad into finished printed circuit boards is not an assist.
542146 dated Nov. 25, 1980 (TAA No. 12); aff'd by 542419 dated June 2, 1981.

Canadian drawing and working model and royalty payments to either a Canadian patent holder or U.S. patent holder are assists, the royalty payments being part of the cost of the drawing and model.
542152 dated Dec. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 13).

A prototype developed entirely in the United States by the U.S. buyer or by his employees and used as a pattern or template is not treated as an assist.
542220 dated Dec. 24, 1980 (TAA No. 15).

Design department costs incurred in the United States are not assists under either transaction or computed value.
542325 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 23).

Costs for patterns that are produced by the buyer's design department in the United States and provided free of charge to the sellers are not to be treated as assists.
542367 dated June 18, 1981.

The following costs are not considered to be assists: (1) technical data, blueprints, drawings, etc., originating in the United States; (2) U.S.-domiciled manufacturing specialists assisting foreign contractors; (3) employees described in (2) above who also perform incidental labor; (4) assistance performed in the United States on

foreign-produced prototypes; and (5) engineering models produced in the United States.
542377 dated June 16, 1981 (TAA No. 32).

542498 dated June 16, 1981. - <u>See</u> Assists, use in connection with production or the sale for export.

Interim U.S. analysis of merchandise is not considered to be an assist. If performed outside the United States, such work may constitute an assist. Engineering and development performed within the United States are not assists. Engineering and development performed outside the United States, which are assists, may be valued according to an estimate based on a percentage-type formula. U.S.-produced pattern generator tapes are not tools within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(ii). Rather, they are in the nature of design work, and therefore, not dutiable as assists.
542324 dated June 22, 1981 (TAA No. 33).

U.S.-manufactured magnetic reel tapes furnished to a foreign manufacturer for use in the production of phonographic discs are design work or product development necessary for the production of imported merchandise, and are not assists.
542446 dated July 23, 1981 (TAA No. 37).

A duplicate working film furnished to the foreign manufacturer, which is developed exclusively in the United States by the U.S. buyer, is not an assist.
542521 dated Oct. 7, 1981.

Photographic negatives used in the foreign manufacture of greeting cards are not assists when they are developed exclusively in the United States.
542625 dated Jan. 18, 1982.

The value of a pattern supplied to the manufacturer is not included in the dutiable value of the imported merchandise produced because the engineering and development was undertaken in the United States.
542774 dated June 14, 1982.

Color and pattern development work accomplished entirely within the United States is not an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv).
542769 dated June 30, 1982.

Research and development costs incurred outside of the United States should be included as direct costs of processing for purposes of determining the eligibility of an article for duty-free treatment under GSP.
542891 dated Sep. 14, 1982.

"Mothers" used in the production of phonograph records are in the nature of design work and therefore, if produced in the United States, then they are not assists.
542936 dated Nov. 12, 1982 (TAA No. 54).

An integrated circuit (chip) which is supplied by the buyer at a reduced cost to the seller is deemed to be a component that is included in the imported merchandise and it is therefore, an assist. The value of the assist is the full cost of acquisition, which includes any research and development costs incurred in producing the chip, whether it is fabricated in the United States or elsewhere.
542948 dated Nov. 29, 1982 (TAA No. 55).

543064 dated June 1, 1983. - See Assists, use in connection with the production or the sale for export.

543324 dated Aug. 8, 1984. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect payments.

543376 dated Nov. 13, 1984 – See Assists, directly or indirectly.

543436 dated Dec. 14, 1984. - See Assists, use in connection with the production or the sale for export.

Pursuant to section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) of the TAA, only research and development that is performed outside of the United States is dutiable as an assist. In this case, all such development is performed in the United States and therefore, its cost is not added to the price actually paid or payable as an assist.
543272 dated Apr. 26, 1985.

Engineering work is obtained from either U.S. or Canadian vendors in order to manufacture tools for export to the United States. The manufacturer does not obtain the engineering work at a reduced cost. The cost of design and engineering work purchased by the manufacturer from vendors in the United States or Canada is dutiable only to the extent that such cost is included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported tools by the importer to the manufacturer.
543584 dated Aug. 30, 1985.

The design and production of photographs are both undertaken in the United States. Therefore, costs incurred by the importer in the design and production of the photographs are not assists.
543851 dated Apr. 13, 1987.

The importer enters into an agreement with a Hong Kong company for the purpose of obtaining design and consulting services. This company provides the services of furnishing engineering, development, artwork, plans and sketches for the importer. The commissions are assists and should be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544088 dated Mar. 25, 1988.

If the importer provides design work to an unrelated U.S. manufacturer who produces the mold, then the value of the mold is based upon the cost of its acquisition. This is the price

paid by the buyer to the manufacturer without the additional cost of the design work because it is the service of manufacturing the mold that is purchased and not the design work. This is similarly the outcome if the importer provides the design work to a foreign manufacturer who constructs the mold.
544192 dated June 16, 1989.

Research and development costs undertaken outside of the United States for new models of firearms and improvements of existing firearms must be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
544337 dated Apr. 9, 1990.

Colorways produced by foreign artists outside of the United States that instruct the foreign manufacturer on how to color textile designs constitute assists within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) of the TAA.
544621 dated Apr. 22, 1991.

544459 dated May 30, 1991. See Assists, value of assists, i.e., cost of acquisition or cost of production.

The standard used to determine whether foreign engineering costs are to be added to the price actually paid or payable as an assist is whether such is "necessary" for the production rather than "used" in the production. In this case, the engineering that produced the initial layout for blueprints was necessary for the production of the imported article. These engineering costs are to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
544609 dated Aug. 12, 1991.

A portion of the design work that is supplied to the seller is performed in the United States and other portions are performed in Mexico. The portion of the work performed in the United States is not dutiable as long as the importer is able to provide a cost breakdown of the design work performed in each country. Accordingly, the only dutiable portion of the assist is the amount of the payment attributable to the work performed in Mexico.
545341 dated Aug. 3, 1994.

The buyer is an importer of video game cartridges for use in home entertainment systems. The imported cartridges consist of read-only memory (ROM) integrated circuits soldered to printed circuit boards. The buyer who engages an independent contractor to provide coding services develops the game concept. The buyer then transfers the code to an erasable programmable read-only memory chip (EPROM). After reviewing the program, a completed EPROM is sent to the manufacturer at no charge. The manufacturer uses the EPROM to create a photomask that reproduces the programming pattern. The pattern is then transferred to silicon wafers, and the wafers are used to make the ROM, which is a component of the video game cartridge. The creation of the code is necessary for the production of the imported merchandise, and is an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) of the TAA.
545279 dated Nov. 30, 1994.

The importer develops certain software at its U.S. facility. The software is copied onto a master set of erasable programmable read-only memory chips (EPROMS). The EPROMS are then supplied free of charge to a foreign manufacturer for use in the production of the imported merchandise, i.e., Delivery Information Acquisition Devices (DIADS). The master EPROMS are electronic means of transferring design work and do not confer final shape and form to the imported merchandise and, therefore, are not similar to tools, dies or molds. The master EPROMS are not assists within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A) of the TAA because they represent engineering and design work undertaken in the United States. Their value is not included in the transaction value of the final imported merchandise.
545256 dated Jan. 10, 1995.

The buyer purchases telephones from various foreign sellers. In connection with these transactions, the buyer supplies the seller, free of charge, with software used to produce the telephones. The buyer in the United States develops the software and it is necessary for the production of the imported telephones. The software supplied by the buyer does not constitute an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A) of the TAA because it represents engineering and design work undertaken in the United States. The value of the software should not be included in the transaction value of the imported telephones.
545987 dated Aug. 28, 1995.

A U.S. subsidiary of a Japanese corporation imports televisions and other electronic products from its related manufacturing division in Mexico. The manufacturing division in Mexico hired, through the importer, Japanese engineers that generally reside in the U.S. for 1 - 3 months yet their services are performed in Mexico. The importer makes the payments for their services to the Japanese employer. Although the importer pays for the services, they are recorded as an expense attributable to the Mexican operation. The expenses are described as payments made to the Japanese parent's employees for engineering assistance. The expenses are not incidental to other engineering undertaken within the United States, but instead pertain to engineering or development undertaken in Mexico in its own right. The costs for the engineering services constitute assists to be included as part of the computed value of the merchandise.
545626 dated Feb. 28, 1996.

The importer purchases and imports various consumer products through various manufacturers. In addition, the importer enters into a services agreement with its parent company in Japan. The parent agrees to perform certain services affecting the production of the imported merchandise that is produced by the third-party manufacturers. The services rendered by the parent are described as follows: review development issues and technical problems that the manufacturers have in complying with design and development requests; confirm specifications agreed to between the importer and manufacturers; evaluate trial samples and work with the manufacturers and the importer; evaluate the final sample of the merchandise; coordinate the importer's service part composition list and provide a list of stock numbers; attend the manufacturers' trial mass production runs; provide other service and assistance upon the request of the importer.

The services provided by the related party parent are part of the development of the imported merchandise and are necessary for the production of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, these services are assists within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) of the TAA. The payment for the services is added to the price actually paid or payable.
546054 dated Oct. 23, 1996.

The design work performed by the importer's fashion consultants and employees of its subsidiary that is supplied free of charge by the importer to the suppliers of the imported merchandise constitutes an assist. Although counsel claims that the "design work" performed includes marketing, quality control services and product development, no documentation has been provided to substantiate the claim. Therefore, the value of the assists, as reflected by the payments to the importer's independent consultants and the employees of its related party, should be included in transaction value.
546511 dated Apr. 15, 1999; <u>clarified by</u> 547419 dated Oct. 31, 2001.

The importer intends to purchase a computer aided device (CAD) that will communicate color specifications from U.S.-based buyers to the overseas manufacturers that produce the wearing apparel. Pursuant to section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) of the TAA, "design work" involved in determining the color combinations and patters of the garment by the CAD system does not constitute an assist, since it is undertaken within the United States by the U.S. buyer. The input of information and creation of the CAD-generated prints in Hong Kong is neither artwork nor design work that is necessary for the production of the imported merchandise. There is no discretion in creating or arranging the color schemes and the activity is clerical in nature. The CAD-generated prints are not assists within the meaning of section 402(b)(1)(A)(iv).
546720 dated July 21, 1999.

The importer provides its buying agent with a computer disk containing U.S.-produced artwork, including packaging graphics such as UPC bar codes. The buying agent gives the disk to the product manufacturer, who then provides the disk to their printing vendor for production of the packaging. The manufacturer pays the printing vendor directly for its work and the cost of the printing is included in the price that the importer pays the manufacturer for the product. The laser scanner/verifiers constitute assists as defined in section 402(h)(1)(A)(ii) of the TAA, in that they will be used in the production of the imported merchandise. The costs of the laser scanner/verifiers are additions to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. Thus, the laser scanner/verifiers constitute assists as set forth in section 402(h)(1)(A) of the TAA.
547451 dated Oct. 22, 1999.

546782 dated Dec. 2, 1999. - <u>See</u> Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

The U.S. buyer uses the foreign and domestic designs/artwork to create new design work and artwork in the United States. The original design work and artwork are transformed to the extent that they no longer exist in the original form. The product sent to the foreign manufacturer is U.S. artwork and design work. Because the U.S. design work is not by

definition an assist, it is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise. Neither design work created in the United States from foreign nor domestic artwork and design work purchased for use as inspiration pieces constitute assists within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) and, therefore, they are not included within the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547578 dated Jan. 18, 2000.

Designs are submitted to foreign manufacturers for production under the importer's name. The design and development activities of the foreign parent of the importer, as set out in the "Tech Package" of specifications, technical drawings and design instructions, constitute assists within the meaning of section 402(a)(h)(1)(A)(iv). To the extent that transaction value is used, the value of the assist, apportioned as appropriate, is to be added to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise. If transaction value is not the basis of appraisement, then the apportioned value or cost of the assist is to be applied as appropriate under section 402.
547487 dated June 23, 2000.

546471 dated Sep. 28, 2001. - See Related Party Transactions, transfer prices.

Based on the reconsideration of the facts of this case, the importer provided design work that constituted an assist and the value of that assist is represented by the payments to the importer's independent consultants and employees of its subsidiary. Therefore, the value of the assists, as reflected by the payments to the importer's independent consultants and the employees of its related party, should be included in transaction value as an addition to the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise. The determination in HRL 546511 is affirmed.
547419 dated Oct. 31, 2001; clarification of 546511 dated Apr. 15, 1999 (546511 affirmed).

The portion of the design work performed by the importer in the United States is not considered an assist. Also, the work performed by the company abroad does not constitute an assist because it is not design work. However, the artwork performed by the artist in Denmark is part of the design work necessary for the production of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, that portion of the design work supplied by the importer free of charge to the manufacturer, therefore, constitutes an assist. The value of the artwork must be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
547808 dated Dec. 19, 2001; modified by 548097 dated Jan. 28, 2003.

Product development services include: designing; developing fashion trends and color palettes; arranging for the production of samples; providing specifications regarding fabric, style, flat sketches and sizing; and determining the best manufacturer for production. Given the extensive nature of these services, it is our conclusion that these services are necessary for the production of the imported merchandise. However, since these services are performed in the United States, they are not considered to be assists.

547645 dated Feb. 13, 2002.

A U.S. company is interested in allowing its unrelated foreign customers to purchase and use its designs in making footwear for importation into the United States. The importer intends to prepare and submit design kits to the customers. Under an agreement, the customers would pay the U.S. company a negotiated design fee based upon the invoice value of the articles produced using the designs. The customers who purchase the design kit would be permitted to use the design in connection with the manufacture, importation, distribution, and sale of the footwear within the United States. The design kits would be prepared entirely in the United States by U.S. designers. The design work undertaken within the United States is not dutiable as an assist. Thus any design work done in the United States to produce the design kits would not be added to the price actually paid or payable.

547880 dated Aug. 21, 2002.

Transparencies and films constitute assists as they are design work supplied by the buyer free of charge for use in connection with the production or sale for export of imported merchandise. To the extent that part of the production of the transparencies and films occurs in the Netherlands, the design work is "undertaken elsewhere than in the United States" within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A)(iv). Additionally, because the transparencies and films impart the essence of the product design to the imported merchandise, without which the manufacturers could not produce the imported merchandise, the design work is "necessary for the production of the imported merchandise." Having made the determination that an assist exists, it is not relevant whether each stage in the production of an assist constitutes design work or something other than design work. Instead, Customs looks at where each stage of the assist's production is performed, i.e., either inside the United States or outside the United States. Because one step in the production of the assist occurred in the Netherlands, the payments made to the Dutch designer by the buyer represent the value of the assist.

548097 dated Jan. 28, 2003, <u>modifies</u> 547808 dated Dec. 19, 2001.

Activities described in a design and consulting agreement between the parties are undertaken outside the United States and are necessary for the production of the imported garments. The design and consulting agreement indicates that the licensor provides assistance and consulting services in connection with the development of a collection of products to be created, designed or approved by the licensor and developed, produced, marketed, distributed and sold by the importer. These services are supplied indirectly by the buyer and free of charge or at a reduced cost. They are activities that concern research, selection or approval of the imported goods' component materials; creation or design of styles and designs of the imported products, review and approval of any changes to be made to the products and review and approval or disapproval of samples of the imported products. These actions all offered significant assistance to the overall production of the garments. Accordingly, the design services are used in the production of the merchandise such that they constitute assist pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(C) of the TAA.

548368 dated Dec. 24, 2003.

The buyer is an importer of “knitdowns” from French and Italian sellers. These knitdowns are traditionally knit-to-shape items and are designed to simulate a panel of a garment in miniature form. After importation and/or internal review of these knitdowns, the buyer may use the design features purchased by the knitdowns to assist in the creation of product sold in the stores of the buyer. The use of these design features varies depending on an item. Thus, these knitdowns, illustrating certain design features are not assists because they are not copied exactly as purchased but rather “used mainly as inspiration” to create a design in the United States by the buyer’s employees domiciled in the United States.

548532 dated July 16, 2004.

The importer and an unrelated Italian company entered into a contract for the production of prototype garments. The importer provided a sketch of new styles and details on the fabric and color. One prototype garment was made and sent to the importer for evaluation. If the design is accepted, the Italian company provides the importer with the paper patterns it used in making the prototype. The patterns are then supplied to Far East factories for commercial production and sample garments are first made. For the prototypes, it was determined that because the contract specified a specific amount of money to be paid on an annual basis, made in monthly installments, for a specific number of prototypes that must be produced on a monthly basis, transaction value was the proper method of appraisement. For the patterns, it was determined that insufficient information and documentation was presented to establish that the foreign manufacturer of the garments could make the garments without the use of the patterns of the prototypes. Therefore, the patterns were held to be dutiable assists as they were necessary for the production of the garments.

548566 dated Oct. 19, 2004.

According to an agreement, the Design Services Agent would develop and present footwear design proposals to unrelated buyers interested in purchasing goods made with the Design Services Agent’s designs. Once a buyer accepts a design proposal, the agent would prepare and submit a design kit to the buyer, consisting of materials, specifications, colors, etc. The design kits would be prepared entirely in the U.S. by U.S. designers. The agreement allows the buyer to use the designs in connection with the manufacture, importation, distribution and sale of the footwear and the designs would remain the property of the Design Services Agent. Payments made for the services were not dutiable as assists since they were performed entirely within the U.S.

548576 dated Oct. 27, 2004.

A preliminary rough sketch of clothing which was not essential to the production of the apparel is not considered a dutiable assist. A detailed pattern provided by the buyer to the foreign manufacturer free of charge which is necessary for the production of the imported apparel is considered a dutiable assist.

563369 dated Jan. 12, 2006.

Design work supplied by the seller to the buyer for a fee would not constitute an assist.

Design work provided by the buyer at no cost or at a reduced cost to the foreign manufacturer necessary to produce the imported good would be considered an assist and should be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported good.
H012412 dated Oct. 16, 2007.

H137435 dated Jan. 5, 2012 – See Royalty Payments and License Fees, price actually paid or payable.

H172356 dated Jan. 9, 2012 – See Royalty Payments and License Fees, Price Actually Paid or Payable.

Payment for work to convert software to 3D models by unrelated foreign third party where software was used to create imported goods was held to be dutiable assists. The work was done by trained engineers in an engineering firm, was not clerical in nature, and not merely for the conveyance of the same information in another format. It was design work necessary for the production of the imported goods.
H205579 dated Aug. 2, 2012.

Storyboard designs created by foreign designer that have no measurements, codes or specifications for colors or patterns is not a dutiable assist
H206976 dated Aug. 17, 2012.

Since a valid written agreement concerning the terms of the payments was not presented, the payments made to the vendors do not qualify as non-dutiable interest payments and should be included in the appraised value of the imported merchandise. No evidence was found that the importer supplied tooling or molds free of charge or at a reduced cost to the overseas footwear factories that it did not report. Therefore, no additions should be made to the price actually paid or payable for assists based on the cost of tooling or molds supplied to the manufacturers of the imported footwear. The work performed by the employees in the buying agent's office in its Utility Product Development Department, Design Team Department, Design Team Department, Production & QA Team Department, and Quality Team Production & QC Team and Commercialization Department were necessary for the production of the imported merchandise. Thus, the work of the employees in these departments are dutiable assists and the costs of those employees should be added to the price paid or payable of the imported merchandise with the exceptions mentioned above. These assists should be apportioned in accordance set forth in 19 CFR § 152.103(e). The fees paid for testing do not constitute dutiable assists.
H235895 dated Aug. 22, 2014.

The importer is a U.S. subsidiary of the parent company, incorporated in Germany. The importer imports men's and women's apparel and the parent company issues purchase orders to unrelated manufacturers for the entire company. The parent company's design team provides sketches to the manufacturers and the manufacturers produce samples to the parent company as evidence of their ability to manufacture the goods without detailed manufacturing instructions. The design work was deemed to be specifications reflecting

instructions to the manufacturer as to what to produce, but not how to produce, the particular garment. The sketches and specifications were general in nature and not essential to the production of the apparel. Therefore, the value of the design work is not dutiable as an assist. The importer also paid management fees to the parent company. Management fees included marketing, financing, IT services, production planning, production management, quality control, purchasing of raw materials, and shipping arrangements. The parent company did not perform any "hands-on" services, since it is not integrally involved in the production (including monitoring work flow and fit approvals). The services are similar to services provided by a buying agent and need not be included in the price actually paid or payable.
H253767 dated Mar. 30, 2015.

equipment

General purpose equipment supplied by a buyer free or at a reduced charge is an assist.
542122 dated Sep. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 4).

General purpose equipment is treated as an assist under computed value. Only the items listed in section 402(h)(i)(A) are assists, consistent with generally accepted accounting principles.
542139 dated Oct. 15, 1980 (TAA No. 9).

Air conditioning equipment, power transformers, telephone switching equipment, emergency generators, and other equipment not used in the production of imported goods, are not assists under either transaction or computed value. Sewing machines used in the production of imported goods are assists.
542302 dated Feb. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 18); 542762 dated Jan. 14, 1983; 544261 dated Feb. 28, 1989; 544421 dated Apr. 3, 1990; 544480 dated Sep. 21, 1990.

544126 dated Aug. 17, 1988; 544083 dated Aug. 16, 1988; 544261 dated Feb. 28, 1989 - <u>See</u> Assists, use in connection with the production or the sale for export.

A U.S. company provides test equipment free of charge to foreign manufacturers to check the integrity of the finished instruments prior to shipment to the United States. The testing equipment is not used in the production of the imported merchandise. The testing equipment is not an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A).
544315 dated May 30, 1989.

Testing equipment provided free of charge to the foreign manufacturer by the U.S. importer may constitute an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)of the TAA if it can be shown that the equipment was used for testing performed during the production process and that such testing, due to the nature of the finished product, was essential to production of the product.
544508 dated June 19, 1990.

In order to determine whether the testing equipment in question is an assist, Customs

must find that the equipment is "used in the production of the imported merchandise." The final testing equipment is used for testing assembled products. Although the testing is performed on fully assembled products, the nature of the products require such testing, as the integrity of the printed circuit boards cannot otherwise be determined. The fact that the circuit boards frequently do not pass testing and are returned to the assembly line is evidence that production of the merchandise is not complete until the circuit boards are determined to be functional. Because the testing equipment is used during the production process and it is essential to the production of the imported merchandise, the testing equipment is considered to be an assist.
545170 dated Oct. 27, 1994.

548286 dated Mar. 17, 2003. - See Packing Costs, packed ready for shipment to the United States.

free of charge or at a reduced cost

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A); 19 CFR 152.102(a)(1); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(b)

543003 dated Feb. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 58); rev'd. by 543096 dated June 21, 1983 (TAA No. 63) - See Transportation Costs, freight and related charges incurred in transporting assists.

543096 dated June 21, 1983 (TAA No. 63); rev'g 543003 dated Feb. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 58), 544201 dated Dec. 12, 1988 - See Transportation Costs, freight and related charges incurred in transporting assists.

Because the transfer price between the importer and Taiwanese assembler does not reflect the special tooling costs, the parts are provided at a reduced cost and, therefore, the tooling constitutes dutiable assists. The value of the assists is equal to the extent of the reduction in cost, which, in turn, equals that portion of the tooling costs relating to the production of the parts which are sent abroad for assembly.
543405 dated June 21, 1985.

The importer pays a Canadian manufacturer to have a third party produce tools for the importer. The importer at all times retains title and ownership of the tools. The Canadian manufacturer then uses the tools free of charge to produce parts for the importer. The tools belong to the importer, are given free of charge to the manufacturer, and are considered to be assists. Their costs can be amortized pursuant to generally accepted accounting principles.
543556 dated Aug. 23, 1985.

543584 dated Aug. 30, 1985. - See Assists, engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production.

543619 dated Oct. 23, 1985 – See Assists, materials, components, parts, and similar

items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

Sewing machines and related equipment purchased by the importer and subsequently sold to the seller for use in production of the imported merchandise do not constitute assists.
543877 dated Mar. 17, 1987.

544315 dated May 30, 1989 – <u>See</u> Assists, equipment.

544508 dated June 19, 1990 – <u>See</u> Assists, equipment.

The sketches and samples in question are not considered to be assists. The costs of these items are included in the price actually paid or payable to the buyer of the imported merchandise. Therefore, they are not provided free of charge or at a reduced cost.
544815 dated May 8, 1997.

The imported merchandise is a food supplement consisting of gelatin capsules filled with a variety of materials. The seller's customers purchase some of the fill materials from outside sources, and provide them to the seller free of charge. After filling the capsule, the seller prepares an invoice for the U.S. customer indicating their charge for the encapsulating process, and a separate line item for the value of the fill material. The fill material provided free of charge to the seller by its customers represents an assist and accordingly, the value of the assist must be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
546679 dated Aug. 11, 1997.

Design work provided by the importer free of charge or at a reduced cost to the seller/manufacturer is an assist. The work is undertaken elsewhere than in the U.S. and is necessary for the production of the imported merchandise.
548420 dated Jan. 13, 2004.

The design services provided free of charge by the importer to the manufacturers of the imported merchandise constitute an assist. The value of the assist is the value of the payments made by the importer to the manufacturer in return for the manufacturer's contribution to the production of the assist, *i.e.*, only the portions of the design work undertaken outside the U.S. are dutiable.
548490 dated Aug. 18, 2004, <u>aff'g</u> 548368 dated Dec. 24, 2003.

The value of the assist may be limited to that portion attributable to the design services and does not include those services pertaining to advertising, marketing, and promotion. The importer must present sufficient documentation, to the port's satisfaction, distinguishing the design service payments from the other services. The total payment for design services is dutiable, as the collective development of the designs was necessary for the production of the imported merchandise. HQ 548490 dated Aug. 18, 2004 was clarified based upon revised facts.
548626 dated Apr. 18, 2005.

inspection services

543365 dated Nov. 1, 1984. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, inspection charges.

Inspection fees, to the extent they are paid for services generally performed by buying agents are not added to the price actually paid or payable. However, where the inspection services entail quality control along the lines of production-related design or development and intimate involvement in the nature of the goods produced, the inspection fees may be dutiable either as part of the price actually paid or payable or as an addition to the price actually paid or payable, i.e., an assist. In this case, the inspection agent's activities appear to be of the kind typically performed by a buying agent and the activities do not amount to quality production quality control that is intimately involved with the nature of the merchandise produced. In addition, the inspection services are relatively limited with respect to involvement in the production process. There is no indication that the agent supplies the seller with "development," in any manner. Therefore, the inspection fees are not added to the price actually paid or payable as assists.
547006 dated Apr. 28, 1998.

The importer purchases garments from various manufacturers and engages the services of a consultant who acts in the capacity of a fabric consultant on behalf of the importer. The consultant's primary duties include acting as mill liaison for the importer and assisting the importer in ensuring that woven fabric purchased by the manufacturers for use in the production of garments to be purchased by the importer conform to the importer's stringent quality specifications. The consultant's services appear to be limited in nature with respect to involvement in production. All fabric at issue is purchased directly by the manufacturers. The consultant fees are for services to be performed akin to those provided by a *bona fide* buying agent on behalf of the importer. Therefore, the consulting fees are not to be included in the price actually paid or payable, nor do the services performed constitute an assist to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
547033 dated June 25, 1998.

management services, salaries

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(B); 19 CFR 152.102(a)(2)

Management services, accounting services, legal services, and other administrative services performed by U.S. buyers are not assists.
542122 dated Sep. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 4); 544323 dated Mar. 8, 1990; 544421 dated Apr. 3, 1990.

Salaries of U.S. personnel working abroad are dutiable only to the extent that their work involves an assist activity.
542144 dated Feb. 4, 1981 (TAA No. 16).

Salaries of an importer's U.S. employees, paid by the importer through its related foreign

exporter, are not assists.
542696 dated Feb. 22, 1982 (TAA No. 46).

Management services provided by the buyer of merchandise to the seller do not constitute assists.
543820 dated Dec. 22, 1986; 543877 dated Mar. 17, 1987; 543631 dated June 8, 1987; 543992 dated Sep. 10, 1987; 544098 dated June 10, 1988; 544126 dated Aug. 17, 1988; 544261 dated Feb. 28, 1989; 544323 dated Mar. 8, 1990; 544421 dated Apr. 3, 1990.

General administrative services, including but not limited to management services, accounting services, legal services, and other services indirectly related to imported merchandise, which are rendered abroad or in the United States by individuals who are paid by the U.S. importer, are not added to the price actually paid or payable.
544353 dated Oct. 24, 1989.

The importer provides raw materials and components for electrical connectors to an assembly facility in Mexico. Several U.S. employees are assigned to the Mexican facility. The importer purchases three homes in Mexico for the U.S. employees to occupy along with their families. The price paid for the homes in Mexico purchased by the importer does not constitute an assist. In addition, the salaries paid by the importer to the employees who direct and manage the overall operation of the assembly plant are not assists.
545117 dated Oct. 30, 1992.

The importer has entered into an “administrative services agreement” with a foreign related party through which the importer will receive supervision and assistance with its business operations. In addition, the importer reimburses the related party for “reasonable expenses” incurred pursuant to the “administrative services agreement.” In exchange, the importer agrees to pay a “management fee” equal to a percentage of its gross sales volume anywhere throughout the world. The importer does not purchase the imported merchandise from the related party providing the administrative services, but rather, purchases the merchandise from unrelated foreign manufacturers. The “management fee” and reimbursement for “reasonable expenses” should not be added to the price actually paid or payable in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
548316 dated July 16, 2003, <u>modified</u> by W548547 dated Mar. 7, 2006, <u>see</u>, chapter ASSISTS, management services, salaries, <u>infra</u>.

The importer has entered into an "administrative services agreement" with a foreign related party through which the importer will receive supervision and assistance with its business operations. In addition, the importer reimburses the related party for "reasonable expenses" incurred pursuant to the "administrative services agreement." In exchange, the importer agrees to pay a "management fee" equal to a percentage of its gross sales volume anywhere throughout the world. The importer does not purchase the imported merchandise from the related party providing the administrative services, but rather,

purchases the merchandise from unrelated foreign manufacturers. The payment of management is not included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable. The payments also are not assists and thus are not additions to the price actually paid or payable.
W548547 dated Mar. 7, 2006; modifies 548316 dated July 16, 2003.

H038381 dated Nov. 17, 2014 – See Transaction Value, restrictions on disposition or use of imported merchandise.

H253767 dated Mar. 30, 2015 – See Assists, engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production.

materials, components, parts, and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A)(i); 19 CFR 152.102(a)(1)(i); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(i)

An integrated circuit (chip) which is supplied by the buyer at a reduced cost to the seller is deemed to be a component that is included in the imported merchandise and is, therefore, an assist. The value of the assist is the full cost of acquisition, including any research and development costs incurred in producing the chip, whether it is fabricated in the United States or elsewhere.
542948 dated Nov. 29, 1982 (TAA No. 55).

543093 dated Apr. 30, 1984; clarified by 543398 dated Aug. 27, 1984, 543623 dated Nov. 4, 1985; overruled by 545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995. - See Assists, components which are destroyed, scrapped or lost.

543407 dated Dec. 14, 1984; 543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988, modified by 545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995. - See Assists, value of assists, i.e., cost of acquisition or cost of production.

The importer solicits offers from domestic firms for the purchase of old fabric and then sells the fabric to the foreign manufacturer for a price equal to the highest domestic bid. Jackets are subsequently produced by the foreign manufacturer and are then sold to the importer at a price negotiated at arm's length. The fabric sold to the foreign manufacturer by the seller does not constitute an assist.
543619 dated Oct. 23, 1985.

A U.S. importer purchases oil well tubing from an unrelated manufacturer in Japan. The tubing is shipped to Canada where another unrelated party applies a plastic protective coating to the tubing. The importer makes separate payments to the Japanese manufacturer and to the Canadian company which performs the further processing. The transaction between the importer and the Canadian processor represents a "sale for exportation to the United States." The transaction value is represented by the price paid

by the importer to the Canadian processor, plus the value, as an assist, of the tubing furnished without charge by the importer to the Canadian processor. The value of the assist equals the sum of the price paid to the Japanese manufacturer and the transportation and related costs incurred in shipping the merchandise from Japan to the processing site in Canada.
543737 dated July 21, 1986; modifies 542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39).

543971 dated July 22, 1987. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, assembly of merchandise.

544082 dated Sep. 19, 1988. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, additional payments made by the buyer to the seller.

The buyer purchases materials in Japan and resells them to the related party seller in Brazil for use in the manufacture of electronic components subsequently sold to the buyer. Due to certain governmental regulations in Brazil and currency fluctuations, the transfer price of the materials is lower than the actual cost. Even though the transfer price is determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, the transfer of these materials at a price lower then their actual cost constitutes an assist and is included in determining computed value.
544481 dated May 8, 1991.

In the instant case, no evidence has been submitted to suggest that the additional components supplied by the importer to the manufacturer were not incorporated into the imported merchandise. Therefore, the components incorporated into the final imported product are assists.
544493 dated June 3, 1991.

The importer purchases fabric and subsequently gives the fabric, free of charge, to a foreign cut, make and trim vendor. The importer receives a cut scale along with the commercial invoice which indicates the quality of the fabric used and also the number of pieces cut as compared to the number of pieces ultimately sent to the importer. The reason for a discrepancy between pieces cut and pieces sent is defective fabric. The excess fabric that is not incorporated into the final imported product does not constitute part of the value of the assist.
544758 dated Feb. 21, 1992; modified by 545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995.

The importer supplied buttons to the seller through its buying agent. It was the agent's responsibility to seek reimbursement from the seller for the buttons and remit the reimbursement to the importer. The agent failed to recoup and/or remit the monies to the importer for several years. The seller subsequently refused to reimburse the importer for the cost of the buttons, and the importer is presently holding the agent responsible for the unremitted monies. The agent is paying the importer through a series of monthly credits. The buttons, supplied free of charge to the seller, through the buying agent are considered

to be assists.
544876 dated Sep. 3, 1993.

The importer supplies belts of foreign origin, procured from a third party, free of charge to the manufacturer of trousers. The belts are placed through loops on the trousers sized to accommodate the width of the belt and are imported and sold with the trousers. The belts are incorporated into the imported merchandise within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(i) of the TAA. Accordingly, the belts supplied by the buyer to the seller constitute an assist. The value of the assist may be apportioned over the first shipment of a given style.
544874 dated Oct. 22, 1993.

545970 dated Aug. 30, 1995. - See Packing Costs, U.S. packing.

545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995; Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995, modifies or revokes 544662 dated Mar. 18, 1994, 544758 dated Feb. 21, 1992, 543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988, 543623 dated Nov. 4, 1985, and 543093 dated Apr. 30, 1984 - See Assists, consumed in the production.

547175 dated Apr. 21, 2000. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, additional payments made by the buyer to the seller.

The importer of ladies garments supplied bulk fabric to the Chinese factory. The Chinese factory assembled the garments. The goods may be appraised under the transaction value method based on the cost of assembly charged by the Chinese factory. The value of the fabric would be added, as well as the costs of shipping these assists to the Chinese factory. The addition for the value of the assists must include the value of any design work, such as sketches, if produced outside of the U.S.
H004684 dated Mar. 16, 2007.

offsetting overpayment of duties

545417 dated May 27, 1994.- See Duties and Taxes, offsetting overpayment of duties.

payment to seller

Payments made by the buyer of imported merchandise to the seller to produce or buy items such as tools and molds (which, if provided by the buyer, would constitute assists) necessary to produce the subject merchandise, constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
544516 dated Jan. 9, 1991; aff'd by 544642 dated June 24, 1991.

Payments made to the seller of merchandise to produce tooling in manufacturing the imported goods constitute indirect payments. If the terms of the original contract between the parties indicate how many units of the merchandise are being purchased, then it is possible to prorate the price actually paid or payable. Accordingly, it is possible to prorate

the value of the payments that constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for each entry.
544525 dated Jan. 31, 1991; 544484 dated Jan. 31, 1991.

The payment of money from the buyer to the foreign seller/manufacturer for tooling and research and development testing does not constitute an assist. It is part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. Consequently, no authority exists to "apportion" these payments over the anticipated number of units produced as would be available if the expenditures were assists.
544381 dated Nov. 25, 1991.

The importer is paying a fee to the seller to cover the cost of research and development for future products. To cover the charge of future research and development, the seller imposes a charge of four percent of the invoice value on current purchases by the importer. The research and development costs become part of the importer's total payment to the seller. The payment is directly tied to the invoice purchase price. The payments made by the importer to the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise currently imported.
544972 dated Oct. 20, 1993.

The importer advances a stated amount to the seller and the manufacturer holds that amount as security for the cost of a mold to produce imported merchandise. It is agreed between the parties that the mold charges are fully refundable if a certain number of pieces are ordered. The importer's payment, characterized as a refundable mold deposit, is part of the price actually paid or payable. The payment does not meet the statutory definition of an assist and cannot be treated as such. In addition, the refund of the mold deposit from the seller to the importer after importation shall not be taken into account in determining the transaction value of the merchandise.
544867 dated Dec. 15, 1993.

proration of assists

The importer failed to declare certain assists to Customs at the time of the entry for the goods in question. However, this fact does not preclude the importer from subsequently prorating the value of the assists upon disclosure to Customs. The importer retains the option to prorate the value of the assists after the fact.
544525 dated Jan. 31, 1991; 544484 dated Jan. 31, 1991.

supplied by the buyer

Although fabric is supplied free of charge to the seller of merchandise, neither the buyer nor a party related to the buyer supplies the fabric and, therefore, the fabric is not an assist.
545172 dated May 6, 1993.

The imported merchandise will incorporate heavy industrial robots purchased by the final

U.S. customer and provided to the foreign seller. The importer supplies the robots directly or indirectly and their value is included in the appraised value of the imported merchandise. The value of the assist is its cost of acquisition, plus the cost of transportation to the place of production, i.e., the foreign seller's plant.
545753 dated Mar. 8, 1996.

testing costs

At the importer's option, steel units are tested to ensure that the design is accurate and that the structure is capable of carrying specified loads. The importer pays the exporter for testing costs separate from the payments for the steel units. The testing cost payment is not an assist; however, the testing cost payments are included as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise, regardless of the fact that the costs are invoiced separately.
542187 dated Nov. 7, 1980 (TAA No. 11).

Testing costs are not assists, but are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable when paid by the buyer to the seller of the imported merchandise.
542187 dated Nov. 7, 1980 (TAA No. 11); 543645 dated Feb. 17, 1987.

Testing costs paid to an independent agent of the buyer, unrelated to the seller, are neither assists nor part of the price actually paid or payable.
542774 dated June 14, 1982.

542946 dated Jan. 27, 1983. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, payments to a third party.

544035 dated Nov. 23, 1987. See Price Actually Paid or Payable, testing costs.

544315 dated May 30, 1989 – See Assists, equipment

544508 dated June 19, 1990 – See Assists, equipment.

545170 dated Oct. 27, 1994. - See Assists, equipment.

A related party seller is supplied with certain assists, the value of which is included in the transaction value. The seller performs testing on these assists before incorporating the assists into the imported merchandise. The cost of the testing, i.e., whether it is included as part of the price of the imported merchandise or if the importer is separately billed for the testing costs, is included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable.
545753 dated Mar. 8, 1996.

ICT fixtures were considered a tool used to perform testing on PCBAs and dutiable assists in the transaction value appraisement of imported power conversion and control systems. The ICT fixture was used, sometimes at the end of production, to test PCBAs as a final

quality control check, and sometimes before final assembly because the subsequent installation of certain components made the PCBA physically unable to fit into the testing fixture and the testing machine. It was determined that while the PCBAs could be produced without testing, such testing, whether performed during or after production of the PCBAs was directly related to the production of the PCBA which were incorporated into the imported merchandise.
H023814 dated June 2, 2008.

Sample documentation was submitted to support the first sale between the Chinese manufacturer and the middleman. Documentation shows merchandise is clearly destined for the U.S. As parties are unrelated, there is a presumption of an arm's length sale. The documentation indicates merchandise must comply with certain U.S. standards and requirements. Proof of payment was shown. Testing of sample garments by third parties paid by middleman to determine whether the fabric and materials used to make the garments meets certain safety certification standards, does not fall within definition of an assist, nor is it an indirect payment to the manufacturer. The apportionment of the logos and design assist using a formula for calculation of an assist percentage was found acceptable.
H255442 dated Oct. 9, 2014.

tools, dies, molds, and similar items used in the production

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A)(ii); 19 CFR 152.102(a)(1)(ii); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph l(b)(ii) and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1(b)(ii)

A metal stamper used in the production of phonograph records is an assist, the value of which includes the cost of musicians and arrangements, rehearsal pay, rehearsal hall rent, agency fee, studio cost, digital recorder, engineer, cartage, mastering, plating and producer.
542355 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 21).

542324 dated June 22, 1981 (TAA No. 33) - <u>See</u> engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production.

Additional amounts paid by the buyer of specific merchandise to the manufacturer to produce tools necessary to produce that merchandise constitute part of the price actually paid or payable.
542812 dated July 19, 1982.

A mold is furnished to two foreign manufacturers, without charge, located either in the same or in two different countries. Once duty has been assessed on the full value of the mold assist, then no additional duty is owed once the mold is transferred to a second foreign manufacturer located either in the same country as the first manufacturer or in a second country.
543278 dated Oct. 31, 1984; <u>overruled</u> <u>by</u> 544857 dated Dec. 13, 1991.

543405 dated June 21, 1985. - <u>See</u> Assists, free of charge or at a reduced cost.

543556 dated Aug. 23, 1985 – <u>See</u> Assists, free of charge or at a reduced cost.

Photomasks, which are used in the transfer of integrated circuitry onto silicon wafers, are analogous to a mold and thus dutiable as an assist.
543889 dated May 12, 1987; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 544147 dated July 5, 1988.

The importer provided video-duplicating services to owners of the program content of videotapes. The program content owner provided one duplicated master videotape to the importer free of charge. The importer then furnished the duplicated master videotapes free of charge to a foreign manufacturer of pre-recorded videotapes. The duplicated master videotapes are in the nature of tools, dies, molds or similar items, i.e., the videotapes give final shape or form to the completed manufactured article and are therefore, dutiable as assists. The value of the assists is the cost of producing the negative master film.
544040 dated Nov. 8, 1988.

When a mold that has been produced by the importer or a person related to him, in the United States or in a foreign country, its value is the cost of producing the mold. Included in this cost of production are the design and development costs incurred under generally accepted accounting principles when the work at issue was undertaken either within the United States or outside the United States. If the importer provides design work to an unrelated U.S. manufacturer who produces the mold, then the value of the mold is based on the cost of its acquisition. This is the price paid by the buyer to the manufacturer without the additional cost of the design work, because it is the service of manufacturing the mold that is purchased and not the design work. This is similarly the outcome if the importer provides the design work to a foreign manufacturer who constructs the mold.
544192 dated June 16, 1989.

A tractor provided to the seller of imported melons, free of charge, is used during the production process and is essential to the growth of the melons. It is a "similar item" with respect to a tool, die or mold used in the production of imported merchandise under section 402(h)(1)(A)(ii) of the TAA and is an assist.
544655 dated June 13, 1991.

If the cost for tooling charges by the importer is fully included in the price of the imported finished merchandise, it is unnecessary to further include these costs in the price of its after-market service parts, as that expense has already been fully recouped.
544844 dated Oct. 15, 1992.

The buyer provides a "Lectra pattern maker" free of charge to the seller. The pattern maker contributes directly to the manufacture of the imported merchandise by recreating garment patterns in different sizes and by manipulating pattern pieces in order to produce the most efficient usage of material. The pattern maker is an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(ii) of the TAA and its value should be added to the price paid or

payable.
545147 dated Nov. 4, 1994.

Mold patterns are supplied by the buyer to the manufacturers of imported castings and are used to make wax castings. The wax castings are then used to make ceramic shells which, in turn, are used to make the imported castings. The mold patterns are in constant use during the production of the imported merchandise. They must be employed whenever a new casting is made because the wax casting molds and the ceramic shell are destroyed each time a new casting is made. The patterns are in constant use during the production of the imported merchandise and are essential to their production. Accordingly, the mold patterns constitute assists within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(ii) of the TAA.
545336 dated Nov. 23, 1994.

The importer supplies the foreign sellers with grinding machines to produce porcelain, stoneware and chinaware products. The importer indicates that the machines are used solely for the purpose of testing the quality of products. The products may not be even, i.e., they may not lay flat on a surface after the manufacturing operations. If a product does not meet specifications, then it is ground by the grinding machine. The machines bring the products up to the manufacturing specifications. The grinding machines are considered to be assists. The machines are used in the production of the imported merchandise and are essential to the production of the imported merchandise. The cost of the grinding machines is included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546102 dated Dec. 22, 1995.

The importer will provide, free of charge, to the foreign manufacturer two molds to be used in the production of shoe outsoles that will be exported to the United States. The manufacturer of the molds will transport the molds to the shoe outsole manufacturer at no additional cost to the importer. After the importer pays for the molds in full, the molds will be transferred, free of charge, to another foreign factory for use in production of additional outsoles. The molds are assists, as defined in section 402(h)(1)(A). The value of the molds is the cost of acquisition plus transportation costs, which, in this instance, are included in the acquisition price. In determining the value of an assist that has been previouslyutilized and depreciated downward in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, depreciation is taken into account.
548667 dated Oct. 5, 2005.

Master gauges provided by the importer free of charge to the foreign manufacturer and used to calibrate tools that are used in the production of the imported merchandise do not constitute “assists” within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(ii).
W563543 dated Nov. 17, 2006.

The importer designs, manufactures, and sells customized finished exhaust systems, such as muffler assemblies, to unrelated U.S. automobile manufacturers. The exhaust systems are built from components manufactured using specially designed tooling, purchased from foreign vendors and imported, or other otherwise procured. The

overseas manufacturer that fabricates the imported components made with the tooling also makes the tooling and sells it to the importer. The automobile manufacturer to which the assemblies are sold is required to reimburse the importer for the tooling. Because the tooling payments are made by the buyer to the seller of the imported components, they are to be calculated as part of the total payment for the imported components.
H134595 dated July 7, 2012.

The importer purchases certain garments from its unrelated manufacturers in Guatemala. The importer purchases U.S.-originating blank sublimation paper from a U.S. vendor. The importer then creates and applies its own heart-shaped design on the sublimation paper in California. The importer supplies the finished sublimation paper to the manufacturers in Guatemala free of charge. In Guatemala, the heart-shaped design is permanently transferred into the garment using the sublimation paper, and paper is discarded. CBP found that the cost of the finished sublimation paper provided by the importer for purposes of production of the imported merchandise constitutes an assist pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A).
H225296 dated July 27, 2012.

transportation costs

19 CFR 152.103(d)(1) and (2)
See also, chapter on TRANSPORTATION COSTS, infra.

543003 dated Feb. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 58); rev'd by 543096 dated June 21, 1983 (TAA No. 63) - See Transportation Costs, freight and related charges incurred in transporting assists.

Freight and related transportation charges paid by a buyer in connection with shipments of material to a foreign assembler are assists.
543096 dated June 21, 1983 (TAA No. 63); rev'g 543003 dated Feb. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 58), 544190 dated Sep. 26, 1988, 544201 dated Dec. 12, 1988.

If in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, the value of an assist provided to the seller is fully depreciated according to the importer's records, then the value of the assist is limited to the cost of transporting the assist to the place of production.
544243 dated Oct. 24, 1988; 544256 dated Nov. 15, 1988.

544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989; modified by 548557 dated Oct. 20, 2004 – See Assists; assist definition.

The importer purchases merchandise manufactured by a related party in the Philippines. The importer consigns to its related party seller certain materials and supplies for use in production of the imported merchandise. The importer has a New York based shipping department that arranges for the transportation of the materials to the related party seller's factory. These activities are incidental to the transportation of the materials and the costs associated with arranging the shipment of the materials are included in the value of the

assists.
544323 dated Mar. 8, 1990.

The cost of air freight is an assist when the buyer/importer pays to have the materials expedited to the seller/exporter for further manufacturing. In this case, the seller/exporter usually paid the cost of ocean freight for transportation from the manufacturer to the seller/exporter. In order to meet scheduled delivery obligations, the buyer/importer paid to air freight the materials for further manufacturing to the seller/exporter. If the seller/exporter did not pay any transportation costs, then the value of the assist is the value of the air freight. If the seller/exporter paid ocean freight costs, then the value of the assist would be the difference between the cost of air freight and the cost of ocean freight.
H135296 dated May 29, 2012.

use in connection with the production or the sale for export

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h) (1) (A); 19 CFR 152.102(a) (1); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph l(b)

542302 dated Feb. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 18); 542762 dated Jan. 14, 1983; 544261 dated Feb. 28, 1989; 544480 dated Sep. 21, 1990 - See Assists, equipment.

Engineering costs incurred for establishing specifications that are used solely to obtain quotations and for issuing purchase orders that are not necessary for the actual production of the imported material are not assists. However, engineering costs that involve the preparation of detailed drawings and specifications to be used directly by the vendor in manufacturing equipment or material are dutiable assists.
542498 dated June 16, 1981.

Development performed outside the United States is an assist only if it is necessary for the production of the imported merchandise.
542324 dated June 22, 1981 (TAA No. 33).

Samples, which convey technical information without which an article could not be made, are dutiable as assists. However, if the manufacturer is capable of producing the article without the samples and, in fact, does not use the samples to manufacture the article, then the samples are considered to be analogous to narrative specifications and do not constitute dutiable assists.
542591 dated Sep. 18, 1981; aff'd by 542690 dated Jan. 28, 1982.

Patterns and related pattern-making activities undertaken in Hong Kong instruct the manufacturer on what to produce rather than how to produce the imported merchandise. Therefore, the functions performed in Hong Kong are not necessary for the production of the imported merchandise and, therefore, are not dutiable as assists.
543064 dated June 1, 1983.

Expenses incurred by the buyer for furniture, fixtures, supplies, etc., in establishing an office in Hong Kong where a buying agent performs inspection and re-packing operations are not assists. These expenditures are not made "in connection with the production or the sale for export to the United States of the merchandise."
543185 dated Sep. 13, 1984.

Costs incurred in retaining a firm of management consultants to increase and improve the rate and quality of future production of merchandise is not "necessary" to the production of any particular merchandise and therefore, is not a dutiable assist. The present production is proceeding and can continue without the work the consultants have undertaken.
543436 dated Dec. 14, 1984.

The equipment in question is not used in the production of the imported merchandise but it is used to operate other areas of the assembly plant. The equipment is not an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A) of the TAA.
544126 dated Aug. 17, 1988; 544083 dated Aug. 16, 1988; 544261 dated Feb. 28, 1989.

A U.S. company provides test equipment free of charge to foreign manufacturers to check the integrity of the finished instruments prior to shipment to the United States. The testing equipment is not used in the production of the imported merchandise. The testing equipment is not an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A) of the TAA.
544315 dated May 30, 1989.

544508 dated June 19, 1990. - <u>See</u> Assists, equipment.

A U.S. company sends a printer to Jamaica where it is used to print garment labels that are incorporated in the imported merchandise. The printer is actually used in production to mark the labels that comprise a part of the imported merchandise. The printer, provided by the buyer, free of charge or at a reduced cost, for use in the production of the garment labels, is an assist.
545570 dated Apr. 21, 1994.

A U.S. buyer provides "prototype" or "model" lasts free of charge to unrelated sellers for use in the production of imported shoes. The lasts are used to make "production" lasts that are used directly in the manufacturing process. The prototype lasts are in the shape of a shoe sole. In contrast, the production lasts, while resembling a shoe sole, are built up around the edges in order that they may function as molds. The prototype lasts supplied by the buyer are not used in the production of the imported shoes. Instead, they are used to make production lasts that are used to produce the imported merchandise. The prototype lasts are not similar to tools, dies, or molds. Instead, they are in the nature of U.S. design work and are not assists within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A) of the TAA.
545297 dated May 31, 1994.

value of assists, i.e., cost of acquisition or cost of production

19 CFR 152.103(d)(1) and (2)

542356 dated Apr. 13, 1981 (TAA No. 24); 542477 dated July 27, 1981 - See Assists, depreciation of assists.

Photomasks provided by a buyer to a seller are assists, the value of which is the cost of acquisition, if purchased, or the cost of production, not including a profit factor, if produced.

542324 dated June 22, 1981 (TAA No. 33).

The importer has entered into a contract with the ultimate purchaser of imported merchandise for the assembly and testing of certain core memory pages. The actual assembly and test operations are performed by the importer's wholly owned subsidiary in Hong Kong. The assembler uses components furnished free of charge by the ultimate purchaser, through the importer. The value of the assist produced by the unrelated, ultimate purchaser of the imported merchandise is limited to the purchaser's cost of production, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, where either the assist is furnished without cost through the importer to the foreign assembler, or is furnished directly to the assembler.

542667 dated Mar. 5, 1982.

542948 dated Nov. 29, 1982 (TAA No. 55). - See Assists, materials, components, parts and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

543278 dated Oct. 31, 1984; overruled by 544857 dated Dec. 13, 1991 - See Assists, tools, dies, molds and similar items used in the production.

The value of assists to be included in the transaction value of imported integrated circuits is limited to the cost or value of the components which are actually incorporated in the imported circuits, plus the transportation costs incurred in transporting the assist to the place of production.

543407 dated Dec. 14, 1984; 543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988; modified by 545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995.

543619 dated Oct. 23, 1985. - See Assists, materials, components, parts, and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

U.S. engineering and development involved in producing a photomask, i.e., a mold, is used in the production of imported merchandise and the mold is provided to the seller, free of charge, by the buyer. The engineering and development that is necessary to produce the photomask is embodied in the item provided to the seller. As long as engineering and development costs are treated under generally accepted accounting principles by the company as production cost, there is no authority to exclude the U.S. engineering and development costs that have been incurred producing the photomask

(mold).
543889 dated May 12, 1987; aff'd by 544147 dated July 5, 1988.

543943 dated Dec. 8, 1987. - See Assists, consumed in the production.

Certain technical documentation and assistance provided by the buyer to the seller, free of charge, is considered to be an assist pursuant to section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) of the TAA. In addition, the buyer is required to pay a royalty in order to acquire the design and development. This royalty payment is part of the value of the assist given that it is part of the buyer's cost of acquisition.
544459 dated May 30, 1991.

544423 dated June 3, 1991. - See Assists, costs of acquiring assists.

The importer provides the foreign manufacturer with an assist. However, the value of the assist is based upon the average net selling price of the imported merchandise and is calculated on a quarterly basis. At the time of importation, the value of the assist is unknown. Transaction value is an acceptable basis of appraisement only if, at the discretion of the port of entry, liquidation can be withheld in order to permit a determination of the cost of acquisition of the assist at a later date. If the port determines that liquidation cannot be withheld, then the merchandise must be appraised in accordance with the first applicable method arrived at through a sequential application of the statutorily enumerated methods.
545086 dated Apr. 1, 1993.

547018 dated Sep. 10, 1999 - See Assists, consumed in production.

The importer designed and manufactured integrated circuits using technical know-how from a foreign third-party (Hitachi), and paid Hitachi for the design, manufacturing, processing rights and technical assistance pursuant to a three-way licensing agreement among the importer, its related party (JE) and Hitachi. JE remits the license fees to Hitachi, and JE is later reimbursed by the importer. The integrated circuits are sent free of charge to foreign subcontractors for assembly. The cost to produce the assist provided by the importer to the foreign subcontractor includes the amounts of the license fees paid by the importer to Hitachi. Accordingly, the value of the assist includes the license fees.
548568 dated Oct. 19, 2004.

BUYING COMMISSIONS

INTRODUCTION

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 8, paragraph 1(a)(i), states:

> 1. In determining the customs value under the provisions of Article 1 [transaction value], there shall be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods:
>
> (a) the following, to the extent that they are incurred by the buyer but are not included in the price actually paid or payable for the goods:
>
> (i) commissions and brokerage, except buying commissions.

In the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1l(a)(i), the term "buying commissions" is defined as: “fees paid by an importer to his agent for the service of representing him abroad in the purchase of the goods being valued."

CCC Technical Committee Explanatory Note 2.1 with regard to commissions states:

1. Article 8, paragraph 1(a)(i) . . . states that, in determining Customs value under the provisions of Article 1, commissions and brokerage, except buying commissions, shall be added to the price actually paid or payable to the extent that they are incurred by the buyer but are not included in the price. According to the Interpretative note to Article 8, the term "buying commissions" means fees paid by an importer to his agent for the service of representing him abroad in the purchase of the goods being valued.
2. Commissions and brokerage are payments made to intermediaries for their participation in the conclusion of a contract of sale.
3. Although the legal position may differ between countries with regard to the designation and precise definition of the functions of these intermediaries, the following common characteristics can be identified:
Buying and selling agents
4. The agent (also referred to as an "intermediary") is a person who buys and sells goods, possibly in his own name, but always on the account of a principal. He participates in the conclusion of a contract of sale, representing either the seller or the buyer.
5. The agent's remuneration takes the form of a commission, generally expressed as a percentage of the price of the goods.
6. A distinction can be made between selling agents and buying agents.
7. A selling agent is a person who acts for the account of a seller; he seeks customers and collects orders, and in some cases he may arrange for storage and delivery of the goods. The remuneration he receives for services rendered in the conclusion of a contract is usually termed "selling commission". Goods sold through the seller's agent cannot usually be purchased without payment of the selling agent's commission. These payments can be made in the ways set out below.
8. Foreign suppliers who deliver their goods in pursuance of orders placed through a selling agent usually pay for the latter's services themselves, and quote inclusive prices

to their customers. In such cases, there is no need for the invoice price to be adjusted to take account of these services. If the terms of the sale require the buyer to pay, usually direct to the intermediary, a commission that is additional to the price invoiced for the goods, this commission must be added to the price when determining transaction value under Article 1 of the Agreement.

9. A buying agent is a person who acts for the account of a buyer, rendering him services in connection with finding suppliers, informing the seller of the desires of the importer, collecting samples, inspecting goods and, in some cases, arranging the insurance, transport, storage and delivery of the goods.

10. The buying agent's remuneration which is usually termed "buying commission" is paid by the importer, apart from the payment for the goods.

11. In this case, under the terms of paragraph I(a)(i) of Article 8, the commission paid by the buyer of the imported goods must not be added to the price actually paid or payable.

Judicial Precedent:

The following court cases are relevant in determining whether an agency relationship exists between a buyer of merchandise and an alleged buying agent. If such a relationship exists between the parties, then the commissions paid to the buying agent are not part of the transaction value for the imported merchandise.

Rosenthal-Netter, Inc. v. United States, 12 Ct. Int'l Trade 77, aff'd 861 F.2d 261 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In this case, Customs argues that the entity to whom the commissions are paid is not a *bona fide* buying agent of the importer but rather, is the actual seller of the merchandise. The court agreed with Customs and indicated that the actions of the parties do not substantiate the claim that a *bona fide* agency was in fact created.

The court indicated that the plaintiff has the burden of proving that an agency relationship exists, and if in fact the plaintiff fails to do so, then the relationship is not an agency relationship. In deciding whether such a relationship exists, the court must examine all relevant factors and each case is governed by its own particular facts. Citing J.C. Penney Purchasing Corp. v. United States, 80 Cust. Ct. 84, 94, C.D. 4741, 451 F. Supp. 973, 982 (1978). The factors in deciding whether a *bona fide* agency relationship exists include: the right of the principal to control the agent's conduct; the transaction documents; whether the importer could have purchased directly from the manufacturers without employing an agent; whether the intermediary was operating an independent business, primarily for its own benefits; and, the existence of a buying agency agreement. Although no single factor is determinative, the primary consideration is the right of the principal to control the agent's conduct with respect to the matters entrusted to him.

In this case, the court found several aspects of the alleged agent's conduct that the importer did not control. First, the importer did not control from which factory the merchandise was selected. Secondly, the alleged agent purchased quantities up to ten

times greater than the amount ordered by the importer. In addition, the importer did not control the amount of discretion exercised in the purchasing process. Fourth, the importer allowed the alleged agent to absorb the cost of shipping and handling, a fact that is further evidence that a true agency relationship does not exist. Fifth, the importer did not control the manner of payment.

As indicated above, the control factor is one aspect of an agency relationship. In this case, the transaction documents indicated that the alleged agent operated an independent business, primarily for its own benefit. A Special Customs Invoice listed the alleged agent as the "seller". In addition, the pricing structure established between the alleged agent and the importer belied the existence of an agency relationship and demonstrated that the alleged agent was actually trading on its own account, for its own benefit. In fact, the alleged agent bore the risk of loss on the merchandise, another factor that militates against the finding of a buying agency relationship.

In conclusion, the court held that the importer failed to meet its burden of establishing a *bona fide* agency relationship between itself and its intermediary.

Jay-Arr Slimwear Inc. v. United States, 12 Ct. Int'l Trade 133 (1988).

The plaintiff (importer) challenged the decision of the Customs Service to include the payment of commissions, among other fees, in the dutiable value of the imported merchandise. The commissions were held not to have been paid for services rendered by a *bona fide* buying agent and therefore, were held to be dutiable. (Note: A classification question was before the court as well, but that issue was not relevant to the valuation of the merchandise.)

The court cites examples of services which are characteristic of those rendered by a buying agent. These services include compiling market information, gathering samples, translating, placing orders based on the buyer's instructions, procuring the merchandise, assisting in factory negotiation, inspecting and packing merchandise, and arranging for shipment and payment. Citing Bushnell Int'l, Inc. v. United States, 60 CCPA 157, C.A.D. 1104, 477 F. 2d 1402 (1973); United States v. Nelson Bead Co., 42 CCPA 175, C.A.D. 590 (1955); J.C. Penney Purchasing Corp. et al. v. United States, 80 Cust. Ct. 84, C.D. 4741, 451 F. SUPP. 973 (1978); United States v. Knit Wits (Wiley) et al., 62 Cust. Ct. 1008, A.R.D. 251 (1969); Carolina Mfg. Co. v. United States, 62 Cust. Ct. 850, R.D. 11640 (1969).

In this case, the alleged agent is also the owner of the company that assembles the merchandise in question. Although this does not per se disqualify the agency relationship, there must be proof of a financial detachment from the manufacturer with respect to the commissions paid. In this regard, the evidence submitted does not conclusively prove that the commissions paid to the alleged agent do not inure to the benefit of the manufacturer.

In addition, the requisite degree of control over the alleged agent has not been proven.

Testimony was elicited indicating that the importer had no control over the alleged agent and that the alleged agent was considered independent. Based upon these factors, the court held that the relationship between the parties is not a buying agency relationship.

Pier I Imports, Inc. v. United States, 13 Ct. Int'l Trade 161 (1989).

The importer challenged the Customs Service decision that the entity to whom the commissions were paid was not a *bona fide* buying agent. The court agreed with the importer that sufficient evidence was submitted to support a finding that the entity operated as the importer's buying agent. The commissions paid are not properly part of the dutiable value of the imported merchandise under transaction value.

The evidence submitted indicated that the importer did in fact control the purchasing process. The agent retained minimal discretion in purchasing the merchandise. The court stated that this fact supports the finding of an agency relationship. Citing, Rosenthal-Netter, Inc. v. United States, 12 Ct. Int'l Trade 77 (1988), aff'd, 861 F.2d 261 (Fed. Cir. 1988); J.C. Penney Purchasing Corp. v. United States, 80 Cust. Ct. 84 (1978).

In addition, the manner of payment establishes that the agent purchased merchandise only at the direction of the importer. In this case, the agent did not retain the discretion to deduct commissions, freight charges, etc., but rather, the importer invoiced charges separately and paid for these charges separately, further indicating that the importer exercised control over the agent. The importer also had the option of purchasing merchandise directly from the manufacturers, a fact that the court stated is further evidence supporting the existence of an agency relationship.

The degree of control is not the sole factor in determining whether an agency relationship exists. Additionally, in citing the Restatement (Second) of Agency, the court indicates that the agent is to act for the benefit of the importer, rather than himself. The evidence indicated that the agent did not buy on its own account, but bought on behalf of the importer. The agent did not bear the risk of loss for the merchandise, only for its own negligence.

A *bona fide* buying agency relationship existed between the importer and the entity paid the commissions. These commissions are excluded from the transaction value of the imported merchandise.

Moss Mfg. Co., Inc. v. United States, 13 Ct. Int'l Trade 420 (1989); aff'd, 896 F.2d 535 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The plaintiff (importer) filed suit against the Customs Service claiming that Customs improperly included commissions paid for alleged buying agent services. The importer paid the commissions directly to the seller of the imported merchandise, for later disbursement to the alleged agent by the seller.

The court framed the issue as follows: whether monies which were disbursed by the buyer

to the seller with directions from the buyer to remit the payment to the buyer's agent, who assisted in bringing about the sale, were properly included in the dutiable value of the imported merchandise.

After discussing the factors to consider in determining whether a buying agency relationship is in fact *bona fide*, the court determined that the agent in this case was a *bona fide* buying agent. However, the court found that the payment was properly part of the price actually paid or payable.

The court held that where a payment for goods is made by the buyer to the seller with instructions to the seller to remit a portion of the payment to the buyer's agent, where the agent assisted in bringing about the sale, such a payment is a disbursement for the benefit of the seller within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) and is properly part of the price actually paid or payable.

Monarch Luggage Co., Inc. v. United States, 13 Ct. Int'l Trade 523 (1989).

The issue in this case is whether commissions paid were properly included in the transaction value of imported merchandise. The plaintiff (importer) contends that the invoice FOB values included buying commissions paid to two Taiwanese companies and should not have been included in the dutiable value of the merchandise.

The importer testified that Monarch Luggage's primary business of importing luggage requires a presence in the exporting country in order to be successful. In 1977, the importer entered into a verbal agreement with a managing director of two companies indicating that these two companies would act as agents for Monarch Luggage. This verbal agreement continued until 1981, at which time the agreement was put in writing.

The court stated that the evidence submitted did in fact establish that the activities performed by the two companies were indicative of an agent-principal relationship and that the agents were at all times *bona fide* buying agents.
However, with respect to entries made prior to the latter part of 1981, the invoices submitted indicated that the commissions were deducted from the price paid for the merchandise. Because the amounts were part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise for these entries, the amounts were properly included in the dutiable value of the imported merchandise for that specific period.

Invoicing changes were implemented in late 1981, and the commissions became an amount separate from and in addition to the price for the merchandise. The commissions paid subsequent to the invoicing changes are properly excluded from the dutiable value of the merchandise.

Headquarters Rulings:

bona fide buying commissions

The commissions paid to the agent to perform the services of purchasing merchandise from foreign manufacturers are to be considered *bona fide* buying commissions, and are therefore, not to be added to the price actually paid or payable. The services provided by the agent are typical of a buying agent and are not negated by the agent's furnishing of essentially ministerial services to manufacturers, given full disclosure and acquiescence by the importer. As long as the payments by the manufacturers have no impact on the importer's price actually paid or payable, it will have no effect on the non-dutiability of the agent's commissions.
544676 dated July 24, 1991.

The importer has established that the agent is in fact a buying agent. The fact that the agent is directed by the importer to retain title and bear the risk of loss for the imported merchandise does not negate the buying agency relationship. Therefore, the commissions paid are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544669 dated Aug. 15, 1991.

Based upon the evidence submitted, consisting of purchase orders, confirmation orders, manufacturers' invoices, correspondence between the parties, responses to Customs information requests, and affidavits, the importer has in fact established that the relationship between the parties meets the criteria of a buying agency relationship. Accordingly, the commissions paid are not added to the price actually paid or payable.
544510 dated Jan. 9, 1992.

The fees paid to the agent pursuant to the proposed agreement for assisting in the purchase of merchandise from the foreign seller are to be considered *bona fide* buying commissions.
544794 dated July 17, 1992.

Under the facts presented, commissions paid to a buying agent for services performed on behalf of a principal, which are not included in the payment made by the buyer to the seller, are not part of the appraised value of the imported merchandise despite the fact that the buyer, seller and agent are related.
544895 dated July 22, 1992.

On the basis of the information provided regarding the relationship between the importer, agent and seller, the totality of the evidence indicates that the agent is in fact a *bona fide* buying agent. In addition, the submission of the agent's invoice along with the seller's invoice supports the fact that the agent is not an independent seller and that the commission is not part of the price actually paid or payable to the seller.
544933 dated July 30, 1992.

The evidence submitted, i.e., the buying agency agreement, invoices, numerous documents produced in the course of an audit and counsel's explanations, and the totality of the circumstances surrounding the arrangements, appears to satisfy the criteria for a *bona fide* agency relationship. Therefore, the commissions paid are not part of the price

actually paid or payable.
544584 dated Dec. 9, 1992.

Based upon the information submitted, it has been established that a buying agency relationship exists between the importer and the agent and therefore, the commissions paid to the agent are not dutiable as part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545075 dated Dec. 23, 1992.

The services provided by the agent in this case are those typically performed by a buying agent. The commissions paid to the agent are buying commissions and they do not constitute part of the price actually paid or payable. The common ownership position of the agent and the trading companies does not alter the fact that the commissions are buying commissions, provided the parties adhere to the terms of the agency agreement.
545176 dated June 28, 1993; 545177 dated June 28, 1993.

If the actions of the parties conform to the descriptions provided regarding the subject prospective transactions, and the terms of the agency agreement are met to the extent that the importer will exercise the requisite degree of control over the buying agents as specified in the agreements, then the commissions paid to the agent are to be considered buying commissions.
545036 dated Dec. 14, 1993.

Under the terms of the proposed agreement, the degree of control the importer has over the alleged agent is consistent with a buying agency relationship. However, having legal authority to act as buying agent and acting as buying agent are different matters, and Customs is entitled to examine evidence that proves the latter. Therefore, despite the existence of an agency agreement, Customs is still required to determine whether the agent acts as a *bona fide* agent.
545421 dated Aug. 3, 1994.

547054 dated Aug. 6, 1999. - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

Based on the evidence presented, the agent and the subagent acted as the importer's *bona fide* buying agents during the period under review wherein they performed the functions of buying agents, i.e., they acted on the importer's behalf in the purchase of the imported footwear and the importer maintained the necessary control over the matters entrusted to them. The evidence establishes that the importer selected the factories to produce the footwear and had the final control over the price and quality of the imported footwear. The transaction documents and the method of payment are consistent with this finding. The manufacturers issued invoices for the imported merchandise to the importer and the agent and subagent separately issued commission invoices to the importer. The importer paid the manufacturers for the imported merchandise and separately paid the commissions to the agent and the subagent. Therefore, the commissions paid to the agent and the subagent are *bona fide* buying commissions that should not be added to

the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value.
546325 dated Oct. 4, 1999.

The buying agency agreement together with agent commission invoices and seller merchandise invoices, as well as the agent's additional documentation demonstrating its relationship with the principal and the related seller, supports a finding that commissions paid to the agency by the principal constitute *bona fide* buying commissions even though the agent and seller are related. Consequently, the commissions would not be added to the price actually paid or payable as buying commissions.
547286 dated Mar. 8, 2000.

In this case, the buying agent does not receive commissions from the importer, but rather, it is reimbursed for expenses it incurs for performing the services. To be compensated, the buying agent files an expenditure report with the importer. Nevertheless, the terms of the proposed buying agency agreement are consistent with a *bona fide* buying agency. Therefore, provided the actions of the parties comply with the terms of the agreement, the funds the importer pays to the buying agent to reimburse the cost of its services constitute non-dutiable *bona fide* buying commissions.
546370 dated Mar. 28, 2000.

Under the terms of a buying agency agreement, the importer and buyer agree to form a buying agency relationship and the importer maintains control over the purchasing process. The agreement indicates that purchases shall be made only upon the explicit instructions of the importer. The buying agent has acquired a controlling interest in one of the factories that manufactures merchandise for the importer. However, the buying agent does not share its commission with the manufacturer, nor does the agent share any expenses or profits with this manufacturer. Nothing in the agreement prevents the importer from purchasing directly from the manufacturers without the buying agent. The fact that profits realized by an agent may indirectly benefit the manufacturer does not in itself bar commissions from being non-dutiable. Therefore, the commissions paid to buying agent constitute *bona fide* buying commissions that are not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise, as long as the parties comport with the terms of the buying agency agreement.
547806 dated Jan. 31, 2001.

The buying agent enters into a non-exclusive buyer's agency agreement with the importer whereby it functions as the importer's agent for the purchase of foreign-made footwear. The payments from the importer to the buying agent for transactions related to entries of the foreign merchandise constitute *bona fide* buying commissions. Therefore, these payments are not to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547523 dated Mar. 28, 2001.

547417 dated Nov. 9, 2001. - <u>See</u> Selling Commissions, addition to price actually paid or payable.

Two unrelated U.S. importers entered into buying agency agreements with the foreign

corporation. Under the agreement, the importers initiate the purchase orders and supply piece goods for the assembly processes sought. Upon the direction of the foreign corporation, the importers purchase merchandise from specific foreign textile factories. The importers pay the foreign corporation a commission of six percent of the invoice price of the purchases made at its direction. The foreign corporation does not remit any portion of the commission payments to the factories nor does it receive compensation from the factories for the sales to importers. Accordingly, the commissions paid pursuant to the buying agency agreement are *bona fide* buying commissions that are not included in the appraised value of the imported merchandise.
548137 dated Sep. 26, 2002.

Transactions involving a related buying agent and seller are subject to closer scrutiny in determining whether the commissions paid constitute *bona fide* buying agency commissions. The documentation indicates that all orders are placed at the direction and under the control of the importer, and the importer pays the seller directly for the merchandise. The totality of the circumstances demonstrates that the services, responsibilities, authority and compensation of the buying agent comport with the traditional concepts of a *bona fide* buying agency. In this case, the higher burden of establishing that a *bona fide* buying agency relationship exists has been met. The commissions paid to the agent for performing its services on behalf of the importer should not be added to the price actually paid or payable.
548222 dated Feb. 27, 2003.

The commissions do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions. The burden is on the importer to establish the existence of a *bona fide* agency relationship. No information has been provided regarding the services performed by the claimed buying agent on behalf of the importer. The mere fact that the importer owns the agent does not demonstrate the requisite control over the transactions in question. There is no evidence that the importer exercised control over the claimed buying agent with respect to specific transactions. There is no evidence that the claimed buying agent acted primarily for the benefit of the importer or that the importer could have purchased the imported merchandise directly from the manufacturers. The importer has not submitted invoices from the claimed buying agent to the importer for the claimed buying commissions. Finally, there is no buying agency agreement between the importer and the claimed buying agent.
548460 dated Mar. 25, 2004.

The evidence presented is insufficient to establish that the payment at issue is a *bona fide* buying commission. The parties act in a manner which is inconsistent with the agreement. The methods of invoicing and disbursement militate against a finding of a *bona fide* buying commission.
548356 dated May 19, 2004.

In the proposed transactions as outlined in a buying agency agreement, the agent will perform services on behalf of the buyer that are typically performed by a *bona fide* buying agent. These include finding suitable manufacturers or suppliers, have potential suppliers

fill out quotes, making available its market research and intelligence on new manufacturers, suppliers, product supply base trends, market trends, and pricing. The agent will also negotiate on behalf of the buyer for the best price and quality, submit samples and arrange for shipment of the merchandise. The control that the purchaser exercises over the agent is further shown by the provision in the agency agreement whereby the proposed agent does not have the authority to bind the purchaser except upon the written authorization of the purchaser, and that it never holds title to the merchandise. It is also significant that the agent's sole sources of compensation in the transactions are the commissions that it earns from the buyer and that it will not receive any payment from the manufacturers or vendors. Thus, if terms of the proposed buying agency agreement are followed, a *bona fide* buying agency would be established and any commissions paid to the agent are *bona fide* buying commissions and are not a part or an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
H109699 dated July 19, 2010.

The seller is a Brazilian trading company and sold merchandise from various Brazilian manufacturers to the importer. The importer's purported agent did not take title to the merchandise. The importer paid the seller directly. Various agreements existed. In one, the alleged agent had the same name as the seller. The importer met its burden to demonstrate the existence of a *bona fide* buying agency with respect to commissions paid to its Brazilian agent subsequent to the agency agreement of 2002. Prior to 2002, the importer's Brazilian commission payments are dutiable because they were paid while defective buying agency agreements were used.
H051136 dated July 20, 2010.

The importer questioned whether payments it made pursuant to a buying agent agreement for purchase orders issued by the importer were dutiable. The agent was appointed the importer's nonexclusive buying representative and paid a commission based on the price of the ordered merchandise. Commissions and purchases were invoiced separately. Under the terms of the agreement, the agent's services included: familiarizing itself with the importer's needs and surveying potential markets; assisting with negotiating favorable terms and prices; placing orders on the importer's behalf; visiting manufacturing facilities to inspect the quality of the ordered products and providing progress reports to the importer; obtaining supplier records necessary to secure the entry of ordered products into the U.S.; ensuring that the invoices contained accurate and complete descriptions of the products and names of suppliers; and, assisting with the return of defective products. The agent carried out many of its duties through a related subagent. In addition, under the terms of the agreement, the agent was prohibited from receiving any form of compensation from any supplier connected to any transaction undertaken for the benefit of the importer, and from sharing any commission received from the importer with any third party. The agent had to certify that it had no ownership/financial interest in or control of any entity supplying goods to the importer, and that no such entity had control of, interest in or ownership interest in the agent. The importer maintained the right to accept or reject merchandise. The agent was found to be a *bona fide* buying agent, and commissions paid to the agent were *bona fide* buying commissions and not a part of or an addition to the price actually paid or payable.

H125835 dated May 18, 2011.

The importer hired agent to supervise the supply of apparel from India. The agent spent considerable amount of time at the seller's premises to oversee the purchasing of the materials and all phases of the production process. The agent's extensive involvement in the production process is not typical of a buying agent. Rather, the services provided by the agent are associated with the actual production of the merchandise. Further, the agent signed the commercial documents on behalf of the seller and used the seller's email address. The fees paid to the agent do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and should be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
H156115 dated Jan. 27, 2014.

commissions paid to agent for acquiring assists

Through its agent, the importer intends to provide materials and parts, specifically piece goods, to the manufacturers of the apparel it imports. The piece goods constitute assists. The commissions paid by the importer as payment to the agent for services rendered in sourcing piece goods (assists) on behalf of the manufacturers of imported merchandise are considered as part of the cost of acquiring the assists. Therefore, the commissions are added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
544976 dated Mar. 17, 1993.

Commissions paid by a buyer of imported merchandise to an agent for acquiring assists are part of the cost of acquisition of the assist and are to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
545266 dated June 30, 1993.

In addition to the traditional duties of the buying agent, the agent also procures and furnishes assists to the manufacturer on behalf of the purchaser. When requested to do so by the purchaser, the agent procures components, materials, tooling, and design work for use in the production of the merchandise. If the parties follow the proposed buying agency agreement, then the agent is considered to be a *bona fide* buying agent. Under the terms of the agency agreement, the agent has the dual role of procuring both finished goods and the assists used to produce the goods. No portion of the agency commissions it receives from purchasers arising out of the agency agreement is considered to be dutiable.
545851 dated May 8, 1995.

H086776 dated Oct. 25, 2011 – <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

control over agent

The importer exercises the requisite degree of control over the agents to warrant a finding that a *bona fide* buying agency exists, provided that the actions of the parties conform to

the terms of the agreement.
544887 dated Oct. 2, 1992.

The primary consideration in determining whether an agency relationship exists is the right of the principal to control the agent's conduct with the matters entrusted to him. In this case, the agent places purchase orders with suppliers in accordance with the importer's instructions, and the purchase orders submitted on behalf of the importer conform to vendor policies established by the importer. The importer selects the manufacturer on the basis of information and samples provided by the agent. The agent's books and records are subject to review by the importer. These facts are indicative of the importer's control over the purchasing power. If the actions of the parties conform to the descriptions provided, and the terms of the agency agreement are met to the extent that the importer exercises the requisite degree of control over the buying agent, then the commissions paid are considered to be *bona fide* buying commissions.
545465 dated Apr. 6, 1994.

The evidence submitted is not sufficient to establish that a buying agency relationship between the parties exists. The buyer has not demonstrated that it has the right to exert any control over the alleged agent's activities. Without such evidence, it cannot be established that the alleged agent acts as a buying agent for the importer. The buyer cannot buy merchandise directly from the vendors. Any commissions paid for the services performed are not considered *bona fide* buying commissions. The payments constitute part of the price actually paid or payable.
545362 dated May 31, 1994.

In this case, the importer paid selling commissions to a U.S. related company. The evidence submitted does not indicate the existence of a *bona fide* buying agency relationship between the importer and the U.S. related company. The importer has not presented any evidence showing that it directs the activities of the U.S. and foreign related companies. In addition, it appears that the U.S. related company is not acting primarily for the benefit of the importer, but rather for its own benefit, or that it functions in support of the seller. As such, the importer does not exercise sufficient control over the purported buying agent. Therefore, a *bona fide* buying agency relationship does not exist between the importer and the related U.S. company. Thus, the commissions in the immediate situation constitute dutiable selling commissions and, accordingly, should be included in the transaction value of the merchandise.
547225 dated Nov. 9, 2001.

547417 dated Nov. 9, 2001 – <u>See</u> Selling Commissions; addition to price actually paid or payable.

Agreements between the requester and an agent provided that the parties jointly identify vendors. The agent assessed factory qualifications for the requester’s review; was aware of product specifications for each product of the requester’s wholly-owned subsidiaries and was responsible for consulting in bid package preparations; delivered bid packages to prospective vendors and facilitated communications between the requester and the

vendors; tracked production levels against purchase order quantities and expected completion date; monitored quality control; and conducted lab and product testing procedures. The requester was responsible for receiving bids, and issuing purchase orders directly to vendors. Commissions due to the agent were calculated based on the actual FOB price paid by the requester directly to the vendor, supplier, or manufacturer. All of the activities of the agent were subject to the direction and discretion of the requester; the requester maintained control and decision making authority over factory and vendor selection; the requester assumed the risk of loss for lost and damaged merchandise; the requester controlled the manner of payment and absorbed the costs associated with shipping and handling; the requester retained the rights to purchase goods without using an agent; and the agent was not related to any vendor or manufacturer. The requester submitted documentation which supported these assertions. A *bona fide* buying agency was found to exist between the requester and the agent.
H043842 dated Mar. 31, 2009.

In determining that commissions paid to the agent constitute *bona fide* buying commissions that are not included in transaction value, CBP considered various evidence that the protestant controlled the purchasing process, for example, email correspondence that instructed the agent to cancel an order if the goods were not shipped that day, or questions from the agent regarding shipment terms. The evidence showed that the protestant was actively involved in the purchase process and that the agent only negotiated and placed orders at the protestant's direction and approval. The protestant was also actively involved in the payment process. The evidence included invoices from the actual seller and separate commission invoices from the agent.
H020231 dated June 25, 2009.

deducting buying commissions

Where the payment made to the seller by the buyer for imported merchandise includes a buying commission, there is no authority to deduct the amount from the price actually paid or payable.
542141 dated Sep. 29, 1980 (TAA No. 7) Error! Bookmark not defined.**; 542362 dated Mar. 18, 1981; 542176 dated May 19, 1981; 542358 dated June 4, 1981; 542785 dated Apr. 29, 1982; 543023 dated Mar. 17, 1983; 543292**
dated Apr. 19, 1985; 544426 dated June 8, 1990.

The "form" of invoicing is a significant factor in deciding whether commissions paid to buying agents are non-dutiable. Where buying commissions are calculated by deducting an amount from the total FOB invoiced value, such commissions are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable, regardless of whether the buying agency relationship is *bona fide* in all other respects.
545519 dated June 30, 1994; <u>modified</u> <u>by</u> 547087 dated July 30, 1998.

The alleged buying commissions are included in the price actually paid or payable by the buyer and are considered as part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.

The price of the merchandise as shown on the agent's invoice includes the buying commissions. Accordingly, the amounts that the importer paid to the alleged buying agent actually represent the price for the goods when sold for exportation to the United States. There is no authority to deduct a buying commission if such is included in the price actually paid or payable.
545564 dated Aug. 8, 1995.

The importer's commissions to its agent are included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. As the commissions are included in the price, there is no statutory authority that allows for the buying commissions to be deducted from that price.
546267 dated Dec. 4, 1998.

dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable

The evidence submitted does not support the existence of a buying agent for the importer. The agreement does not indicate that the importer does, or has the right to, exert any control over the agent's activities in purchasing the merchandise. In addition, the method of payment of the agent's commission, i.e., from the seller's account, is insufficient to establish that the payment is a buying commission. There is no separate invoice for the commission and it is calculated out of the total invoiced value of the merchandise. Therefore, the commissions paid to the agent are dutiable as part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544668 dated July 15, 1991.

Based upon the lack of documentation demonstrating control over the importer's purported buying agents, and absent actual invoices from the manufacturers covering the entries in question, the existence of a buying agency relationship is rejected. Accordingly, the commissions are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable.
544610 dated Dec. 23, 1991.

Based upon the information provided regarding the relationship between the importer, agent and seller, the totality of the evidence does not indicate that the agent was under the control of the importer and is, in fact, a buying agent. Therefore, the fees paid to the agent do not constitute buying commissions and are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545012 dated Oct. 13, 1992.

Based upon the importer's statement of extensive quality inspections, the commensurate 15% rate of commission paid to the alleged agent, and the lack of an agency agreement at the time the representative transactions occurred, the totality of the evidence does not indicate that the agent is in fact a buying agent. The fees paid to the agent do not constitute buying commissions and the fees are to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545038 dated Feb. 17, 1993.

The information submitted is insufficient to support the existence of an agency

relationship. There is no documentation that the requisite degree of control existed over the alleged agent. No evidence exists to indicate that the risk of loss was borne by the importer. Moreover, no invoices from the manufacturer to the alleged agent were submitted. Consequently, the commissions are part of the price paid or payable.
545100 dated Mar. 2, 1993.

No invoice or other documentation from the seller has been submitted. Customs has only been provided with an invoice from the purported agent, and that is insufficient to show that the alleged agent is not a seller. The only price upon which to base appraisement under transaction value is the total price on the invoice. In this case, the price actually paid or payable includes the payment for the alleged commission, and Customs has no authority to deduct the purported commission from the price.
545296 dated Aug. 16, 1993.

The relationship between the importer and the agent does not support the existence of a buying agency. The importer does not exert sufficient control over the agent, and it is unclear whether the agent is related to any of the foreign manufacturers. The commissions paid to the alleged agent are not buying commissions.
545140 dated Aug. 24, 1993.

The agreement between the buyer and seller specifically provides that the relationship between the parties is exclusively that of seller-purchaser. The agreement states that neither the buyer nor the seller “shall have the authority to act as agent for, or in any other manner contractually bind, the other.” The contract unambiguously states that the relationship between the parties is not that of principal and agent. Therefore, the alleged “commissions” paid to the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545387 dated Feb. 27, 1995.

The information submitted failed to substantiate fees paid to an alleged purchasing agent as *bona fide* buying commissions. The invoices submitted show the alleged purchasing agent is actually an independent buyer and seller of merchandise. Therefore, the fees paid do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and are included in the transaction value.
546934 dated Jan. 27, 1999.

The buyer included the buying agent's commission in the transaction value of the merchandise it imports from the seller. The buying agent's commission is considered dutiable as part of the transaction value of the goods, because it constitutes a disbursement "to, or for the benefit of, the seller" under section 402(b)(4)(A) of the TAA, regardless of whether the seller's billing invoice identified separately the buying commissions from the per se value of the goods.
547098 dated Feb. 2, 1999.

The document submitted indicates that the buying agent was an independent buyer and seller of the merchandise who had title and bore the risk of loss of the merchandise. Therefore, the fees paid do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546981 dated Feb. 8, 1999.

546607 dated Aug. 17, 1999. - **See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.**

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish that the importer had any control over the alleged buying agents. Also, the alleged agent did not actually perform the typical services of a buying agent. Therefore, the fees paid by the importer do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and should be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546874 dated Aug. 17, 1999.

The importer has the burden of proving that an agency relationship exists and that payments to its agent constitute *bona fide* buying commissions. The foreign seller's invoice indicates that the price to the buyer included a five percent commission. This documentation, alone, is insufficient to prove the existence of a *bona fide* buying commission. As such, the transaction value for the merchandise includes the total payments made by the importer to the foreign seller.
548206 dated Nov. 15, 2002.

The importer regularly purchases canola seeds directly from Canadian producers for importation into the United States. On occasion, seed brokers are used to
locate grain suppliers that are willing to sell at the importer's quoted price. In accordance with industry business customs, the price quoted by the seed broker to the seller is understood to be a net amount from which the seed broker's commission has already been deducted. Commissions are separately remitted to the broker, and the seed brokers customarily operate without a written buying agent type of agreement. The evidence indicates that the parties include the brokerage fees in their contract price; therefore, Customs has no authority to deduct them from the transaction value of the goods.
548258 dated Oct. 9, 2003.

548515 dated Sep. 28, 2004 - See Selling Commissions, addition to price actually paid or payable.

factors to consider

A foreign intermediary acts as a service company and performs traditional buying agency functions for the importer. The profit made by the intermediary upon sale of the merchandise to the importer is a non-dutiable buying commission.
542621 dated Jan. 4, 1982.

A *bona fide* agency relationship exists between the importer and the agent and therefore, the commission paid by the importer to the agent is not part of the price actually paid or

payable.
542679 dated Jan. 11, 1982; 542781 dated Mar. 24, 1982; 542756 dated May 13, 1982; 543092 dated Apr. 10, 1984; 543249 dated June 11, 1984; 543185 dated Sep. 13, 1984; 543461 dated Mar. 1, 1985, revoked by 543990 dated Mar. 25, 1988; 543440 dated May 13, 1985; 543632 dated Oct. 22, 1985; 543616 dated Oct. 1, 1985; 543821 dated Oct. 29, 1986; 543834 dated Aug. 18, 1987; 544029 dated Dec. 2, 1987; 544119 dated May 25, 1988; 544234 dated Jan. 24, 1989; 544244 dated June 16, 1989; 544338 dated Sep. 13, 1989; 544335 dated Feb. 7, 1990; 544431 dated Mar. 8, 1990; 544396 dated May 14, 1990; 544472 dated July 30, 1990; 544452 dated Sep. 11, 1990.

A commission paid to an agent who is directed and controlled by the importer are held to be a non-dutiable buying commission.
542807 dated May 17, 1982; 542919 dated Oct. 8, 1982; 542924 dated Nov. 17, 1982.

Whether a buying agency exists between an importer and an alleged buying agent is not determined by a single factor, but depends upon the relevant facts of each case.
543837 dated Feb. 18, 1987; 543911 dated Nov. 1, 1988; 544008 dated Aug. 17, 1988.

The importer has the burden of proving the existence of a principal-agent relationship and in this case, the burden has not been met. Accordingly, the alleged commissions are part of the price actually paid or payable.
544008 dated Aug. 17, 1988; 544110 dated Apr. 26, 1990; 544426 dated June 8, 1990; 544419 dated July 12, 1990.

While a relationship between the buying agent and the seller does not preclude the existence of a buying agency, the circumstances surrounding such related party transactions are subject to closer scrutiny in determining whether a commission is a *bona fide* buying commission.
544512 dated Dec. 20, 1990.

A buying commission is *bona fide* when the importer proves the existence of an agency relationship. The importer should submit the signed and executed buying agency agreement and the necessary accompanying documents (invoices, proof of payment, etc.). If these documents substantiate that importer has complete control over the buying process and that it and the alleged buying agent operate independently from one another and the manufacturers, Customs finds that a *bona fide* buying agency exists between the importer and alleged buying agent. *Bona fide* buying commissions are not included in the statutory provisions for additions to the price actually paid or payable and thus the commission is not dutiable.
548002 dated June 13, 2002.

Of the three scenarios set forth, the payments made by the importer to the agent under the first and second scenarios are not dutiable. Under these two scenarios, the services provided by the agent on behalf of the importer are typical of those performed by a *bona fide* buying agent. For example, the agent will identify sources for product, request samples, place orders for goods, negotiate prices, inspect the goods and manufacturing

facilities, and provide logistic support. The Sourcing Agreement which specifies the activities to be performed by the agent for the importer indicates that the agent's procurement activities are always subject to the importer's specific directions and requirements. The importer could purchase the merchandise directly from the vendors without assistance from the
agent. The agent acts on behalf of the importer and not for its own benefit. The agent is financially detached from the vendors and is not receiving any benefit from the vendors. The agent bears the risk of loss for damaged, lost, or defective merchandise only if it is caused by the agent's failure to carry out its responsibilities, and the importer is responsible for its own shipping costs. However, the payments made by the importer to the agent under the third scenario are dutiable. The services the agent will perform under the third scenario merely involve placing a purchase order with the foreign vendor, taking title to the goods, assuming risk of loss, and making payment to the vendor. Even though the agent will perform these services under the direction and control of the importer, without more, they are not typical services provided by a buying agent. Instead, they indicate that the parties are performing as buyer and seller.
H098419 dated Oct. 26, 2010.

The information presented did not establish that compensation the importer paid to certain parties for the services they performed in purchasing merchandise on behalf of the importer were *bona fide* buying commissions. Thus, the compensation that the parties received was considered as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b). In addition, the evidence presented did not establish that the transactions between the middlemen and manufacturers were *bona fide* sales or that the merchandise was clearly destined to the United States at the time of export. Accordingly, the appraisement of the imported merchandise using the transactions between middlemen and manufacturers was not appropriate.
H050895 dated Dec. 6, 2010.

The services that Company B provides to Company A are characteristic of the types of services that a buying agent generally will perform. These services include compiling market information, translating, placing orders with suppliers, negotiating with suppliers, supervising the quality control of food products, obtaining samples, surveying potential markets, assisting with financial arrangements, shipping and inspecting merchandise, directing processes for defective merchandise, and preparing necessary shipping and Customs documents. In certain transactions Company B will employ Company C as a sub-agent to assist it in carrying out its responsibilities as a buying agent to Company A. Company C will be compensated from the commissions that Company A pays to Company B. The use of a sub-agent to help provide services does not affect the determination that Company B is a *bona fide* buying agent so long as the evidence demonstrates that they are not acting as an independent seller or on the seller's behalf.
H148196 dated Mar. 28, 2011.

H218258 dated July 24, 2014 – <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

identity of seller

In order to establish that a commission is in fact *bona fide* and that the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise does not include an amount for the alleged commission, an invoice from the seller is required. This evidentiary requirement must be satisfied even though there may have existed a past practice of treating a commission as non-dutiable based upon the existence of a buying agency agreement.
542141 dated Sep. 29, 1980 (TAA No. 7); 542358 dated June 4, 1981; 543625 dated Feb. 4, 1986; 543508 dated Feb. 18, 1986; 543496 dated Mar. 3, 1987; 544258 dated Feb. 1, 1989; 544335 dated Feb. 7, 1990; 544431 dated Mar. 8, 1990; 544396 dated May 14, 1990.

If the documentation submitted with the entry papers only reflects the purported agent as the seller, Customs has no alternative but to appraise on the basis that the alleged agent is the seller. Even if the actual sellers are listed on the invoice submitted, a separate invoice from the seller that establishes the price actually paid or payable is required.
542357 dated Mar. 31, 1981; 542662 dated Feb. 16,1982; 543625 dated Feb. 4, 1986.

The purported agent acts as an independent seller of the merchandise rather than as a buying agent for the U.S. importer. The alleged buying agent pays the foreign manufacturer one price for the merchandise while it charges the importer another higher price, without the importer's knowledge, upon which is based the agent's purported commissions. The alleged commissions are dutiable and are properly part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
543330 dated May 23, 1984.

The importer failed to furnish invoices or other documentation from the actual foreign sellers of the imported merchandise. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to establish that the purported agent is not the seller of merchandise.
543171 dated June 20, 1984; 543148 dated June 26, 1985.

Where a buying agent incurs the cost of foreign inland freight and includes this amount in its invoice to the buyer, it is necessary for the importer to satisfy Customs that the buying agent is, in fact, a *bona fide* buying agent and not an independent seller or a representative of the foreign manufacturer and/or seller.
544026 dated Oct. 20, 1987.

An invoice or other documentation from the actual foreign seller to the alleged agent is required in order to establish that the agent is not the seller of the imported merchandise, as well as to determine the price actually paid or payable to the seller. The buyer has not provided a separate invoice from the actual foreign seller. Instead, the buyer has merely supplied a copy of the agent's invoice allegedly stamped by the seller. In addition to the fact that there is no separate invoice, the commission is calculated on the basis of the total invoice value of the merchandise. The documentation in this case is insufficient to support the contention that the commissions paid to the agent constitute *bona fide* buying

commissions.
545174 dated Sep. 7, 1994.

No invoice or other documentation from the actual seller of the imported merchandise has been provided. The commission is included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545846 dated Dec. 9, 1994.

There are no invoices available from the seller of the imported merchandise. The only invoices regarding the merchandise sold are those prepared by the alleged buying agent and which only make mention of the manufacturer. The alleged
agent, not the manufacturer prepares the sales confirmation documents, and the documents identify the alleged agent as the seller of the merchandise. Other correspondence submitted indicates that the alleged agent, not the manufacturer, is responsible for failing to meet the terms of the purchase order/contract. The fact that the alleged agent has the authority, per the agency agreement, to prepare a commercial invoice in the absence of one from the manufacturer, does not change the requirement that a manufacturer's invoice is requisite to finding a *bona fide* buying agency relationship. Despite the existence of the agency agreement, the remainder of the documentation submitted specifically refers to the alleged agent as the seller of the merchandise and not as the buying agent. The documentation contradicts the terms of the buying agency agreement submitted. The commissions paid to the alleged agent are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
546604 dated Aug. 8, 1997.

No invoice was provided from the factory and the commissions were not separately identified to Customs. In addition, no evidence exists indicating that the buyer determines who manufactures the imported merchandise or even knows the identities of the factories manufacturing the goods. Based on the facts presented, the commissions are not *bona fide* buying commissions.
546691 dated Sep. 8, 1997.

The invoices submitted make no reference to any buying commissions, nor do the invoices identify any of the sellers of the imported merchandise. These invoices are insufficient to establish the identity of the sellers in determining whether an agency relationship exists between the buyer and the alleged buying agent.
546709 dated Dec. 1, 1997; <u>aff'g</u> 546539 dated Oct. 30, 1996.

The *bona fide*s of the buying agency relationship have been substantiated. The alleged agent acted at all times as a *bona fide* buying agent. In addition, the buying commissions are not included in the price actually paid or payable. The submitted manufacturer's invoices reflect the price actually paid or payable by the importer without the commissions. The agents' invoices indicate that the invoice amounts include the buying commissions. Since the manufacturer's invoice accurately reflects the price actually paid or payable without the commissions, the buying commissions are not included in the

appraised value.
547087 dated July 30, 1998; <u>modifies</u> 545519 dated June 30, 1994.

totality of circumstances

The existence of a *bona fide* buying commission is to be determined by the totality of the circumstances.
542141 dated Sep. 29, 1980 (TAA No. 7).

Sufficient evidence has been submitted by the importer to support a finding that an agency relationship exists between the importer and the buying agent. The buying commission paid should be excluded from the dutiable value of the imported merchandise.
542912 dated June 28, 1983; 543053 dated July 11, 1983; 543386 dated July 23, 1984; 544088 dated Mar. 25, 1988; 544304 dated Mar. 20, 1989.

There is no legal impediment to a parent corporation acting as an agent for its subsidiary corporation. However, the totality of the evidence relative to the transactions must demonstrate that the purported agent is in fact a buying agent.
542912 dated June 28, 1983.

The fact that a buying agent of a particular importer acts as a selling agent for the seller in a separate transaction does not necessarily negate the existence of the established buying agent relationship.
543053 dated July 11, 1983.

A buying agent purchases merchandise on an ex-factory basis from a seller on behalf of a U.S. importer. The agent incurs the cost of transporting the merchandise from the place of manufacture to the port of exportation, and the invoice from the agent to the buyer separately identifies the price for the goods, the foreign inland freight charges and the agent's buying commission. As long as the agent's invoice clearly reflects that the terms of sale are ex-factory, the separately itemized buying commission and foreign inland freight charges are not included in the dutiable value of the merchandise.
543208 dated Dec. 28, 1983.

The alleged agent acts primarily as a seller of the imported merchandise and its conduct belies the claimed buying agency relationship.
543305 dated Dec. 27, 1984.

On the basis of the totality of the evidence, the *bona fide*s of the alleged buying agency have not been established. The preponderance of the evidence belies an agency relationship. Therefore, the alleged commissions are part of the price actually paid or payable.
543447 dated Feb. 5, 1985; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 543566 dated July 10, 1986; 543625 dated Feb. 4, 1986.

The totality of the evidence and the circumstances must demonstrate that the purported

agent is in fact a *bona fide* buying agent and not a selling agent or an independent seller.
543496 dated Mar. 3, 1987.

The agency relationship between the importer and the agent has been established provided that: the agent continues to perform services which are consistent with the existence of a buying agency; the importer continues to control and direct the agent; and no part of the commission inures to the benefit of any supplier.
543636 dated Mar. 30, 1987.

In this case, the purported buying agent and the foreign manufacturers are related. While such a relationship does not preclude the existence of a buying agency, the circumstances surrounding such related party transactions are subject to closer scrutiny in determining whether the commission is a buying commission. Any determination of whether a buying agency exists depends upon the particular case. The appraising officer at the port of entry will make the actual determination, based upon the documentation submitted. Therefore, in order to find that a buying agency relationship exists, satisfactory documentation must be presented at the time of entry and the actions of the parties must conform to the documentation presented.
544575 dated Jan. 31, 1991.

Based upon the information submitted, it has been established that a buying agency relationship exists between the parties and that, therefore, the commission paid to the agent is not dutiable as part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544314 dated Apr. 15, 1991.

The importer has failed to produce adequate documentation and evidence to support the claimed buying agency relationship between the parties in question. Without substantial evidence apart from an agreement, the importer has not established the existence of a buying agency and therefore, the commissions paid are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable.
544423 dated June 3, 1991.

If the actions of the parties conform to the evidence submitted, and the terms of the agency agreement are met to the extent that the importer exercises the degree of control over the buying agent as specified in the agreement, the commissions are considered to be buying commissions. Therefore, the commissions are not dutiable as part of transaction value.
544634 dated June 20, 1991.

Based upon the totality of the evidence presented, the commissions paid to the purported buying agent to perform services in conjunction with the purchase of the imported merchandise are buying commissions and should not be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544965 dated Feb. 22, 1994.

The duties performed by the alleged agent are those typically performed by a buying

agent, and include compiling market information, obtaining samples, placing orders on the buyer's instructions, inspecting the merchandise and arranging for shipment. The buyer selects the garments to be purchased. The buying agency agreement provides that the agent will place orders only upon the specific instructions of the buyer. The commissions paid by the buyer to the agent constitute buying commissions and are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
544781 dated Mar. 4, 1994.

An agreement between an importer and an alleged buying agent contains two penalty clauses, both of which are intended to induce the agent to perform its duties. If, as a result of the failure of the agent to perform the inspection services of the agreement, merchandise is received below the standard of the purchase order and satisfactory adjustments cannot be obtained from the seller, then the agent agrees to assume liability for damages to the extent of the commissions paid. In addition, if the agent fails to ensure that the merchandise is shipped on schedule, then the commissions are reduced. The penalty clauses do not negate an otherwise valid buying agency relationship between the importer and the agent. The commissions paid to the agent to perform the services specified are to be considered buying commissions.
545423 dated Mar. 17, 1994.

The importer has not provided sufficient documentation to support the existence of a *bona fide* agency relationship. Consequently, the amounts identified as "buying commissions" constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545466 dated June 29, 1994; 545253 dated Aug. 10, 1994; 545255 dated Aug. 10, 1994.

The terms of the proposed buying agency agreement are consistent with a buying agency relationship. As long as the appraising officer is satisfied that the agents act in accordance with the terms of the agreement, commissions paid to the agents by the importer will not be added to the price actually paid or payable of imported merchandise.
545601 dated Oct. 13, 1994.

The totality of the circumstances indicate that the alleged agents function as *bona fide* buying agents and not as independent sellers. From the time the buyer specifies the items to be purchased to the time the goods are ultimately shipped, the agents act under the direction and control of the buyer. The manufacturers' invoices do not include an amount for commissions. The buying commissions are non-dutiable.
545624 dated Oct. 25, 1994.

The buying agency agreement, the affidavit, facsimiles, invoices, and payments provide sufficient evidence to show that there is a *bona fide* buying agency relationship between the parties. Consequently, the buying commissions are not dutiable.
544843 dated Oct. 31, 1994; <u>reconsideration</u> <u>of</u> 544423 dated June 3, 1991 (new facts presented in reconsideration request; position in HRL 544843 does not represent a revocation or modification of HRL 544423).

The information presented is insufficient to establish that a buying agency relationship existed between the parties. No details regarding the services allegedly performed by the agent were provided. There is no information regarding the right of the principal to control the agent's conducts with respect to the matters entrusted to him. It appears as if the alleged agent was operating an independent business primarily for its own benefit rather than acting as a buying agent. No invoice or other documentation from the actual seller was provided. The buyer has not met its burden of proving that an agency relationship existed or that the payments constitute buying commissions.
545715 dated Nov. 8, 1994.

The information submitted is insufficient to support the existence of a *bona fide* agency relationship. There is no evidence that demonstrates that the importer exercised control over the alleged buying agent, and no invoices from the manufacturer to the purported buying agent were submitted. The commissions are part of the price actually paid or payable.
545744 dated Jan. 19, 1995.

The evidence presented supports the finding that the commissions paid to the agent by the buyer constitute buying commissions, notwithstanding the fact that the agent, in some instances, receives compensation from unrelated manufacturers for ministerial services provided to the manufacturers.
545660 dated Feb. 10, 1995.

The buyer did little to control the actions of its purported buying agent. The buyer did not know the names of the factories that produced the merchandise, did not visit the factories and did not know who actually negotiated the price of the goods with the factories. The buyer failed to exercise control over the alleged agent. The commissions paid do not constitute buying commissions.
545661 dated Mar. 3, 1995.

The terms of the buying agency agreement are consistent with the existence of a *bona fide* buying agency relationship. However, having legal authority to act as a buying agent and acting as a buying agent are different matters, and Customs is entitled to examine evidence that proves the latter. Despite the existence of the agency agreement, the appraising officer must make a case-by-case determination regarding whether the agent acts as a true buying agent. As long as the appraising officer is satisfied that the agent acts in accordance with the terms of the buying agency agreement, the commissions paid to the agent by the U.S. importer do not represent dutiable buying commissions.
545129 dated Mar. 6, 1995.

The importer exercises the requisite degree of control over the agent, and the totality of the evidence demonstrates that the agent is in fact a buying agent. Provided the actions of the parties conform to the evidence submitted, and the terms of the agency agreement are met, the agent is a *bona fide* buying agent and the fee paid to the agent is not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545422 dated Mar. 13, 1995.

The alleged buying agent performs services on behalf of the purchaser that are typically performed by a buying agent. The agent's primary function is to find and negotiate the best deal in terms of price and quality for the purchaser. It also performs other functions such as quality control inspection, arranging for transportation and insurance, and preparing necessary documents. The agreement specifically states that these functions are performed on behalf of and at the direction of the purchaser. The terms of the buying agency agreement are consistent with a *bona fide* buying agency. Therefore, provided the actions of the parties comply with the terms of the agreement, the commissions paid to the agent by the purchaser for its services constitute buying commissions.
545851 dated May 8, 1995.

The fact that an importer and a purported buying agent are related does not negate an otherwise legitimate buying agency relationship. It appears as if the buyer exercises sufficient control over the actions of the agent. The buying agent performs the services described in the agency agreement for the account of the importer and at the importer's instructions. Provided the parties adhere to the terms of the agreement, the commissions paid to the agent constitute buying commissions and are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
545988 dated May 18, 1995.

Based upon the information submitted and provided the parties' actions conform to the terms of the proposed agency agreement, Customs is satisfied that the alleged agent is a buying agent. The agency commissions paid constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545708 dated May 25, 1995.

The duties performed by the agents are those typically performed by *bona fide* buying agents. The agents place production orders with the factories designated by the importer and only at the direction of the importer. The importer controls the manner of payment, and the buying agency agreement requires the importer's written authorization with regard to most matters involving the purchase of the merchandise. The commissions paid to the buying agent are buying commissions and as such are not part of transaction value.
545420 dated May 31, 1995.

Although the terms of the buying agency agreement reserve control over the alleged buying agent's actions, having legal authority to act as buying agency and acting as buying agent are different matters and Customs is entitled to examine evidence that proves the latter. In the instant situation, it is questionable as to whether the buyer exercises control over the agent's actions. It does not appear as if the agent places orders with factories only after having been instructed to do so by the principal. The alleged agent's actions are largely discretionary. Accordingly, the importer has not established that the commissions paid are buying commissions.
544945 dated June 30, 1995.

The information submitted is insufficient to support the existence of a buying agency relationship. Although a number of services performed by the alleged agent are among those usually performed by an agent, there are several aspects of its conduct that the importer failed to control. Nothing in the agreement shows that the importer controlled from which factory the agent ordered the merchandise or that the importer had to approve the order before it was placed. There is no evidence to indicate that the importer could buy the merchandise directly from the manufacturer without going through the agent or that the importer controlled the method of payment. The fees paid do not constitute buying commissions, but rather are included in the price actually paid or payable.
545759 dated Aug. 11, 1995.

Based upon the totality of the evidence presented, the total commissions paid by the importer to the two alleged agents are not for buying agency services. The commissions should be included in the transaction value of the merchandise. In addition, as the importer has failed to establish that the two alleged agents are not selling agents or independent sellers of the imported merchandise, the quota payments made to them by the importer are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545550 dated Sep. 13, 1995.

Insufficient evidence has been submitted to conclude that the alleged agent was acting as a *bona fide* agent for the importer. There is no written agreement between the parties, and the facts and documentation indicate that the importer did not exercise control over the agent's activities. It has not been established that a buying agency relationship exists.
545627 dated Sep. 13, 1995.

No documents such as purchase orders, invoices, or proof of payment have been submitted concerning the alleged agents. Customs is unable to conclude that the buyer was substantially involved in choosing manufacturers, participated in negotiations with the factory, could have purchased directly from the sellers, absorbed shipping and handling costs, or controlled the manner of payment. In addition, Customs is not able to determine whether the alleged agents operated as independent businesses for their own benefit. The totality of the evidence does not enable Customs to reach a finding regarding the *bona fide*s of the agency relationships.
545938 dated June 5, 1996.

When examining whether a purported agent is a *bona fide* buying agent, closer scrutiny is warranted where the purported agent and the seller are related. Such a relationship does not, however, automatically preclude the existence of a buying agency relationship. In this case, the evidence establishes that the alleged agent acted as an independent seller rather than as a buying agent. The importer does not exercise the requisite degree of control over the alleged agent but rather, the alleged agent acts primarily for its own benefit and not for the benefit of its purported principal. The price actually paid or payable includes the 20% additional payment.
546035 dated July 11, 1996.

The evidence does not support a finding that the alleged buying agent actually acted as

a *bona fide* buying agent under the terms of the agency agreement. The importer has not established that the alleged agent was not an independent seller of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the alleged buying commissions are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and are properly included in transaction value.
546539 dated Oct. 30, 1996.

The duties of the alleged buying agent, pursuant to a written buying agency agreement, include: investigating buying possibilities; checking the acceptability of potential suppliers; obtaining market intelligence; assisting with supplier meetings and negotiations; obtaining samples; assisting in the preparation of documents; inspecting merchandise, and expediting the shipment of merchandise. Although these services are performed on behalf of the buyer of the imported merchandise, the buyer makes all of the final decisions regarding the ordering of merchandise and the price paid for the merchandise. Only the buyer has the authority to place orders with a supplier, and the agent does not have the authority to accept or reject price quotations on behalf of the buyer. The terms of the buying agency agreement are consistent with a *bona fide* buying agency. Provided the parties comply with the terms of the agreement, the commissions that the buyer pays to the buying agent are buying commissions.
546341 dated Nov. 12, 1996.

The duties performed by the alleged buying agent are duties typically performed by *bona fide* buying agents, and include compiling market information, obtaining samples, placing orders on the buyer's instructions, inspecting the merchandise and arranging for shipment. The buying agent has no financial interest in the factories and acts only upon explicit written instructions from the buyer. As long as the buying agent remains under the control of the buyer and the transactions are carried out as described, the amounts remitted to the buying agent qualify as buying commissions and as such, are not dutiable.
546135 dated Nov. 25, 1996.

The information submitted is insufficient to support the existence of a *bona fide* buying agency relationship. No information regarding the services performed by the purported agents on behalf of the importer has been provided. In addition, there is no evidence available to indicate that the importer exercised control over the purported agents with respect to the matters entrusted to them. Similarly, there is no evidence that the purported agents acted primarily for the benefit of the importer, nor that the purported agents were financially detached from the importer. It is unclear whether the importer could have purchased directly from the manufacturers of the imported merchandise. Although a buying agency agreement has been submitted, and commission invoices were provided, these items are insufficient to support the existence of an agency relationship. The amounts in question should be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546284 dated July 14, 1997.

The commissions paid to the agent by the importer/buyer appear to be *bona fide* buying commissions notwithstanding the fact that the agent will, in some instances, receive

compensation from unrelated manufacturers/sellers for services provided to the manufacturer/sellers. Accordingly, as long as the agent informs the importer/buyer about the nature of the services to be performed for the manufacturers/sellers and the amount of compensation to be received is the same, and the selling agent services do not exceed the functions described, then only the commissions paid to the agent by the manufacturers/sellers, and not the buying commissions, will be added to the price actually paid or payable.
546543 dated Aug. 6, 1997.

Based on a review of the buying commission agreement, the duties to be performed by the alleged buying agent appear to be those typically performed by a buying agent with the agent's primary function being to find the best price/quality deal for the buyer. However, the agreement contains language that expressly states that the relationship between the parties is that of principal and independent contractor. The agreement also states that nothing in the agreement shall constitute the representative as an agent of the buyer; rather each respective party acts as a principal. Under these circumstances, the parties have agreed that their relationship cannot be construed as an agency relationship. Accordingly, the commissions paid are not *bona fide* buying commissions and are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
546520 dated Aug. 11, 1997.

As long as the importer and the buying agent provide the services described in the submitted buying agency agreement and comply with the agreement, and the proper invoices and documentation can be provided to Customs, then the commissions paid are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. Under the terms of the agreement, the buyer has the right to control the actions of the buying agent, and the agent is agreeing to perform services that are typical of a *bona fide* buying agent.
546727 dated Nov. 25, 1997.

Insufficient evidence was presented to indicate that the alleged buying agent actually performed as a buying agent pursuant to the agreement or that it performed typical services of a buying agent, such as compiling market information, gathering samples, placing orders pursuant to the buyer's direction, assisting in price negotiations, inspecting and packing merchandise, and arranging for shipment. On the contrary, the evidence submitted indicates that the buyer deals directly with the foreign supplier. The fees paid do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546262 dated Nov. 29, 1997.

Based on the terms of the submitted buying agency agreement between the parties and representations made regarding the relationship, it appears that the alleged agent's actions are primarily for the benefit of the importer and the importer has the right to control the agent's actions. It appears that the commissions paid to the buying agent are *bona fide* buying commissions.
546744 dated Feb. 24, 1998.

Pursuant to the terms of the submitted buying agency agreement, the alleged agent will act on behalf of, and subject to the control of the principal, and the principal will delegate responsibilities to the agent and pay a commission. The alleged agent will act on behalf of the principal only upon the explicit instructions of the principal and not vary any of the terms of the purchase order without the express written authorization of the principal. The agreement further provides that the agent is never to act as a seller in any transaction involving the principal and, without exception, the agent will provide the principal with the seller's invoice reflecting the transaction and indicating the price to be paid for the merchandise. As long as the parties transact business in accordance with the terms of the agreement, the commissions paid are *bona fide* buying commissions such that they are not added to the price actually paid or payable.
547058 dated May 19, 1998.

Based upon the representations of counsel and the terms of the buying agency agreement, it appears that the principal controls the agent's activities and conduct. The principal controls the selection of suppliers via the procurement process and its oversight process. The principal negotiates its contracts with suppliers through the agent, and the agent is prohibited from issuing any purchase order on behalf of the principal without prior approval. The principal retains ultimate control of the terms of the purchase and of the negotiation process. The agent never bears the risk of loss for damaged, lost or defective merchandise. The terms of the buying agency agreement are consistent with the existence of a *bona fide* buying agency. Assuming the parties transact business according to the representations made by counsel and the terms of the agreement, the commissions paid to the agent are *bona fide* buying commissions.
547117 dated Aug. 31, 1998.

The terms of the submitted buying agency agreement are consistent with a *bona fide* buying agency arrangement between the parties. Provided the actions of the parties comply with the terms of the agreement, the commissions paid by the buyer for the agent's services constitute *bona fide* buying commissions. The commissions are not added to the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
547176 dated Oct. 23, 1998.

Under the terms of the submitted buying agency agreement, the services to be performed by the agent are indicative of those generally provided in a buying agency relationship. The agent might be visiting factories, negotiating favorable prices, arranging for shipping, inspecting the goods, but all activities are under the control of the importer. It appears that the agent is acting primarily at the specific direction of the principal, as is necessary in an agency relationship. The commissions paid to the agent constitute *bona fide* buying commissions, such that the payments are not added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
5**47127 dated Nov. 20, 1998; <u>clarified</u> <u>by</u> 547239 dated Mar. 29, 1999.**

The information submitted supports a finding that commissions paid to agent constitute *bona fide* buying commissions when the agent and seller are related. Payments made to the agent by the principal constitute buying commissions such that they are not additions

to the price actually paid or payable under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b). The totality of the evidence must demonstrate that the purported agent is in fact a buying agent and neither a selling agent nor an independent seller. Additionally, the actual determination of a buying agency relationship is made by the appraising officer at the applicable port of entry and will be based upon the entry documentation submitted.
547239 dated Mar. 29, 1999; clarification of 547127 dated Nov. 20, 1998 (additional facts provided, HRL 547127 remains valid).

The transaction value of the sale from the foreign vendors to the middleman may be used to determine the price actually paid or payable when those sales are *bona fide* sales for export to the U.S. and negotiated at arm's length. The following factors indicate that the middleman is acting as an independent seller of merchandise: current market conditions underlying the prospective transactions, the absence of provisions in the agreements detailing the ability of the importer the control the middleman's company, the possibility that the middleman would receive title and assume the risk of loss, and the middleman's essential role in prospective transactions. Thus the buying agency program between the importer and the middleman does not constitute a *bona fide* principal-agent relationship and a buying commission may not be deducted from the price paid or payable between the middleman and the importer. Only activities necessary for the production of imported merchandise will be considered assists and such assists are considered to be dutiable only if they are performed outside of the U.S.
547642, 547643, 547644 dated Feb. 13, 2002.

A prima facie, contractual designation alone will not create a *bona fide* principal-agent relationship. In the instant case, the agreements contain no provisions explaining how the importer will exercise control over the subsidiary and, at its discretion, the subsidiary can resell some merchandise to the importer. Even after the purchase, the importer must submit to the subsidiary's claims policy to recover losses for damaged or defective merchandise. Therefore, commissions paid by the importer to its subsidiary must be added to the price paid or payable.
547645 dated Feb. 13, 2002.

Buying commissions are fees paid by an importer to an agent for the service of representation abroad in the purchase of the goods being appraised. Customs will not evaluate the buying agency agreement between the importer and the middleman in an application for further review of a protest when the agreement was drafted after the formal protest. Even so, if the available evidence taken as a whole still leads to the conclusion that a principal-agent relationship existed, then the buying commission may still be classified as *bona fide*. However, in the instant case, the importer failed to meet the burden of demonstrating with sufficient evidence the validity of its claim. Insufficient documentation coupled with the finding of a relationship between that the middleman and the manufacturers precludes a *bona fide* buying agency relationship between the importer and the middleman. (The middleman is related to the seller on the basis of having a common officer and having a common shareholder.) The commissions paid to the middleman by the importer are thus for the benefit of the seller and are considered to be part of the price paid or payable for the subject merchandise.

547608 dated Feb. 21, 2002.

Based on the following factors, there was insufficient evidence to conclude that a *bona fide* buying agency existed: (1) the middleman and the manufacturer are related parties; (2) submissions by the importer do not include any documentation that the importer directed the middleman to purchase merchandise on its behalf; and (3) there is no concrete indication that the importer instructed the middleman as to how to conduct its agency on behalf of the principal. The commissions paid by importer to the middleman do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions, but rather are payments made to a party related to the seller for the benefit of the seller. As such, the commissions are to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.

547623 dated Feb. 21, 2002.

The middleman performs services primarily for the benefit of the buyer, i.e., to find the best price/quality deal as designated by the importer. Additionally, the middleman performs services on behalf of the seller. These services, provided to the manufacturer, include locating materials, providing quality control, assisting in importation requirement, etc. The services that the middleman performs on behalf of the manufacturers are ministerial and they are to be performed with the full knowledge and acquiescence of the buyer. Under these circumstances, the services that the middleman performs on behalf of the manufacturer do not preclude Customs from finding that the commissions paid to the middleman by the importer/buyer constitute *bona fide* buying commissions. The existence of the buying agency relationship is factually specific. Based on the facts presented, the middleman is acting as a *bona fide* buying agent, notwithstanding the fact that it will, in some instances, receive compensation from unrelated manufacturers for ministerial services that it provided to the manufacturers.

548135 dated July 30, 2002.

Under the buying program, a U.S. based apparel-sourcing company facilitates the purchase of apparel produced by foreign manufacturers for its United States clients. The company receives a commission based on a percentage of the “selling” price, either FOB port of export or ex-factory price of the goods. The company and its clients negotiate the exact percentage. The company does not assume title and risk of loss for the goods, nor does it act as an independent seller. Under the terms of the agreement, the services provided by the company are performed under the discretion and control of the buyer. The existence of a buying agency is factually specific. Based on the totality of the evidence in the instant case, a *bona fide* buying agency relationship exists. Accordingly, the fees paid to the company under the buying program are *bona fide* commissions that are to be excluded from the price actually paid or payable.

548163 & 548188 dated Aug. 29, 2002.

The fact that both the importer and purported buying agent have a financial interest in the foreign seller does not negate an otherwise legitimate buying agency relationship. The alleged buying agent performs services on behalf of the importer that are typical of a buying agent and the importer appears to exercise sufficient control over the actions of the agent. Although the importer made one total payment to the alleged agent for the

imported merchandise and the alleged buying commission, the importer was able to provide sufficient evidence that it controlled the method of payment to the manufacturer. The totality of the circumstances indicates the existence of a *bona fide* agency relationship.
W563617 dated Sep. 14, 2007.

Importer of garments sold to rental stores and distributed to retailers who sell to the public claimed transaction value as the proper method of appraisement for the entered merchandise. Undeclared lump-sum payments to various vendors and to overseas foreign entities were discovered. The importer was unable to provide any evidence that these were non-dutiable buying commissions. The port was correct to reject transaction value and was directed to consider the various methods of appraisement set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1401a sequentially.
H019263 dated Nov. 8, 2010.

CANCELLATION PAYMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Headquarters Rulings:

contract termination fee

If the buyer of merchandise requests termination of an order and the supplier has in its inventory excess fabric which is then sold to recoup the loss, the buyer is to reimburse the supplier for the loss incurred. This payment is not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise since these payments are made to compensate the supplier for losses incurred from the sale of the unused fabric.
543924 dated May 29, 1987.

In determining whether a payment is truly a charge for the termination of a contract, Customs will consider whether the charges are incurred for a legitimate business purpose and whether the charges are treated separately from the imported merchandise in the importer's records. In the instant case, the importer has not established that the fee is a true contract cancellation fee. There was no written notice of cancellation, as required by the terms of the purchase agreement between the parties. No evidence of subsequent cost settlement between the parties was provided. Therefore, there is no authority to deduct the fee from the total price actually paid or payable for the merchandise already imported.
544516 dated Jan. 9, 1991.

A payment from the buyer to the seller for cancellation of a production order does not constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for merchandise which has already been imported when it is established that the payment is clearly a charge for termination of the order and no merchandise is imported as a result. However, in this case, insufficient evidence has been submitted to support the non-dutiability of such a payment, i.e., that the fee was paid for the right to cancel the purchase order. The evidence indicates that the buyer internally handled the fee, and that the payments are not actual cancellation payments.
544689 dated Sep. 26, 1991; aff'g 544516 dated Jan. 9, 1991.

goods not imported

If a cancellation occurs prior to any importation, no dutiable consequences can arise. Charges paid by an importer to cancel a production order do not constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for merchandise already imported, so long as such charges are incurred for a legitimate business purpose, and are treated separately from the imported merchandise on the importer's accounting records.
543088 dated June 28, 1983.

An amount paid by the ultimate purchaser (not the buyer of the imported merchandise), to the seller of imported merchandise, for cancellation of a contract, is not part of the price actually paid or payable. Even if the buyer had paid the cancellation fee to the seller of

the imported merchandise, the reason for the payment is to compensate the seller for merchandise that was contracted for but not imported.
543295 dated Jan. 15, 1985.

Amounts paid by the importer to the seller in connection with the failure of the importer to purchase any diesel engines during the relevant model year are not dutiable since the diesel engines were subject to a purchase agreement in which no engines were imported.
543445 dated Oct. 23, 1985.

If charges incurred by an importer are truly charges for the termination of a contract, and merchandise is not imported as a result of the terminated contract, then the payments made to the seller are not to be included in the price actually paid or payable for merchandise imported subsequent to the terminated contract.
543770 dated Feb. 10, 1987; 544205 dated Dec. 12, 1988.

Maintenance payments for the seller's out-of-pocket costs resulting from underutilized capacity are not part of the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise. Rather, the payments are made to compensate the seller for expenses incurred in preparation for production of merchandise contracted for by the imported but never imported. These payments are not dutiable under transaction value.
543882 dated Mar. 13, 1987; aff'd by 554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989.

An agreement between the buyer and seller provides for a payment to the seller resulting from the buyer's decision not to place new orders with the seller. The buyer is not breaching an ongoing contract and no merchandise is imported as a result of the payment. The payment is excluded from the price actually paid or payable for merchandise imported prior to the payment.
544031 dated Jan. 19, 1988.

An additional payment made by the buyer to the seller represents a payment made for merchandise that was ordered but not manufactured nor imported. This payment is not part of the price actually paid or payable for merchandise previously imported into the U.S.
544121 dated June 24, 1988.

The importer's payments to the seller for costs incurred for work in progress, materials, and overhead and labor for merchandise that was contemplated by contract but never ordered by the importer, are not part of the price actually paid or payable for merchandise actually imported. The seller's invoices, the importer's documentation and accounting records establish that the cancellation fees are for expenses incurred with respect to merchandise that was not imported.
545175 dated Jan. 4, 1995.

liquidated damages and/or penalties

If a contract termination charge is in the nature of a penalty, then such a charge cannot

reasonably be construed as part of the price actually paid or payable by the buyer to the seller for the imported merchandise. Also, the termination charge is not encompassed by any of the items set forth in section 402(b)(1), which are items to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
543293 dated Jan. 15, 1985; overruled on other grounds by 543574 dated Mar. 24, 1986.

Delay payments incurred by the buyer are liquidated damages separate from the specific price actually paid or payable and, thus, are not part of transaction value.
543812 dated Apr. 20, 1987.

minimum quantity cancellation charges

Additional compensation required as a result of the importer's failure to purchase a contracted minimum quantity of engines was computed on the basis of a specific amount for each engine below the minimum quantity that was not purchased. There is a direct relationship between this additional compensation and the gasoline engines that were purchased. Therefore, the additional compensation required in connection with the purchase of the engines is properly part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported engines.
543445 dated Oct. 23, 1985.

Additional compensation paid by the importer to the seller as a result of the former's failure to purchase a contracted minimum quantity of engines during a model year is properly part of the price actually paid or payable for the engines purchased and imported into the United States during that model year. There is a direct relationship between the additional compensation and the engines that were purchased and imported.
543456 dated Nov. 6, 1985.

544205 dated Dec. 12, 1988. - See Discounts, quantity discounts.

The importer purchases fabric to utilize in the production of samples. A minimum quantity purchase is required. When the importer does not order this minimum quantity specified, the seller imposes a charge. In this case, it is unlikely that the importer will ever order the minimum quantity since only 50 to 75 yards are required for the production of the samples. Since there is little likelihood that the minimum quantities will be purchased, the total payment for the imported merchandise usually includes the surcharge. Accordingly, this amount is part of the price actually paid or payable.
544340 dated Sep. 11, 1990.

The mill required that a minimum quantity of fabric be purchased or else they will assess an additional less-than-minimum order surcharge (LTM) as a penalty for producing less than an optimal lot size. Because the buyer directs the manufacturer to purchase the specific quantities of certain fabric, it is the party that causes the LTM surcharge from the upstream supplier to be incurred. The LTM quantity surcharge is directly connected to the production of the merchandise, in that the amount is paid to obtain the fabric that is

used in making the merchandise. Since the payment for the LTM surcharge is made to the seller of the merchandise and not to a third party, in accordance with Generra Sportswear Co. v. United States, 905 F.2d 377 (Fed. Cir. 1990), the payment is presumed to be a part of the price actually paid or payable unless rebutted

H095412 dated Mar. 8, 2010.

COMPUTED VALUE

INTRODUCTION

The TAA, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(e), defines computed value as the following:

COMPUTED VALUE.

(1) The computed value of imported merchandise is the sum of -

(A) the cost or value of the materials and the fabrication and other processing of any kind employed in the production of the imported merchandise;

(B) an amount for profit and general expenses equal to that usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind as the imported merchandise that are made by the producers in the country of exportation for export to the United States;

(C) any assist, if its value is not included under subparagraph (A) or (B); and

(D) the packing costs.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1) -

(A) the cost or value of materials under paragraph (1)(A) shall not include the amount of any internal tax imposed by the country of exportation that is directly applicable to the materials or their disposition if the tax is remitted or refunded upon the exportation of the merchandise in the production of which the materials were used; and

(B) the amount for profit and general expenses under paragraph (1)(B) shall be based upon the producer's profits and expenses, unless the producer's profits and expenses are inconsistent with those usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind as the imported merchandise that are made by producers in the country of exportation for export to the United States, in which case the amount under paragraph (1)(B) shall be based on the usual profit and general expenses of such producers in such sales, as determined from sufficient information.

19 U.S.C. 1401a(e)(h)(5) defines "sufficient information" as the following:

> The term sufficient information, when required under this section for determining - (A) any amount - . . . (iii) added under subsection (e)(2) as profit or general expense; . . . means information that establishes the accuracy of such amount, difference, or adjustment.

19 U.S.C. 1401a(g)(2) states:

> For purposes of this section, merchandise (including, but not limited to, identical merchandise and similar merchandise) shall be treated as being of the same class or kind as other merchandise if it is within a group or range of merchandise produced by a particular industry or industry sector.

Regarding Customs regulations, 19 CFR 152.106 is relevant with respect to computed value. In sections 152.106(a) and (b), the language is similar to that found in the TAA. In

addition, 19 CFR 152.106(c) through (f) provides for the following:

(c) Profit and general expenses. The amount for profit and general expenses will be taken as a whole. If the producer's profit figure is low and general expenses high, those figures taken together nevertheless may be consistent with those usually reflected in sales of imported merchandise of the same class or kind.

(1) Interpretative note 1. A product is introduced into the United States, and the producer accepts either no profit or a low profit to offset the high general expenses required to introduce the product into this market. If the producer can demonstrate that there is a low profit on sales of the imported merchandise because of peculiar commercial circumstances, the actual profit figures will be accepted provided the producer has valid commercial reasons to justify them and his pricing policy reflects the usual pricing policies in the industry.

(2) Interpretative note 2. Producers have been forced to lower prices temporarily because of an unforeseeable drop in demand, or they sell merchandise to complement a range of merchandise being produced in the United States and accept a low profit to maintain competitiveness. If the producer's own figures for profit and general expenses are not consistent with those usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind as the merchandise being valued which are made in the country of exportation for export to the United States, the amount for profit and general expenses will be based upon reliable and quantifiable information other than that supplied by or on behalf of the producer of the merchandise.

(d) Assists and packing costs. Computed value also will include an amount equal to the apportioned value of any assists used in the production of the imported merchandise and the packing costs for the imported merchandise. The value of any engineering, development, artwork, design work, and plans and sketches undertaken in the United States will be included in computed value only to the extent that their value has been charged to the producer. Depending on the producer's method of accounting, the value of assists may be included (duplicated) in the producer's cost of materials, fabrication, and other processing, or in the general expenses. If duplication occurs, a separate amount for the value of the assists will not be added to the other elements as it is not intended that any component of computed value be included twice.

(e) Merchandise of same class or kind. Sales for export to the United States of the narrowest group or range of imported merchandise, including the merchandise being appraised, will be examined to determine usual profit and general expenses. For the purpose of computed value, merchandise of the same class or kind must be from the same country as the merchandise being appraised.

Example. A foreign shipper sells merchandise to a related U.S. importer. The foreign shipper does not sell to any unrelated persons. The transaction between the foreign shipper and the U.S. importer is determined to have been affected by the relationship. There is no identical or similar merchandise from the same country of production. The U.S. importer further processes the product and sells the finished product to an unrelated buyer

in the U.S. within 180 days of the date of importation. No assists from the unrelated U.S. buyer are involved, and the type of processing involved can be accurately costed. The U.S. importer has requested that the shipment be appraised under computed value. The profit and general expenses figure for the same class or kind of merchandise in the country of exportation for export to the U.S. is known. How should the merchandise be appraised? The merchandise should be appraised under computed value, using the company's profit and general expenses if not inconsistent with those usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind.

(f) Availability of information. (1) It will be presumed that the computed value of the imported merchandise cannot be determined if: (i) the importer is unable to provide required computed value information within a reasonable time, and/or (ii) The foreign producer refuses to provide, or is legally prevented from providing, that information. (2) If information other than that supplied by or on behalf of the producer is used to determine computed value, the district director shall inform the importer, upon written request, of: (i) The source of the information, (ii) The data used, and (iii) The calculation based upon the specified data, If not contrary to domestic law regarding disclosure of information. See, also section 152.101(d).

19 CFR 152.102(h) defines "merchandise of the same class or kind" as:

> merchandise (including, but not limited to, identical merchandise and similar merchandise) within a group or range of merchandise produced by a particular industry or industry sector.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

In Article 6, the Agreement provides:

1. The customs value of imported goods under the provisions of this Article shall be based on a computed value. Computed value shall consist of the sum of:

(a) the cost or value of materials and fabrication or other processing employed in producing the imported goods;

(b) an amount for profit and general expenses equal to that usually reflected in sales of goods of the same class or kind as the goods being valued which are made by producers in the country of exportation for export to the country of importation;

(c) the cost or value of all other expenses necessary to reflect the valuation option chosen by the Party under Article 8.2 [cost of transport of the goods to the port or place of importation; loading, unloading and handling charges associated with the transport of the goods to the port or place of importation; and the cost of insurance].

2. No Party may require or compel any person not resident in its own territory to produce for examination, or to allow access to, any account or other record for the purposes of determining a computed value. However, information supplied by the producer of the goods for the purposes of determining the customs value under the provisions of this

Article may be verified in another country by the authorities of the country of importation with the agreement of the producer and provided they give sufficient advance notice to the government of the country in question and the latter does not object to the investigation.

In the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, Paragraphs 1 and 2, states:

1. As a general rule, customs value is determined under this Agreement on the basis of information readily available in the country of importation. In order to determine a computed value, however, it may be necessary to examine the costs of producing the goods being valued and other information which has to be obtained from outside the country of importation. Furthermore, in most cases the producer of the goods will be outside the jurisdiction of the authorities of the country of importation. The use of the computed value method will generally be limited to those cases where the buyer and seller are related, and the producer is prepared to supply to the authorities of the country of importation the necessary costings and to provide facilities for any subsequent verification which may be necessary.
2. The "cost or value" referred to in a Article 6.1(a) [cited above] is to be determined on the basis of information relating to the production of the goods being valued supplied by or on behalf of the producer. It is to be based upon the commercial accounts of the producer, provided that such accounts are consistent with the generally accepted accounting principles applied in the country where the goods are produced.

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6, are similar to 152.106(d), 152.106(b)(2), 152.106(c)(1) and (2), and 152.106(f)(2), respectively.

The term "general expenses" covers the direct and indirect costs of producing and selling the goods for export. See Interpretative notes, Note to Article 6, paragraph 7.

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, paragraph 8 corresponds with 19 CFR 152.106(e), “Merchandise of same class or kind.”

In Article 15, paragraph 3, "goods of the same class or kind" is defined as:

> goods which fall within a group or range of goods produced by a particular industry or industry sector, and includes identical or similar goods.

In addition, Interpretative Notes, General Note, Use of generally accepted accounting principles, paragraph 2, regarding computed value states:

> For the purposes of this Agreement, the customs administration of each party shall utilize information prepared in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles in the country which is appropriate for the Article in question. . . . On the other hand, the determination of usual profit and general expenses under the provisions of Article 6 [computed value] would be carried out utilizing information prepared in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting

principles of the country of production.

Judicial Precedent:

In Campbell Soup Co., Inc. v. United States, 853 F.Supp. 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1994), the Court of International Trade affirmed Customs' decision regarding the calculation of computed value. The importer claimed a deduction for taxes paid by the importer's subsidiary in Mexico, which were subsequently rebated by the Mexican government. The rebates represented a percentage of the value of the exported product. The Court agreed with Customs and disallowed the deduction from expenses that the importer had claimed for the subsidiary's payments, and in determining computed value, included the amount of the rebates in the subsidiary's profits. In addition, the Court agreed with Customs in determining that inland freight costs were properly regarded as selling expenses that contributed to the subsidiary's "profit and general" expenses under computed value.

Campbell Soup Co., Inc. v. United States, 107 F.3d 1556 (Fed. Cir. 1997).
The Court of Appeals determined that 1) the Court of International Trade (CIT) erred in not allowing the "Certificado Export de Devolucion de Impuestos" (CEDIS - Mexican export program whereby recipients of CEDIS apply the certificates as credit toward payment of Mexican taxes) rebates as a reduction of material costs for purposes of the computed value calculation; 2) the CIT was correct in including the CEDIS rebates as a part of the manufacturer's profits because such amounts were included as such in the producer's financial statements and there was no showing that the producer's actual general expenses and profits are inconsistent with the usual profit calculation of other product or similar merchandise; and 3) the CIT was correct in including freight costs associated with shipping the product from the manufacturer's loading dock in Mexico to the U.S. border in the computed value calculation because the producer recorded these costs as a general expense in its financial records and because this treatment is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles in Mexico.

Headquarters Rulings:

assists

19 U.S.C. 1401a(e)(1)(C); 19 CFR 152.106(d); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, paragraph 3

542139 dated Oct. 15, 1980 (TAA No. 9). - See Assists, equipment.

544481 dated May 8, 1991. - See Assists, material, components, parts, and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

cost of fabrication

19 U.S.C. 1401a(e) (1) (A) ; 19 CFR 152.106(a) (1); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article

6, paragraph l(a) and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, paragraph 2

Design department costs, not carried on a producer's books as a cost or value of materials and of fabrication, or a general expense, if in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, are not part of computed value.
542325 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 23).

Accounting services furnished by a U.S. parent to a foreign subsidiary which are kept on the parent's books, are not assists. Plant rental and building depreciation not on the manufacturer's books are dutiable as a cost of fabrication under computed value, unless the costs are not included as such under generally accepted accounting principles of the producing country.
542658 dated Jan. 12, 1982 (TAA No. 44); 542873 dated July 20, 1982 (TAA No. 44, Supp. No. 1).

The following expenses do not relate to the materials and fabrication employed in the production of the imported merchandise and are not included in computed value: (1) expenses incurred by the assembler's plant manager in traveling from the Mexican plant to the U.S. plant (manager is a U.S. resident and is paid by the
importer); (2) entertainment expenses incurred by plant manager in the U.S. and Mexico; (3) expenses incurred in transporting an engineer employed by the assembler to the home office in the U.S.; (4) membership fees and dues paid to a U.S. association to which the plant manager belongs. The expenses are not encompassed within any of the assist categories and are not included in computed value as assists.
543502 dated June 11, 1985.

The cost of a software system design, program development, programming and a carrier medium is included in the computed value of production equipment which is imported already programmed if these costs are reflected in the parent company seller's commercial accounts as costs relating to the production of that equipment.
543391 dated Feb. 18, 1987.

The buyer of imported merchandise pays part of the salaries of 21 employees of the related party seller. These employees are primarily engineering and quality control supervisors who work directly with engineering and production personnel in the seller's plant. The salaries are not included in determining computed value as a cost of fabrication.
544481 dated May 8, 1991.

Capital improvement expenses depreciated by the importer that relate to the assembly process are costs of fabrication or other processing of the imported merchandise and are included in computed value, unless the importer can establish otherwise under generally accepted accounting principles of the country of production.
545199 dated Dec. 22, 1994.

Employees of the foreign assembler are paid ”make-up pay” where the employees are

paid for more than is produced to arrive at a minimum pay as required by the Mexican government. In addition, to comply with Mexican Labor Laws, the employees are paid "time work pay" whereby the employees are paid even when the factory is temporarily out of work. Finally, the employees are paid a premium for those hours worked beyond their normal workday, i.e., "overtime premium pay." The "make-up pay" and the "overtime premium pay" are directly related to the cost of production and are part of the dutiable value. They are actual labor costs involved in the assembly of the merchandise. With regard to "time work pay", the payments are part of the producer's general expenses and profit related to the merchandise and dutiable under computed value.
545679 dated June 23, 1995.

election by importer between computed and deductive value

19 U.S.C. 1401a(a); 19 CFR 152.101(c); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 4 and Interpretative Notes, General Note, Paragraph 3

Unless the importer chooses at the time of entry to use computed value, deductive value is applicable as the means of appraisement.
542765 dated Apr. 20, 1982.

543912 dated Apr. 19, 1988.- - <u>See</u> Importer's Options, computed value versus deductive value.

The protestant made a valid request for its merchandise to be appraised under computed value, as opposed to deductive value. The protestant's claim for a "treatment" is premature inasmuch as the appraised value of the merchandise is yet to be determined.
548284 dated Mar. 22, 2004.

Company A is in the business of manufacturing silicon wafers and provides reclamation of wafers for further use to its customers. The reclaim process is performed by a sister company in Japan (Company B). Company B ships the reclaimed wafers directly to the customers, but Company A acts as the IOR, while the customers are listed as the ultimate consignee. The price is negotiated per customer and independent from the parent company. Customers pay Company A for the reclamation service, and Company A retains 4% of the price for acting as the IOR because there is no sale between Company A and Company B, since there is no transfer of ownership and the price paid does not include the value of the wafer. Transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is not applicable because the HTSUS only has a tariff provision for wafers generally, and not reclaimed wafers, and CBP is unable to obtain any information on imports of reclaimed wafers. Company A elected to exercise the option to reverse the order of appraisement under deductive value and computed value and proposed that computed value is the best method of appraisement. Computed value is also not applicable because Company A does not have access to actual production or accounting records to calculate Company B's cost of reclamation and without such data, computed value cannot apply. Company A stated that it is not able to use deductive value because there is no retail value for the reclaimed wafers from which to make the appropriate deductions. However, CBP found

that there is a worldwide wafer reclaim market and held that Company A has not sufficiently eliminated deductive value as an appropriate basis of appraisement. CBP concluded that, provided Company A is able to obtain the necessary information from Company B to ensure that the technical requirements are satisfied to appraise the reclaimed wafers under the computed value method as specified in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d), computed value is the appropriate basis of appraisement.
H256778 dated Sep. 16, 2015.

elements of computed value

Computed value cannot be used when certain elements of cost are not included in the computation. In this case, elements such as patent, trademark, research and development costs, royalties, etc., have been excluded from computed value. Customs does not have the authority to exclude costs associated with the production of the merchandise from computed value. Neither the seller nor the importer is able to provide the information. Computed value is not proper under these circumstances.
544605 dated Mar. 15, 1991.

Assuming computed value is the appropriate method of appraisement in this case, neither drop shipping merchandise directly from the port of entry nor importing through various ports of entry will affect the computed value of the merchandise.
546156 dated Jan. 10, 1997.

The importer must provide to Customs, if requested, the documentation that supports the figures regarding the cost of manufacturing the merchandise in order to establish a valid computed value. Regarding computed value, 19 CFR 141.88 provides that when the port director determines that information as to computed value is necessary in the appraisement of any class or kind of merchandise, the importer shall be notified. Thereafter, invoices of such merchandise shall contain a verified statement by the manufacturer or producer of computed value as defined in section 402(e) of the TAA.
546735 dated June 19, 1997; <u>clarified</u> <u>by</u> 546735 dated June 24, 1997 (classification issued clarified).

A manufacturing plant incurred damages from a fire and the importer claimed an $80,000 business interruption expense resulting therefrom. A credit could not be allowed against foreign operating expenses that represent an opportunity loss rather than an actual expense incurred by the importer, on which duties were paid. There is no authority, either in determining the appraised value of the imported merchandise under sections 402(e) or 402(f) of the TAA, or in determining the dutiable value of the imported merchandise to effect adjustments with respect to claimed business interruption credit where the underlying credit is not offset by expenses incurred. Where packing costs are unavailable, the computed value may not be used to determine the value of the subject merchandise. Instead, a fallback method, pursuant to section 402(f), using a modified computed value should be applied. Subsequently, Customs may make adjustments and estimations for unknown packing costs. The importer erred in a number of ways, including the following: (1) the packing costs submitted by the importer were inconsistent with the manufacturer's

records; (2) the importer was not able to substantiate the reporting method; and (3) the importer could not provide invoices to support the purchase of foreign packing bags. In light of these shortcomings, it was reasonable for Customs to base the value of foreign packing on the cost of the most expensive packing bags used by the importer.
545611 dated Jan. 2, 2001.

In order to increase production, the importer established a second manufacturing plant. Due to this, the importer funded certain start-up costs, including training and excess overhead costs, which were maintained on the producer's books. Based on the information submitted and pursuant to section 402(e)(1)(B), the non-production salary and training expenses incurred in establishing the related foreign producer are general expenses for the purpose of calculating the computed value of the imported merchandise.
547548 dated Sep. 26, 2001.

Customs fixed the computed value of the imported merchandise based on the values that the importer provided at the time of entry. The importer claims that the merchandise should not have been liquidated at the entered values because the entered values were estimates and did not represent the actual computed value. The importer determined the actual computed value and submitted it to Customs at a later date. The importer did not provide evidence detailing the breakdown of the adjusted cost figures on an entry-by-entry basis. Without the submission of an entry-by-entry calculation of the actual computed value, Customs will determine the computed value on the basis of the values provided at the time of entry.
548096 dated June 4, 2002.

The distributor is a U.S. company that manages the engineering, marketing, and sales of automotive merchandise, including merchandise manufactured by the importer. U.S. customers enter into agreements with the distributor whereby the distributor contracts with a third party to produce the merchandise. The distributor enters into production agreements with the importer/manufacturer, and the importer/manufacturer assumes the following responsibilities: arrange and pay for freight and insurance; maintain title and risk of loss until the merchandise is ready for shipment to the customer from the U.S. warehouse; and act as IOR for the transaction. After entry, the importer/manufacturer arranges for storage of the merchandise in warehouses in the United States. The transactions between the importer/manufacturer and the distributor are not *bona fide* sales. Transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement. With respect to deductive value, the shipment of the merchandise and the resulting sale to the customer may occur as late as five months after the importation of the merchandise. Because the deductive value method may only be used when merchandise is sold within 90 days of importation, deductive value is not an appropriate method of appraisement. The merchandise concerned is properly appraised on the basis of computed value. Because the importer is also the manufacturer of the merchandise, information concerning material and processing costs should be readily available.
548165 dated Mar. 21, 2003.

Company A requested a ruling concerning the proper valuation of graduation gowns to be imported from an unrelated maquiladora in Mexico. Company A provides materials to manufacture the imported gowns and owns the manufactured merchandise. The maquiladora manufactures gowns from raw materials provided by Company A and temporarily stores finished gowns in Mexico. There is no sale for export between the Mexican maquiladora and Company A because Company A always has title to the goods. In this case, CBP held that based on the facts submitted, the subject merchandise should be appraised under computed value method of appraisement pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(e), provided Company A is prepared to present CBP with documentation to support appraisement under this method.
H234540 dated Jan. 23, 2013.

Valuation of dental spray for pets produced in Canada and shipped to the U.S. for warehousing. The spray is sold after importation into the U.S. and the sales are to U.S. customers and customers abroad. Importer proposed a modified deductive value method. Decision held the spray may be valued either using deductive value or computed value. If this could not be done, a modified deductive value may be acceptable.
H264679 dated July 10, 2015.

merchandise of the same class or kind

19 CFR 152.106(e), 19 CFR 152.102(h); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 15, paragraph 3 and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, paragraph 8

543031 dated Apr. 12, 1983. - <u>See</u> Computed Value, profit and general expenses.

No other Mexican producers of the same class or kind of merchandise undergoing appraisement exist. The producer's profit and general expenses may be used as the "usual" profit and general expenses in ascertaining a computed value for the merchandise.
543268 dated Dec. 14, 1984.

The importer defines “pass and destroy” materials as vegetables, which are removed from the fields in which they were planted and taken to the subsidiary’s plant for processing, but were then rejected for quality control purposes and destroyed. The producer has not demonstrated that such costs are inconsistent with expenses that are usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind as the imported merchandise. Additionally, the producer provides insufficient information concerning the maintenance of commercial accounts with respect to the costs at issue. For these reasons, the amounts identified for “pass and destroy” materials should be included in the computed value calculation for the imported merchandise.
548149 dated Aug. 21, 2002.

H242509 dated Aug. 15, 2013 – <u>See</u> Transaction Value of Identical or Similar Merchandise, identical or similar merchandise.

profit and general expenses

19 U.S.C. 1401a(e) (1) (B); 19 CFR 152.106(b) (1) and (2); 19 CFR 152.106(c); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 6, paragraph l(b) and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, paragraphs 4 and 5

542325 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 23). - See Computed Value, cost of fabrication.

A loan interest expense incurred by the assembler prior to commencement of assembly operations appearing on the assembler's books of account is properly included in the amount for usual profit and general expenses under computed value.
542849 dated Aug. 6, 1982.

In the instant case, no other Mexican producer of merchandise of the same class or kind exists. The assembler's general expenses and profit are to be regarded as the “usual,” including all of the interest expense incurred relating to the production facility.
543031 dated Apr. 12, 1983.

Unless there is evidence to indicate that figures submitted which reflect a company's profit and general expenses are inconsistent with the profit and general expenses usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind, these figures must be accepted. The general expenses and profit called for by the statute and regulations are the "actual" expenses and profit as shown on the books of the assembler.
543076 dated Sep. 6, 1983.

General expenses of an assembler reimbursed by the importer are part of the computed value of the imported merchandise.
543166 dated Jan. 6, 1984.

A sculpture that is imported several times during its development for review may be appraised pursuant to its computed value. This is the cost of producing the imported article plus an amount for the profit and general expenses usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind in the country of exportation for export to the United States. Of course, a particular sculpture that is imported on multiple occasions has a progressively higher computed value on each importation as the sculpture nears completion.
543239 dated Jan. 24, 1984.

Interest on a loan is considered to be a general expense under computed value. Because general expenses are not considered to be direct costs of processing pursuant to 19 CFR 10.178, the interest expense in question in this case may not be included in computing the 35% requirement for GSP eligibility.
543159 dated May 7, 1984.

Under computed value, the amount for general expenses and profits is determined by information the producer supplies, provided such is in accordance with generally

accepted accounting principles in the country of production. Currency conversion losses cannot be used for computed value purposes since, in this case, the losses have no direct relationship to the assembly process and are used only to balance the general ledger when accounts are converted from foreign currency to U.S. dollars.
543276 dated May 15, 1984.

543268 dated Dec. 14, 1984. - See Computed Value, merchandise of the same class or kind.

General expenses incurred by a foreign assembler which are reimbursed by the importer are not included in computed value as part of "materials and fabrication," "profit and general expenses," or, if not encompassed within one of the four assist categories, as an assist. This conclusion assumes that the expenses are reflected on the importer's books.
543502 dated June 11, 1985.

Where general expenses incurred in connection with an assembly operation are reflected as such in the assembler's commercial accounts, those expenses are dutiable under computed value even if they were actually paid by the importer and they do not qualify as assists.
543576 dated Mar. 3, 1986.

The profits and general expenses of the producer of imported merchandise are used in the calculation of computed value, unless the producer's profit and general expenses are inconsistent with amount usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind.
543820 dated Dec. 22, 1986.

543857 dated Feb. 18, 1987. - See General Accepted Accounting Principles, computed value.

A tax rebate is calculated on a percentage of Mexican integral costs that is given to Mexican firms who export products containing a certain percentage of Mexican raw materials. The value of the tax is included in computed value as part of the profit and general expenses of the Mexican company because it is treated in such a manner by the producer on its books. In the absence of information showing that these figures are inconsistent with what is usual, the producer's figures are used to determine profit and general expenses. Prepaid transportation costs directly related to transporting a finished product from the loading dock of a Mexican plant to the U.S. border are carried on the books of the producer. Prepaid insurance premiums paid to cover the risk of transportation from the plant to the border are also carried on the producer's books. These expenses are included in the exporter's financial statements as a cost of production and included in the computed value of the merchandise.
543891 dated May 2, 1988.

544616 dated Apr. 15, 1991. - See Computed Value, severance pay.

Export incentives provided to a seller of imported merchandise by the foreign government are to be included in the computed value of the merchandise to the extent that such is reflected in the overall profit and general expenses, pursuant to section 402(e)(1)(B) of the TAA.
544481 dated May 8, 1991.

Whether the producer's profit and general expenses are consistent with the profit and general expenses usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind as the imported merchandise that is made by producers in the country of exportation for export to the United States is a question of fact and, as such, the outcome will vary depending on the particular point in issue. Customs' authority to reject figures relating to the producer's profit and general expenses is limited to those situations where such figures are inconsistent with those usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind.
544736 dated Aug. 26, 1992.

A Canadian company imports merchandise into the United States by consigning inventory to storage warehouses operated by a related U.S. company. The merchandise is appraised pursuant to computed value. Certain general expenses related to the Canadian company's U.S. operations are recorded on the books and records of the Canadian company. These expenses include commissions paid to distributors on U.S. sales, the costs of conventions conducted in the United States, commissions paid to marketing companies on U.S. sales, credit card fees on U.S. sales, management fees to operate U.S. warehouses, and depreciation expenses associated with assets used in the warehouses. These expenses related to the U.S. operations are carried on the Canadian company's books as general expenses and are properly a component of computed value. An unusual and non-recurring expense for losses suffered by the producer may not be used to calculate the amount of profit and general expenses for computed value purposes.
545384 dated Nov. 23, 1993.

Where 9801.00.10 HTSUS merchandise is entered with 9802.00.80 HTSUS merchandise, the profit and general expenses and packing costs attributable to the packing of the 9801.00.10 merchandise should be allocated to that merchandise and not included in the appraised value of the 9802.00.80 merchandise, provided that the importer's cost submission conforms to generally accepted accounting principles.
545161 dated Apr. 7, 1994.

Various U.S. related costs and non-production costs are general expenses of the producer and are included in the computed value of imported merchandise. Fire loss expenses are extraordinary expenses under generally accepted accounting principles and are not included in computed value. Rent expense for the 20% portion of unused space is a cost of fabrication or other processing and is included in computed value. Excess start-up and pre-production costs should be included and whether these costs are amortized depends upon their treatment in the producer's books. Verified freight charges for transporting U.S. components from the U.S. facility to the port of exportation

are part of the cost or value of the U.S. components to be deducted from the full value of imported merchandise entered under 807.00 TSUS and 9802.00.80, HTS.
544863 dated Sep. 29, 1994.

Where the producer's amount for general expenses and profit is recorded on the producer's books in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles, there is no authority to add to that figure certain amounts recorded on the importer's books. Therefore, the amount for general expenses and profit recorded on the importer's books is not included in the computed value of imported merchandise.
545577 dated Jan. 4, 1995; 545088 dated Feb. 14, 1995.

The imported merchandise is appraised pursuant to computed value, section 402(e) of the TAA. The following items are expenses incurred and recorded in the related Mexican assembler's accounting records as expenses: wages paid to U.S. resident employees who perform management services at the assembly facility in Mexico; U.S. Customs duties paid upon the importation of the merchandise into the United States; and U.S. freight paid for the transport of the merchandise from the U.S./Mexican border to North Carolina. No evidence has been submitted to indicate that the amount for profit and general expenses recorded on the foreign assembler's books is inconsistent with that usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. Therefore, the expenses at issue are appropriately included in the calculation of computed value for the imported merchandise.
545953 dated Aug. 3, 1995.

Customs appraised the merchandise at issue pursuant to computed value. The importer has not provided any information to refute Customs' calculations. The statutory requirement of using the material and processing costs incurred in the production of the subject merchandise has been followed. In addition, the amount for profit and general expenses is generally based on the producer's profit and expenses. The requirements of section 402(e) of the TAA regarding computed value have been met, and the merchandise has been properly appraised.
546673 dated Mar. 17, 1998.

A company imports t-shirts into the United States. A related contractor in El Salvador has assembled the t-shirts from U.S.-cut components provided by the importer. Some of the non-production expenses incurred are either shown initially on the importer's books or are transferred from the assembler's books to the importer's books on a monthly basis. The accounting principles followed by the assembler are in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles as they are followed in El Salvador. In addition, there is no evidence to indicate that the amount is inconsistent with the amount for general expenses and profit usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. The amount for general expenses and profit reflected on the importer's books should not be included in determining the computed value of the imported merchandise.
546801 dated Nov. 5, 1998.

546882 dated Apr. 9, 1999. - <u>See</u> Currency Conversion, computed value.

An importer of wearing apparel has a factory in Costa Rica that is its sole source of the apparel. All costs associated with operating the related party facility in Costa Rica are maintained in an account found on the importer's books. Because the foreign factory's commercial account records are used as a basis of calculating computed value, all of the general expenses recorded in the account are included in the "amount for profit and general expenses" under section 402(e)(1)(B) of the TAA. Thus, those expenses are dutiable under computed value.

547094 dated June 3, 1999.

The cost of materials damaged by the fire and labor expenses associated with the fire are extraordinary expenses incurred by the manufacturer, whose manufacturing plant caught fire. The importer's classification of these expenses as general expenses, in a computed value appraisement, is in error.

545611 dated Jan. 2, 2001.

The importer did not submit evidence to indicate that certain amounts incurred for general expenses recorded on the foreign assembler's books were inconsistent with that which is usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. Start-up costs, including training costs and overhead costs related to excess capacity in a new manufacturing facility, are to be included in the computed value of merchandise imported into the United States.

547652 dated Apr. 9, 2002.

A freeze completely destroyed certain fields of vegetables that were being grown exclusively for the importer. The expenses associated with this field disaster may be construed as extraordinary expenses under generally accepted accounting principles. As such, they are not included in the computed value so long as they are not recorded in the producer's commercial accounts as either general expenses or as fabrication costs.

548149 dated Aug. 21, 2002.

A factory located in Germany is the parent company to the importer and designer, both located in the United States. The factory intends to contract with the designer to design and engineer items that the factory subsequently produces and sells worldwide, including to the importer. The imported merchandise is a prototype that is actually produced in the United States, exported to Germany, then re-imported and consigned to the importer in the United States. Proceeding through the available means of appraisement, computed value is not an appropriate method of appraising the merchandise. The adequacy of the producer's profits and expenses is measured by sales of merchandise of the same class or kind made by producers in the country of exportation for export to the United States. In this case, although the country of exportation is Germany, the imported merchandise is in fact produced in the United States. Therefore, it is impossible to employ the standard of comparability to ensure the adequacy of the producer's profit and general expenses for purposes of a computed value appraisement.

548276 dated Apr. 29, 2003.

A maquiladora operation was expanded to include accounting and financial services that handles the global accounts payable function for a business which are unrelated to the assembly operations of imported goods. The accounting and financial services are segregated from the general expenses incurred in the assembly operations and are tracked separately on the foreign assembler's books. The costs of the global accounting services described above would not be included in calculation of the computed value of goods assembled at the maquiladora.
H010951 dated Sep. 21, 2007.

H065015 dated Apr. 14, 2011 – <u>See</u> Related Party Transactions, rejection of transaction value.

severance pay

Severance payments made to employees who are discharged as a result of a decrease in production levels are included in the computed value of the imported merchandise as part of the profit and general expenses usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind.
544616 dated Apr. 15, 1991.

An importer purchases merchandise from a related party. Employees of the related seller accumulate severance pay based upon the employees' length of employment and percentage of yearly income. Upon termination of employment, the employee receives the severance pay. The related seller pays the severance pay to its employees. The payable is expensed on the foreign books when paid, and the importer records an estimated liability at each year-end, should the foreign assembler's factory close. The importer does not actually make the severance payments, however, it uses the yearly addition to its severance pay liability to reduce its revenue. The severance payments recorded on the related seller's books are included in computed value. The severance pay expensed on the importer's books is not included in the computed value of the imported merchandise.
545405 dated Feb. 1, 1994.

CONDITIONS OR CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH A VALUE CANNOT BE DETERMINED

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A) provides the following:

> The transaction value of imported merchandise . . . shall be the appraised value of that merchandise for the purposes of this Act only if - . . . (ii) the sale of, or the price actually paid or payable for, the imported merchandise is not subject to any condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined with respect to the imported merchandise.

In addition, 19 CFR 152.103(j)(1)(ii) states:

Limitations on use of transaction value -

> (1) In general. The transaction value of imported merchandise will be the appraised value only if: . . . (ii) The sale of, or the price actually paid or payable for, the imported merchandise is not subject to any condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined.

19 CFR 152.103(k)(2), along with interpretative notes, states:

> The transaction value will not be accepted as the appraised value if the sale of, or the price actually paid or payable for, the merchandise is subject to a condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined.
>
> (i) Interpretative note 1. The seller establishes the price of the imported merchandise on condition that the buyer also will buy other merchandise in specified quantities.
>
> (ii) Interpretative note 2. The price of the imported merchandise is dependent upon the price or prices at which the buyer of the merchandise sells other merchandise to the seller of the merchandise.
>
> (iii) Interpretative note 3. The price of the imported merchandise is established on the basis of a form of payment extraneous to the merchandise, such as where the merchandise is to be further processed by the buyer, and has been provided by the seller on condition that he will receive a specified quantity of the finished merchandise.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 1, paragraph 1(b), parallels 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A)(ii).

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Paragraph 1(b) corresponds with the above-cited Customs regulation, 19 CFR 152.103(k)(2). In addition, that paragraph states:

> However, conditions or considerations relating to the production or marketing of the imported goods shall not result in rejection of the transaction value. For example, the fact that the buyer furnishes the seller with engineering and plans undertaken in the country of importation shall not result in rejection of the transaction value for the purposes of Article 1. Likewise, if the buyer undertakes on his own account, even though by agreement with the seller, activities relating to the marketing of the imported goods, the value of these activities is not part of the customs value nor shall such activities result in rejection of the transaction value.

In addition, CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 16.1 states the following:

1. What treatment should be given to the situation where the sale or price is subject to some condition or consideration for which a value can be determined with respect to the goods being valued? (emphasis added)
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:
3. According to clause (b) of Article 1.1 the Customs value of imported goods cannot be established on the basis of the transaction value if the sale or price is subject to some condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined with respect to the goods being valued.
4. The provision of clause (b) of Article 1.1 should be interpreted to mean that if the value of a condition or consideration can be determined with respect to the goods being valued, the Customs value of the imported goods should, subject to the other provisions and conditions of Article 1, be the transaction value as determined under that Article. Interpretative Notes to Article 1 and the Protocol make it very clear that the price actually paid or payable is the total payment made by the buyer to or for the benefit of the seller, that the payment may be made directly or indirectly and that the price includes all payments actually made or to be made by the buyer to the seller, or by the buyer to a third party. Thus the value of the condition, when it is known and relates to the imported goods, is a part of the price actually paid or payable.
5. It should rest with individual administrations as to what they consider would be sufficient information to specifically determine the value of a condition or consideration.

See also, CCC Technical Committee Commentary 11.1, which discusses tie-in sales and their treatment under the GATT Valuation Agreement.

Headquarters Notices:

Tie-in Sale Transactions, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 30, No. 23, June 5, 1996.

This notice reminds the public that sales of imported merchandise in which there is a condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined, such as a tie-in sale, will preclude the use of transaction value as a basis of appraisement. A tie-in sale of imported merchandise is one in which the sale of or price for the imported merchandise is conditioned on the sale of or consideration for other merchandise. Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1484(a)(1), the IOR is required, using reasonable care, to make and complete

entry by filing with Customs, among other things, the declared value of the merchandise. The importer's use of transaction value in circumstances in which there is a tie-in sale constitutes a failure to exercise reasonable care.

Headquarters Rulings:

transaction value inapplicable

Higher than contract prices of imported merchandise are off-set by lower than contract prices on other merchandise imported by the buyer. This off-set arrangement has a value that cannot be determined and therefore, transaction value is eliminated as a means of appraisement.
542747 dated June 3, 1982; 542994 dated Apr. 26, 1983; 543358 dated Sep. 13, 1984 (543358 overruled on other grounds by 544856 dated Dec. 13, 1991).

An agreement stipulates that the U.S. buyer is responsible for the construction and management of a seawater treatment plant. At the time the original contract was entered into, there was nothing indicating that services on the plant were to be performed by personnel provided under contract with the owner. Transaction value is not applicable as a method of appraisement because there exists a condition or a consideration for which a value cannot be determined.
543066 dated July 25, 1983.

The price of merchandise is dependent upon the price or prices at which the buyer of the imported merchandise sells other merchandise to the seller of the imported merchandise. This interdependency of prices affects the cost and price of the imported goods and is, therefore, a consideration for which a value cannot be determined with respect to the imported goods.
543881 dated Dec. 3, 1987.

The importer has entered into an "exchange savings agreement" with the seller. The agreement involves the calculation of a duty and freight savings amount realized when the importer, through its Saudi Arabian affiliate, supplies glycol to the seller's Japanese affiliate and in-turn, the seller supplies product to the importer's U.S. plant. Transaction value must be eliminated as a means of appraisement because there exists a condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined.
544491 dated Oct. 29, 1990.

The merchandise is originally purchased for a C&F price, to be shipped by ocean vessel. However, the price was renegotiated prior to the exportation of the merchandise resulting in a higher C&F price, to be shipped by air. The "renegotiated" price did not represent a value for the goods and a value for the allegedly included air freight costs. In this particular case, transaction value was inappropriate as a means of appraisement because the renegotiated price subjected the imported merchandise to a condition for which a value could not be determined.
544620 dated Dec. 23, 1991.

The price of imported merchandise is based upon the transaction being structured as a sale to Canada rather than as a sale to the United States. The seller offers to sell canned tomatoes to the buyer at a lower price, made possible by an export subsidy program. The program is not available on tomato products exported to the United States, therefore the seller can offer the lower price only if the transaction is structured in such a way to make it appear to the Italian authorities that the tomatoes are being sold to a non-U.S. buyer. Transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement since there exists a condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined.
545477 dated Nov. 22, 1994.

CONFIDENTIALITY

INTRODUCTION

The Customs Service is guided by the current U.S. laws relating to confidentiality and disclosure, primarily those contained in the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), as amended (5 U.S.C. 552), and the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a; 18 U.S.C. 1904). See also Statement of Administrative Action.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 10 states:

All information which is by nature confidential or which is provided on a confidential basis for the purposes of customs valuation shall be treated as strictly confidential by the authorities concerned who shall not disclose it without the specific permission of the person or government providing such information, except to the extent that it may be required to be disclosed in the context of judicial proceedings.

CONSIGNMENTS

INTRODUCTION

In 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1), transaction value is defined as "the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States . . . ." (emphasis added)

The corresponding Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.103(b).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article I, paragraph 1, parallels 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1).

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 1.1 states the following with regard to consignments:

I. Free consignments

Where transactions do not involve the payment of a price they cannot be regarded as sales under the Agreement. Examples: gifts, samples, promotional items.

II. Goods imported on consignment

Under this trading practice, the goods are dispatched to the country of importation not as a result of a sale, but with the intention that they would be sold for the account of the supplier, at the best price obtainable. At the time of importation no sale has taken place.

Example: Producer P in country of exportation E sends his agent X in country of importation I a consignment of 50 carpets for sale by auction. The carpets are sold in the country of importation at a total price of 500,000 c.u. The sum to be transferred by X to producer P in payment of the imported goods will be 500,000 c.u., less the costs incurred by X in connection with the sale of the goods and his remuneration on the transaction.

Headquarters Rulings:

transaction value inapplicable

See 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1); 19 CFR 152.103(b); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 1, paragraph 1; CCC Technical Committee, Advisory Opinion 1.1

Transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement for fabric that is imported into the United States in an unfinished condition and consigned to a U.S. textile firm for processing.

542765 dated Apr. 20, 1982.

543243 dated Apr. 30, 1984. - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.

Transaction value does not apply to merchandise which has been consigned rather than sold.

543128 dated June 4, 1984; 543403 dated Sep. 24, 1984.

No sale for exportation occurs between the exporter and the importer in the United States but rather, the merchandise is consigned to the importer. Transactions involving goods that are shipped on a consignment basis do not constitute *bona fide* sales and cannot be appraised pursuant to transaction value.
546602 dated Jan. 29, 1997.

547604 dated Apr. 10, 2001. - See Transaction Value, limitations on use of transaction value.

The dutiable value of consigned merchandise entered by the importer, warehoused at a third party's location, and only paid for by the importer at the time of withdrawal from the warehouse, is properly determined based on the "fallback" method under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f). There is no sale for export to the U.S. The merchandise is entered under consignment and only purchased at a later date on an as needed basis. The other methods of appraisement could not be used and so the "fallback" method was employed. Using that method, CBP determined that it would be reasonable to use the most recent purchase order price being paid to the supplier for a warehouse withdrawal as a modified transaction value of imported merchandise.
548574 dated Mar. 17, 2005.

H125115 dated Apr. 6, 2011 – See Value if Other Values Cannot Be Determined, sequential order.

Importer brought goods into the U.S. under a "vendor owned inventory" program where the sale occurred at the time the goods were withdrawn from the importer's warehouse. It was determined that deductive value did not apply and that appraisement should be by section 1401a(f), the fallback method. It was acceptable to use the pro forma commercial invoice presented at the time of entry, provided that it included the value of any additions provided by the importer.
H131663 dated Apr. 14, 2011.

An imported good imported on consignment and where the price is not finally set until the good is withdrawn from the warehouse, can be appraised based on a fallback method, using the invoice price if the price does not change from the time of the entry until withdrawal from the warehouse.
H021399 dated Apr. 29, 2011.

Flowers imported under consignment cannot be valued based on an average price calculated using the average of the prices from the previous four weeks (per flower and grade) of imported flowers sold in the United States, less a percentage for gross margin and international transportation. Flowers entered under consignment should be appraised based upon the transaction value of identical merchandise or similar merchandise (19 U.S.C. 1401a(c)), if possible, deductive value (19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)) if a value cannot be ascertained under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(c), and then if unable to ascertain a value upon which to base appraisement, by computed value (19 U.S.C. 1401a(e)) and

"fallback" value (19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)), in that order. It is the responsibility of the importer to value his merchandise and provide the port with all the necessary information to fix the final appraisement.
H165361 dated Nov. 1, 2011.

The manufacturer did not sell the merchandise to the related importer. Instead, the goods were only transferred between facilities of the two companies and remained on the company's books as its property until they were sold to end customers in the U.S. after importation. Since there was no sale for exportation, transaction value could not be used to appraise the imported merchandise. Insufficient information was available to appraise the goods under the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise method. Because the actual deductible expenses in connection with the U.S. sales of the imported merchandise was not provided, the deductive value method of appraisement is inapplicable under the circumstances. However, the merchandise produced in the Dominican Republic and imported into the U.S. was to be appraised under the fallback method of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) using a modified deductive value based on the prices from the sales of the merchandise made in the U.S. Because accurate determinations of the deductible expenditures and profits were not ascertainable, no deductions from the U.S. sale prices will be allowed in setting the value of the imported merchandise.
H233789 dated June 21, 2013.

The parent company sells the goods to a related party in Switzerland, who will hold title to the goods while the goods are shipped to another related party (importer) in the U.S. on a consignment basis. The importer will function as a distribution center in fulfilling sales orders for the parent company's customers in North America, Central America, and South America. Since there is no sale, transaction value does not apply. Transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is not applicable because the parent company does not sell to any non-related parties. Deductive value is not applicable because the importer states that the goods will be stored indefinitely until future orders are received, which may occur well after the 90th day after importation. Computed value is also not applicable because the importer states that the parent company establishes the price without any input from its subsidiaries and is not willing to share financial information with the importer. Since the goods cannot be appraised under the methods set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)-(e), the value will be determined in accordance with the "fallback" method as set forth in section 402(f) of the TAA. While the importer proposed a modified transaction value, CBP did not have sufficient information/documentation to establish that the proposed modified transaction value would meet the circumstances of the sale test. The importer did not provide any financial information to determine whether the relationship between the parties will affect the price, a transfer pricing study, or a comparison to the prices set in the relevant industry. CBP concluded that while a modified transaction value method may be used, the importer should be prepared to substantiate its values with detailed financial information.
H246651 dated Feb. 5, 2014.

ABB was an importer of industrial robots. ABB Robotics in Sweden ("ABB Sweden"), a related party, launched a Global Inventory Management System ("GIM"). ABB Sweden

stocked parts inventory in several locations around the world, including one at a warehouse in Ohio which was operated by a third party logistics company. Under the GIM, after importation into the U.S., the inventory in the Ohio warehouse was still owned by ABB Sweden. The inventory was carried on the books of ABB Sweden at cost. ABB stated that the U.S. customers placed orders with ABB, who in turn placed an order with ABB Sweden to be fulfilled from the Ohio warehouse. ABB stated that the products were shipped by ABB Sweden to the U.S. warehouse on a consignment basis, with no sale at the time of shipment to the U.S. ABB Sweden owned the goods in inventory at the U.S. warehouse. ABB cleared the goods through CBP using a pro forma invoice. For the pro forma invoice, the goods were valued based on the ABB transfer price at the time of shipment between ABB Sweden and ABB. ABB paid all of the duties owed at the time of importation. All sales to the U.S. end customers were made by ABB, and there were no direct sales from ABB Sweden to U.S. end customers. There were no obligations on ABB to purchase and some parts were ultimately exported to other countries. Once a U.S. customer order was received, the eventual sales price between ABB Sweden and ABB was based on the transfer list price at the time of sale. This sales price was claimed to be at arm's length based upon fair market value and was sufficient to cover all costs plus a profit. The sales price was usually the same as the transfer list price declared at the time of entry as per the pro forma invoice, unless there was a change in price between the import date and the sale date. Title to the goods transferred from ABB Sweden to ABB at the time of shipment from the Ohio warehouse. Title and risk of loss then transferred from ABB to the end customer when the goods were delivered to the customer. CBP found that the subject merchandise could not be appraised using the transaction value method. A fallback transaction value method of appraisement should be used. CBP determined that the pro forma invoice price represented a reasonably adjusted transaction value under the fallback method, with the addition of all applicable additions to value listed in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1).
H218916 dated Apr. 29, 2014.

There was no *bona fide* sale for exportation to the U.S. because the importer entered the goods under consignment at an invoice value, but was not obligated to purchase the goods until they were removed from inventory at a time after importation. Additionally, the importer did not assume title to the consignment merchandise, nor was the sale price for the consignment merchandise fixed until after importation when the goods were withdrawn from inventory. Accordingly, transaction value appraisement was precluded. The other methods of appraisement were not applicable, and the importer was permitted to make reasonable adjustments to transaction value under the "fallback" method because it was likely that the price declared upon entry would be the price paid when withdrawn from inventory as the goods would not remain in inventory for a long time, and the price could be audited at a later time to ensure that there was a clear and definite relationship between the declared price and price actually paid. Additionally, due to the nature of the business, when there was a change in price, it was generally a decrease in price, and if there were an increase in price, the importer was required to report it. Accordingly, the consignment goods could be appraised under the fallback method with reasonable adjustments to transaction value, subject to any verification deemed necessary.

H264876 dated Sep. 17, 2015.

transaction value of identical or similar merchandise

Consigned goods cannot be used as "identical" or "similar" merchandise for purposes of appraising goods under transaction value of identical or similar merchandise. Such goods must similarly be sold for exportation to the United States.
542568 dated Nov. 16, 1981; 543112 dated May 10, 1984; 543128 dated June 4, 1984; <u>overruled</u> <u>by</u> 543641 dated Aug. 22, 1986.

The fact that merchandise is consigned rather than sold is not a basis for denying the use of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise. Of course, it is necessary that sufficient information be available in order to make any adjustment that may be necessary.
543641 dated Aug. 22, 1986; <u>overrules</u> 542568 dated Nov. 16, 1981; 543112 dated May 10, 1984; 543128 dated June 4, 1984.

The fact that merchandise is consigned rather than sold is not a basis for denying the use of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.
544469 dated Aug. 16, 1990.

Based on the evidence available, transaction value is not the proper basis of appraisement for the subject wearing apparel, in that no sale for exportation occurred between the exporter and the importer in the United States but, rather, the merchandise is consigned to the importer. Thus, transactions involving goods that are shipped on a consignment basis do not constitute *bona fide* sales and cannot be appraised pursuant to transaction value. Appraisement of the imported wearing apparel should proceed sequentially through the subsequent provisions of section 402 of the TAA, with the first alternative basis of appraisement being the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise in section 402(c) of the TAA.
547591 dated Apr. 21, 2000; 547573 dated Apr. 21, 2000; 547628 dated Apr. 21, 2000.

COUNTERTRADE

INTRODUCTION

GATT Valuation Agreement:

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 6.1 states the following with respect to barter or compensation deals:

How are barter or compensation deals to be treated with reference to Article 1 of the Agreement? The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following opinion:

1. International barter takes various forms. In its purest form, it consists of an exchange of goods or services of approximately equal value, without recourse to a common unit of measurement (money) to express the transaction.
Example: X tons of product A from country E are exchanged for Y units of product B from country I.

2. Disregarding the question as to whether a sale has occurred in cases of pure barter, where the transaction is neither expressed nor settled in monetary terms, and there is no transaction value or objective and quantifiable data for determining that value, the Customs value should be established on the basis of one of the other methods set out in the Agreement, taken in the sequence prescribed.

3. For a variety of reasons (e.g. bookkeeping, statistics, taxation, etc.), it is hard to dispense entirely with reference to money in international trade relations and, hence, pure barter is rarely encountered nowadays. Barter now usually involves more complex transactions in which a value of bartered goods is determined (e.g. on the basis of current world market prices) and expressed in monetary terms.
Example: Manufacturer F in the country of importation I has the opportunity of selling electrical equipment in country E provided an equivalent value of goods produced in country E is bought and exported from that country. After an arrangement between F and X trading in plywood in country I, X imports into country I a quantity of plywood from country E and F exports electrical equipment to country E, the equipment being invoiced at 100,000 c.u. The invoice presented on importation of the plywood also shows a value of 100,000 c.u.; no financial settlement is however made between X and the seller in country E, the payment for the goods being covered by exportation of the electrical equipment by F.

4. Although many barter deals expressed in monetary terms are concluded without a financial settlement being made, there are situations where money does change hands, for example, when a balance has to be paid in clearing operations, or in cases of partial barter where part of the transaction involves a money payment.
Example: Importer X in country I imports from country E two machines priced at 50,000 c.u., on the understanding that only one fifth of this sum is to be the subject of a financial settlement, the rest being offset by the delivery of a specified quantity of textile products.

The invoice presented on importation shows a value of 50,000 c.u.; however, the financial settlement between X and the seller in country E involves only 10,000 c.u., the balance being covered by the delivery of the textile products.

5. Under the legislation of some countries barter transactions expressed in monetary terms can be regarded as sales, such transactions however will of course be subject to the provisions of Article 1, paragraph l(b) [condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined].

6. Barter or compensation deals should not be confused with certain sales transactions in which the supply of the goods, or their price, is governed by factors extraneous to the transaction concerned. This would apply in the following cases: - The price of the goods is fixed by reference to the price of other goods which the buyer may sell to his supplier.
Example: Manufacturer F in country of exportation E has an agreement with importer X in country I to supply specialized equipment designed by F, at a unit price of 10,000 c.u., on condition that importer X supplies him with relays used in the production of the equipment, at a unit price of 150 c.u.- The price of the imported goods depends on the purchaser's willingness to obtain from the same supplier other goods, in a specified quantity or at a specified price.
Example: Manufacturer F in country of exportation E sells leather goods to buyer X in country I at a unit price of 50 c.u., on condition that X also purchases a consignment of shoes at a unit price of 30 c.u.

7. It should be pointed out that these transactions too are subject to the condition laid down in Article 1, paragraph l(b) [condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined].

See also CCC Technical Committee Commentary 11.1 on tie-in sales, which includes countertrade as an example.

Headquarters Notices:

Countertrade Transactions, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 24, No. 22, May 30, 1990.

The U.S. Customs is forming a Countertrade Committee to study and prepare a report on the current status of countertrade and its effect on Customs practices, particularly the determination of transaction value under the Trade Agreements
Act of 1979 (TAA).

Countertrade Transactions, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 25, No. 6, February 6, 1991.

The Customs valuation aspects of any countertrade transaction can be considered only on the basis of the particular facts and circumstances of that transaction. Therefore, in their consideration of countertrade transactions which result in the importation of merchandise into the United States, the importing public is advised that obtaining a ruling

from the U.S. Customs should be an integral part of their planning process.

Headquarters Rulings:

price actually paid or payable

GATT Valuation Agreement, CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 6.1

Unless barter transactions specify monetary value of the merchandise involved, inherent difficulties in ascertaining a value for such goods precludes a finding of transaction value.
543209 dated Jan. 25, 1984.

An exchange agreement between a foreign supplier and a U.S. importer provides for the importer to send the supplier copper cathodes in exchange for the supplier shipping certain merchandise in return. Because the contract involved does not specify a monetary value for the goods, the goods are precluded from valuation pursuant to transaction value.
543400 dated Apr. 16, 1985.

The use of transaction value is precluded in countertrade transactions if the parties have not made reference in their contracts to some reasonable monetary standard representing the price actually paid or payable.
543644 dated Nov. 20, 1985.

The use of transaction value is precluded in a pure barter situation where the transaction is neither expressed nor settled in monetary terms, and there is no transaction value or objective and quantifiable way to determine that value. The importations must be appraised pursuant to the next available method.
544666 dated Apr. 5, 1993.

CURRENCY CONVERSION

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Customs Service uses the date of exportation for currency conversion purposes. This is in accordance with section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (31 U.S.C. 372). See also Statement of Administrative Action.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 9 states:

1. Where the conversion of currency is necessary for the determination of the customs value, the rate of exchange to be used shall be that duly published by the competent authorities of the country of importation concerned and shall reflect as effectively as possible, in respect of the period covered by each such document of publication, the current value of such currency in commercial transactions in terms of the currency of the country of importation.

2. The conversion rate to be used shall be that in effect at the time of exportation or the time of importation, as provided by each Party.

In the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 9, the "time of importation" may include the time of entry for customs purposes.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 20.1 states:

1. The question has been asked whether conversion of currency is necessary in cases in which the contract of sale of the imported goods provides for a fixed rate of exchange.

2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation considered this question and advised that the conversion of currency is not necessary if the settlement of the price is made in the currency of the country of importation.

3. Therefore, what is important in this matter is the currency in which the price is settled and the amount of the payment.

Headquarters Rulings:

computed value

543276 dated May 15, 1984 - See Computed Value, profit and general expenses.

Under computed value, gains or losses due to currency fluctuations should not be considered in determining the amount for profit, as long as they have no direct relationship to the assembly process. In this case, no information with regard to expenses other than what is shown on the income statement was provided to demonstrate that the currency translations are listed under Financial Expenses, which are listed separately from: Income, Costs of Sales, Production Expenses, and Administrative Expenses. Therefore, the currency fluctuations do not appear to be directly related to the Mexican assembly process. This ruling presumes that no additional payments beyond the invoice price are made to the producer.
546882 dated Apr. 9, 1999.

formulas used in determining the price actually paid or payable

A price, which is determined pursuant to a formula that takes currency fluctuations into account, may represent the transaction value for imported merchandise.
543094 dated Mar. 30, 1984; 543252 dated Mar. 30, 1984.

The final sales prices between the buyer and seller are determined pursuant to a formula that is fixed at the time of exportation. Because the formula from which the prices is determined and is agreed to before the dates of importation, the currency exchange payments from the seller to the buyer do not constitute rebates or other decreases in the price actually paid or payable. Adjustments to the invoice prices resulting from currency exchange gains as well as from currency exchange losses are taken into consideration in determining transaction value.
543089 dated June 20, 1984.

A market based rate for a currency conversion from a bank may not be used in determining the actual cost in U.S. dollars of various non-dutiable handling and coordinating charges invoiced in a foreign currency. Conversions of a foreign currency must be in done in accordance with the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 5151 et seq. based on the conversion rates determined and certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.
H133042 dated Dec. 20, 2010.

When a transaction originally negotiated in dollars and prior to exportation is changed to yen, the price actually paid or payable in yen represents the transaction value.
543191 dated Jan. 31, 1984.

In determining the price actually paid or payable, it is necessary to ascertain whether payment is made in U.S. or Canadian currency. If, at the time of entry, the purchaser pays or intends to pays for a shipment in U.S. currency, then that amount constitutes the price actually paid or payable. If the purchaser pays or intends to pay in Canadian currency, then that amount, converted to U.S. dollars, constitutes the price actually paid or payable.
543437 dated May 17, 1985.

If at the time of entry, the purchaser has paid, or intends to pay for a shipment in U.S. dollars, then that amount constitutes the price actually paid or payable for the imported

merchandise. If the purchaser has paid or intends to pay in foreign currency, then the invoiced amount, converted to U.S. dollars, constitutes the price actually paid or payable. For currency conversion purposes, Customs uses the rate of exchange in effect on the date of exportation.
544754 dated Oct. 24, 1991.

The price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise between the importer and the seller is the peseta price presented on the invoice at the time the imported merchandise is entered, converted to United States dollars in accordance with the appropriate currency conversion rate which is in effect on the date of exportation.
544739 dated Jan. 21, 1992.

Conversion of the invoice price from British pounds to U.S. dollars pursuant to a currency provision in a distributorship agreement between the parties is allowable. The invoice price in U.K. pounds, converted into dollars in accordance with the fixed exchange rate and paid in U.S. dollars, constitutes the price actually paid or payable.
544940 dated May 13, 1992.

The transaction value of an imported yacht, in U.S. dollars, is properly based on the exchange rate applicable on the date of its exportation from the Netherlands to the United States. Section 152.1(c), Customs Regulations, provides that the date of exportation or time of exportation referred to in section 402 of the TAA, means the actual date the merchandise finally leaves the country of exportation for the United States. 19 CFR 159.32 provides that the date of exportation for currency conversion shall be fixed in accordance with section 152.1(c).
545574 dated Oct. 12, 1994.

While the importer had previously purchased the DM at a different exchange rate than that in effect at the date of exportation, there is no evidence that the parties had entered into a currency exchange rate contract for purposes of setting the exchange rate for the price of the imported merchandise. Under these circumstances, the exchange rate at which the DM were purchased cannot be used to determine the transaction value of the imported merchandise and, instead, the rate of exchange in effect at the date of exportation controls.
546523 dated Aug. 11, 1997.

The importer sources general merchandise from various countries including Italy and Spain in unrelated party transactions. Based on the information presented, the currency exchange rate to be used on entries in transactions where payment is made to the vendor either prior to or after entry of the shipment, is the rate of exchange in effect on the date of exportation. In this case, where there is no agreement establishing the exchange rate to be used for Customs purposes between the U.S. importer and the two foreign vendors, 19 CFR 159.34(a) controls the applicable exchange rate.
547546 dated Jan. 18, 2000.

The importer negotiates and purchases the merchandise in Japanese yen. At the time of

export, the currency conversion rate in effect on the date of export is applied to calculate the value. As a result, if the exchange rate fluctuates post-entry, there is a difference in the amount of U.S. dollars that are remitted between the calculation that results based on the exchange rate in effect at the time of entry and the exchange rate in effect at the time of payment. Absent an agreement between the unrelated parties to adjust the price by reason of currency conversion rate fluctuations, the appropriate rate of currency conversion is the rate in effect on the date of exportation. Therefore, the price actually paid or payable for the importations from Japan should be determined based on the currency conversion rate applicable at the time of exportation.
547633 dated June 9, 2000.

When daily currency exchange rates are not available until after the time of shipment from the foreign port of exportation, an importer may use the published currency exchange rate for the day before the date of exportation for entry filing purposes, provided the importer adjusts the entered value to reflect the currency exchange rates published on the date of exportation at the time of filing the entry summary.
563362 dated Dec. 11, 2005.

DEDUCTIVE VALUE

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d) states the following:

DEDUCTIVE VALUE-
(1) For purposes of this subsection, the term "merchandise concerned" means the merchandise being appraised, identical merchandise, or similar merchandise.
(2)(A) The deductive value of the merchandise being appraised is whichever of the following prices (as adjusted under paragraph (3)) is appropriate depending upon when and in what condition the merchandise concerned is sold in the United States:

(i) If the merchandise concerned is sold in the condition as imported at or about the date of importation of the merchandise being appraised, the price is the unit price at which the merchandise concerned is sold in the greatest aggregate quantity at or about such date.

(ii) If the merchandise concerned is sold in the condition as imported but not sold at or about the date of importation of the merchandise being appraised, the price is the unit price at which the merchandise concerned is sold in the greatest aggregate quantity after the date of importation of the merchandise being appraised but before the 90th date after the date of such importation.

(iii) If the merchandise concerned was not sold in the condition as imported and not sold before the close of the 90th date after the date of importation of the merchandise being appraised, the price is the unit price at which the merchandise being appraised, after further processing, is sold in the greatest aggregate quantity before the 180th date after the date of such importation. This clause shall apply to appraisement of merchandise only if the importer so elects and notifies the customs officer concerned of that election within such time as shall be prescribed by the Secretary.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the unit price at which merchandise is sold in the greatest aggregate quantity is the unit price at which such merchandise is sold to unrelated persons, at the first commercial level after importation (in cases to which subparagraph (A) (i) or (ii) applies) or after further processing (in cases to which subparagraph (A)(iii) applies) at which such sales take place, in a total volume that is (i) greater than the total volume sold at any other unit price, and (ii) sufficient to establish the unit price.
(3)(A) The price determined under paragraph (2) shall be reduced by an amount equal to-

(i) any commission usually paid or agreed to be paid, or the addition usually made for profit and general expenses, in connection with sales in the United States of imported merchandise that is of the same class or kind, regardless of the country of exportation, as the merchandise concerned;

(ii) the actual costs and associated costs of transportation and insurance incurred with respect to international shipments of the merchandise concerned from the country of exportation to the United States;

(iii) the usual costs and associated costs of transportation and insurance incurred

with respect to shipments of such merchandise from the place of importation to the place of delivery in the United States, if such costs are not included as a general expense under clause (i);

(iv) the customs duties and other Federal taxes currently payable on the merchandise concerned by reason of its importation, and any Federal excise tax on, or measured by the value of, such merchandise for which vendors in the United States are ordinarily, liable; and

(v) (but only in the case of a price determined under paragraph (2)(A)(iii)) the value added by the processing of the merchandise after importation to the extent that the value is based on sufficient information relating to cost of such processing.

(B) For purposes of applying paragraph (A)-

(i) the deduction made for profits and general expenses shall be based upon the importer's profits and general expenses, unless such profits and general expenses are inconsistent with those reflected in sales in the United States of imported merchandise of the same class or kind, in which case the deduction shall be based on the usual profit and general expenses reflected in such sales, as determined from sufficient information; and

(ii) any State or local tax imposed on the importation with respect to the sale of imported merchandise shall be treated as a general expense.

(C) The price determined under paragraph (2) shall be increased (but only to the extent that such costs are not otherwise included) by an amount equal to the packing costs incurred by the importer or the buyer, as the case may be, with respect to the merchandise concerned.

(D) For purposes of determining the deductive value of imported merchandise, any sale to a person who supplies any assist for use in connection with the production or sale for export of the merchandise concerned shall be disregarded.

The Customs regulations regarding deductive value are found in 19 CFR 152.105(a) through (i) and various interpretative notes. The following sections provide definitions regarding deductive value:

(a) merchandise concerned. For the purposes of deductive value, "merchandise concerned" means the merchandise being appraised, identical merchandise, or similar merchandise.

(b) merchandise of the same class or kind. For the purposes of deductive value, "merchandise of the same class or kind" includes merchandise imported from the same country as well as other countries as the merchandise being appraised.

(Note: 19 CFR 152.105(c) and (d) parallel the TAA, see 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(2) and (3), supra.)

19 CFR 152.105(e) through (i) supplement the statutory provisions in the TAA and state the following:

(e) Profit and general expenses; special rules. (1) The deduction made for profit and general expenses (taken as a whole) will be based upon the importer's profits and general expenses, unless the profit and general expenses are inconsistent with those reflected in sales in the United States of imported merchandise of the

same class or kind from all countries, in which case the deduction will be based on the usual profit and general expenses reflected in those sales, as determined from sufficient information. Any State or local tax imposed on the importer with respect to the sale of imported merchandise will be treated as a general expense. (2) In determining deductions for commissions and usual profit and general expenses, sales in the United States of the narrowest group or range of imported merchandise of the same class or kind, including the merchandise being appraised, for which sufficient information can be provided, will be examined.

(f) Packing costs. The price determined under paragraph (c) of this section will be increased, but only to the extent that the costs are not otherwise included, by an amount equal to the packing costs incurred by the importer or the buyer with respect to the merchandise concerned.

(g) Assists. For purposes of determining deductive value, any sale to a person who supplies any assist for use in connection with the production or sale for export of the merchandise concerned will be disregarded.

(h) Unit price in greatest aggregate quantity. The unit price will be established after a sufficient number of units have been sold to an unrelated person. The unit price to be used when the units have been sold in different quantities will be that at which the total volume sold is greater than the total volume sold at any other unit price.

(1) [See, 19 CFR 152.105(h)(1), Interpretative Note 1.]

(2) Interpretative Note 2. Two sales to unrelated persons occur: in the first sale, 500 units are sold at a price of $95 each, in the second sale, 400 units are sold at a price of $90 each. In this example, the greatest number of units sold at a particular price is 500; therefore, the unit price in the greatest aggregate quantity is $95.

(3) [See, 19 CFR 152.105(h)(3), Interpretative Note 3.]

(i) Further processing - (1) Quantified data. If merchandise has undergone further processing after its importation into the United States and the importer elects the method specified in paragraph (c)(3) of this section, deductions made for the value added by that processing will be based on objective and quantifiable data relating to the cost of the work performed. Accepted industry formulas, recipes, methods of construction, and other industry practices would form the basis for the deduction. That deduction also will reflect amounts for spoilage, waste, or scrap derived from the further processing.

(2) Loss of identity. If the imported merchandise loses its identity as a result of further processing, the method specified in paragraph (c)(3) of this section will not be applicable unless the value added by the processing can be determined accurately without unreasonable difficulty for either importers or Customs. If the imported merchandise maintains its identity but forms a minor element of the merchandise sold in the United States, the use of paragraph (c)(3) of this section will be unjustified. The district director shall review each case involving these issues on its merit.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

The provision in the GATT Valuation Agreement for deductive value is found in Article 5, paragraphs 1 and 2 (similar to statute, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)).

In the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 5, paragraph 1, states:

The term "unit price at which . . . goods are sold in the greatest aggregate quantity" means the price at which the greatest number of units is sold in sales to persons who are not related to the persons from which they buy such goods at the first commercial level after importation at which such sales take place.

Note to Article 5, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 correspond with the Customs regulations, 19 CFR 152.105(h)(1) through (3).

Note to Article 5, paragraph 5, is similar to 19 CFR 152.105(g), Assists.

In addition, Note to Article 5, paragraphs 6, 8 and 9 are found in 19 CFR 152.105(b) and (e), Merchandise of the same class of kind, and Profit and general expenses; special rules.

In referring to Article 5, paragraph l(a)(i) regarding profit and general expenses, Note to Article 5, paragraph 7 states:

The "general expenses" include the direct and indirect costs of marketing the goods in question.

With respect to superdeductive value, i.e., further processing in the country of importation, Note to Article 5, paragraphs 11 and 12 correspond with 19 CFR 152.105(i).

In addition, Interpretative Notes, General Note, Use of generally accepted accounting principles, paragraph 2, the relevant portion regarding deductive value states:

For the purposes of this Agreement, the customs administration of each party shall utilize information prepared in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles in the country which is appropriate for the Article in question. For example, the determination of usual profit and general expenses under the provisions of Article 5 [deductive value] would be carried out utilizing information prepared in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles of the country of importation.

Judicial Precedent:

The following case involves the deduction for "the customs duties . . . currently payable on the merchandise", provided for in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(3)(A)(iv), from the appropriate price in accordance with 19 U.S.C 1401a(d)(2)(A)(i), (ii) or (iii).

Figure Flattery, Inc. v. United States, 13 Ct. Int'l Trade 726 (1989), aff'd, 907 F.2d 141 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The merchandise in question was assembled abroad of United States components, the value of which was eligible for exemption from duty under item 807.00, TSUS (prior to Harmonized System). In calculating deductive value, the Customs Service subtracted the value of the eligible components from the unit price before reducing it by "the customs duties currently payable on the merchandise".

The plaintiff claims that the proper method of calculating deductive value with respect to merchandise classifiable under item 807.00, TSUS, is to reduce the sales price by the customs duties currently payable on the merchandise prior to subtracting the value of the United States components eligible for duty exemption from the sales price.

Customs contends that deductive value contemplates a deduction for actual duties assessed. The duty assessed, i.e., duties currently payable, is to be based upon the rate that is appropriate after the value of the U.S. components has been deducted from the value of the entire article.

The Court concluded that the Customs Service interpretation is proper. The plaintiff has not established that Customs incorrectly appraised the merchandise.

Headquarters Rulings:

deduction for commissions

Whether a commission is of the type usually paid or agreed to be paid in connection with sales in the United States of imported merchandise that is of the same class or kind, regardless of the country of exportation, is a question of factdetermined by the appraising officer.
544635 dated May24, 1991.

The determination as to whether a commission is of the type usually paid or agreed to be paid in connection with sales in the United States of merchandise that is of the same class or kind, regardless of the country of exportation, is to be made by the appraising officer, as this is a question of fact.
544806 dated Aug. 10, 1992.

deduction for usual profits and general expenses

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(3)(A)(i); 19 CFR 152.105(d) and (e); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 5, Paragraph l(a)(i)

A customhouse broker's fee is either a general expense or a cost of transportation that is

deductible under deductive value.
542267 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 22).

The price determined under deductive value is reduced by either a commission paid or the addition usually made for profit and general expenses. Therefore, an importer who elects deductive value as a means of appraisement is only entitled to an adjustment of either the commission or the addition usually made for profit and general expenses.
543065 dated June 20, 1983.

In determining the deductive value of imported merchandise, the amounts designated by the importer as salaries and wages, rent, taxes, travel, advertising, automotive expense, and contract services are fully deductible as "general expenses" from the unit price at which the merchandise is sold to unrelated U.S. purchasers. The general expenses indicated are consistent with those reflected in sales in the United States of imported merchandise of the same class or kind.
545187 dated Feb. 14, 1995.

In appraising merchandise pursuant to deductive value, demurrage fees due to devanning, customs devanning exam costs, and harbor maintenance fees are all deductible either as associated transportation costs from the place of delivery in the United States or as general expenses in selling the merchandise. Expenses for the repacking and repackaging of merchandise incurred after Customs release of the merchandise and in selling the merchandise in the United States are deductible expenses incurred in connection with the selling of the merchandise in the United States. Therefore, these expenses should be deducted in the determination of the deductive value of imported merchandise.
546120 dated Mar. 26, 1996.

Imported melons sold on consignment were properly appraised based on deductive value. Deductions for the costs and expenses for marketing anddistribution of the fruit, overhead, cost of loading and unloading at the port of destination in the U.S., for the actual shipping and landing costs under 19 CFR 152.105(d)(1) were made. Deductions for the actual ocean freight, the insurance paid in connection with the ocean freight; inland freight in the U.S.; and foreign in-land freight to the port of shipment were proper under 19 CFR 152.105(d)(2) and (3). A deduction was proper for customs duties, harbor taxes or merchandise processing fees paid by the U.S. vendor pursuant to 19 CFR 152.105(d)(4). A deduction for the cost of the phytosanitary certificate was not proper.
H007667 dated May 25, 2007.

To the extent the usual profit and general expenses ("P&GE") claimed by an importer are consistent with the manner such P&GE would be prepared under the generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") in the United States, such P&GE may be deducted for purposes of deductive value. Therefore, expenses previously categorized as deductible P&GE for deductive value purposes should have qualified as a P&GE under GAAP, while if GAAP does not consider an expense to fall under P&GE, then that expense should not be deducted as P&GE for deductive value purposes. Overhead and profit allocation,

general job site operating expenses, and packing costs, if incurred in the process of selling the product to the customer in the United States and after release by customs, would be accepted as deductible P&GE.
H258738 dated Feb. 20, 2015.

In a sale between related parties, where the importer retained ownership of the materials along with the product produced from these materials throughout the entire production process, transaction value was precluded because there was no sale for exportation to the United States. Transaction value of identical or similar merchandise was also not applicable, and the importer elected appraisement under its proposed computed value, rather than deductive value. The importer demonstrated how it would calculate its cost information, profit and general expenses, assists, and packing costs to determine its computed value, while noting that no profit or assist would attach to the transaction at issue. CBP could not definitely rule on whether the importer's proposed method was in accordance with the computed value method of appraisement. Particularly, even though the importer indicated that there was no profit because there was no sale, the general expenses still need to be taken into account and compared to the usual profit and general expenses for sales of imported merchandise of the same class or kind. Moreover, due to the relationship of the parties and the manner in which the U.S. importer had provided certain assists to the manufacturer, CBP needed more information to show that no further assists had been provided from the importer to the manufacturer. Therefore, because CBP could not calculate the profit and general expenses and assists from the information provided, it could only note that the computed value method could be proper if the required information was available and verifiable. If not, computed value may not be applicable, and the importer may have to appraise its products under deductive value.
H269186 dated Nov. 6, 2015.

duties currently payable

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d) (3) (A) (iv); 19 CFR 152.105(d) (4); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 5, paragraph l(a)(iv); See Figure Flattery, Inc., v. United States, 720 F. Supp. 1008 (1989), aff'd 907 F.2d 141 (1990).

In determining the duties that are to be paid under deductive value where there is entitlement to the partial exemption for U.S. components, "customs duties currently payable on the merchandise concerned by reason of its importation" are arrived at after the cost or value of the U.S. components has been deducted.
542439 dated June 12, 1981, aff'd by Figure Flattery.

election by importer between deductive and computed value

19 U.S.C. 1401a(a); 19 CFR 152.101(c); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 4 and Interpretative Notes, General Note, Paragraph 3

542765 dated Apr. 20, 1982. - See Computed Value, election by importer between

computed and deductive value.

543912 dated Apr. 19, 1988. - <u>See</u> Importer's Options, computed value versus deductive value.

related party transactions

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(2)(B)

The resale price in the United States between two related parties cannot be used to determine a deductive value for imported merchandise.
542267 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 22).

The importer purchases lamps from a related company and from other unrelated manufacturers. Although the method described by the importer's written transfer pricing policy may be acceptable for establishing an arm's length transaction, the documentation does not support that the calculations are acceptable for purposes of transaction value. Thus, based on the facts provided, it is appropriate to appraise the subject merchandise using the deductive value method.
547231 dated Dec. 16, 2001.

Transaction value cannot be used because the buyer and seller are related and the importer has some measure of control over the formula involved, as represented by the ultimate sales. The goods should be appraised on the basis of deductive value on the basis of the unit price at which the merchandise concerned is sold to unrelated persons in the greatest aggregate quantity at the first commercial sale after exportation.
548391 dated Feb. 6, 2004.

Replacement assemblies are imported for automotive heating and cooling systems. A related party uses the parts, provided to them at no cost, to assemble the final good. There is no sale; consequently deductive value is used using actual net sales and subtracting actual profit and actual general and administrative expenses.
H019749 dated July 22, 2008.

It was alleged that the transfer price between Lear Philippines and Lear Corporation EEDS and Interiors is an acceptable transaction value. However, the evidence did not establish a *bona fide* sale between these parties. The Lear Corporation Intercompany Sales and Supply Agreement raised questions whether *bona fide* sales occurred, for example, regarding the risk of loss and requests for credits for damaged merchandise, and who was responsible for freight costs. Rather, Lead Corporation EEDS and Interiors acted as a selling agent for Lear Philippines, and *bona fide* sales occurred between Lear Philippines and the ultimate U.S. consignees.
W548600 dated Feb. 5, 2009.

H243689 dated Jan. 9, 2014 – See Related Party Transactions, rejection of transaction value.

H038381 dated Nov. 17, 2014 – See Transaction Value, restrictions on disposition or use of imported merchandise.

H260036 dated Feb. 24, 2015 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

Importer imports aircraft parts from related parent supplier. Parties use a transfer price which is subject to adjustment. The imported parts are sold to unrelated parties, become part of a "pool" program for customers, or are imported for service bulletin or warranty transactions. The parts imported for service bulletin and warranty transactions are not subject to a sale. The importer sought use of transaction value based on the transfer prices. The port and the Office of Regulatory Audit believed there was insufficient information to support transaction value and believed deductive value was appropriate as the majority of imported parts were sold to unrelated parties. It was determined that deductive value was the appropriate method for appraisement for the goods sold after importation. For the goods not sold, the methods of valuation, after transaction value, had to be examined in order of the hierarchy and resort may be made to the "fallback" method if no other method could apply.
H157795 dated June 29, 2015.

H223036 dated July 24, 2015 – See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

H254700 dated Nov. 25, 2015 – See Related Party Transactions, rejection of transaction value.

resale in the United States

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(2)(B)

The first commercial level subsequent to importation is the sales price from which any deductions are made to determine a deductive value of imported merchandise. The base price must be taken from sales to unrelated purchasers.
544469 dated Aug. 16, 1990.

Merchandise is consigned to the importer from its related party supplier. Transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraising the merchandise due to the fact that there is not sale for exportation. In addition, there is no transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, nor is there a computed value appraisement applicable. The importer resells the merchandise in the United States; however, it is not resold until six to nine months subsequent to the importation. Therefore, deductive value does not apply. The most appropriate way to appraise the imported merchandise is to use a modified deductive value pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), where the time restriction of "90 days"

enumerated in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d) is relaxed.
546312 dated Jan. 17, 1997.

Asparagus shipped to the United States on a consignment basis is appraised pursuant to deductive value. The deductive value is based upon weekly figures that do not account for price adjustments to the instant importations, which may take several months to finalize. However, section 402(d)(1) of the TAA provides that "merchandise concerned" as provided in section 402(d) means the merchandise being appraised, identical merchandise, or similar merchandise. All three types of merchandise may be utilized for appraisement, and there is no indication that one type must have priority over the other. Although Customs generally concerns itself with the sale of the goods being valued, it is not precluded, based on the information available at or about the date of importation, from utilizing on-going sales of identical or similar goods for appraisement. Customs is not required to wait until the instant goods are actually sold or the necessary information concerning such sales is made available. Assuming such prices otherwise fit the definitions set forth in section 402(d), they may serve as the appropriate bases of appraisement.
546602 dated Jan. 29, 1997.

With regard to appraising merchandise imported and placed in inventory for sale in the U.S., it is determined that based on the information presented, it appears that the portion of the merchandise that is resold within 90 days after importation must be appraised using a deductive value method of appraisement. The merchandise sold after the 90th day after importation must be appraised under the fallback method, i.e. section of 402(f) of the TAA, using a modified deductive value approach. It is incumbent on the importer to provide sufficient information and to correctly appraise their imported merchandise. However, the final determination regarding the appropriateness of the proposed figures, including the deductions, will be subject to the discretion of the Customs officer at the port of entry.
546442 dated Mar. 23, 1999.

Due to financial hardship, the prospective buyer was unable to pay for the goods; therefore, the sale was never consummated and the merchandise was abandoned. Another company later bought the merchandise and the documentation presented shows that the merchandise was resold in the United States in the condition in which it was imported and that the merchandise was imported more than ninety days later. Therefore, 19 CFR 152.107(c), one of the modifications to deductive value under section 402(f), allows more than ninety days for the importation of the merchandise. Accordingly, the appraisement of the subject merchandise should be undertaken pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), flexibly applying deductive value.
547314 dated Sep. 27, 2001.

548165 dated Mar. 21, 2003 – See Computed Value, elements of computed value.

The importer, through its supplier and independent warehouse contracts, operates a just-in-time inventory management program whereby inventory management warehouses are

located near the importer's various manufacturing facilities. For any specific entry, the importer is not able to provide the price for merchandise when it is withdrawn and the price for the sales that take place in the greatest aggregate quantity. The merchandise cannot be appraised under the deductive value method.
548236 dated Mar. 27, 2003 – <u>see also</u> Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, sequential order.

The fresh fruit is sold on consignment and the price is determined based upon multiple factors that include the type, size, grade, quality, color, condition of the of the fruit and the time of sale (time of arrival up to 30 days after arrival) in a fluctuating market. There are various rulings in which produce sold on consignment has been valued based on deductive value. It has not been shown that fruit cannot be appraised pursuant to deductive value or some other basis of appraisement. Therefore, appraisement based on 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) is not acceptable.
563483 dated Dec. 28, 2006.

The price paid or payable by the importer to the seller is not determined until after the goods have been imported and sold to the importer's customer's in the U.S. Further, the manner in which the imported goods are stored in the U.S. negatively affects the importer's ability to match quantities of imported goods with quantities of the goods sold from its U.S. distribution center. The goods should be appraised under deductive value. Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(2)(A)(ii), the deductive value of the goods is the unit price at which the merchandise concerned is sold in the greatest aggregate quantity after the date of importation of the goods being appraised but before the close of the 90th day after the date of such importation. "Merchandise concerned" means the merchandise being appraised, identical merchandise, or similar merchandise. If, in a given case, there are no sales within 90 days after importation, the goods may be appraised under the fallback method, using a modified deductive value.
H006585 dated Apr. 12, 2007.

The importer issues purchase orders to unrelated foreign sellers. The sellers deliver the goods to the importer's distribution center abroad. At the time a purchase order is issued, it is not certain which products or how many units are destined for the United States. The importer takes title to the goods when they are received at the distribution center. Upon the importer's determination of what products should be exported from the distribution center, the importer issues an invoice to the distribution center indicating the product that is ready for export. On occasion, the importer will import products needed to meet urgent or special order requirements directly from the unrelated foreign manufacturer. As a general rule, there is no sale for export when the goods are transferred from the importer's distribution center to the United States; therefore transaction value is not an appropriate appraisement method. A limited exception may exist in those infrequent cases where the goods are shipped directly from the unrelated foreign manufacturer to the importer. Where such an exception does not exist, the importer must proceed sequentially through the remaining bases of appraisement in order to properly appraise the imported merchandise. In most instances, it is our opinion that deductive value should be used.

H090181 dated Apr. 7, 2010.

The U.S. antique dealer purchases antiques from the U.S. and abroad, or receives the goods under consignment from individuals or dealers at antique trade shows in the U.S. and abroad where the antiques are sold. If they are not sold, they are re-imported into the U.S. The goods are described as extremely unique and likely irreplaceable, and typically not sold within 90 days, but many months or years. The importer requested to use the fallback method for its trust or consigned goods which are not sold at a tradeshow and re-imported into the U.S. The importer currently has the valuation to match its responsible amount on its insurance policy coverage for consigned merchandise, which is described as the "net" consignment amount, plus 10%. The importer provided three categories of transactions and requested CBP to determine the appraisement method to be applied: (1) goods purchased abroad and imported into the U.S.; (2) goods held and imported under trust or consignment to be sold in the U.S.; or (3) previously imported articles re-imported to the U.S. after being exported for sale outside the U.S., but for which a foreign sale does not materialize. In category 1, CBP determined if there is a bona fide sale for export to the U.S., transaction value would be used for appraisement. In category 2, where the goods are consigned, or held in trust for sale in the U.S., deductive value method based on sales in the greatest aggregate quantity is appropriate. If more than 90 days, then CBP found the fallback method using a modified deductive value to be appropriate. In category 3, if the goods are re-imported and not sold, the fallback method using the proposed insurance value described above would be correct.
H233019 dated Nov. 14, 2013.

sales to unrelated persons

With regard to the use of deductive value, if there are no sales to unrelated persons at the first commercial level after importation, then deductive value should be based on the unit price at which the greatest number of units is sold after importation at the first level at which sales to unrelated persons occur. Deductive value is not limited to the first sale after importation, but can be applied to any unrelated sale after importation, provided quantity levels are satisfied.
545481 dated Sep. 14, 1994.

similar merchandise

Honeydew melons are imported from Mexico and appraised pursuant to deductive value using the price of similar merchandise at the greatest aggregate quantity. If merchandise is commercially interchangeable, (for example, the same USDA standard grade) then the merchandise is "similar" within the meaning of the statutory language regarding deductive value.
544784 dated Aug. 10, 1992.

The use of the unit price at which the merchandise concerned is sold in the greatest aggregate quantity in this case is acceptable. The importer has failed to produce evidence regarding a claim that the merchandise is of inferior quality and therefore, no adjustment is necessary. If the merchandise is commercially interchangeable, then the merchandise is "similar" to the imported merchandise and is acceptable in appraising merchandise pursuant to deductive value.
544806 dated Aug. 10, 1992.

superdeductive value

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d) (2)(A)(iii); 19 CFR 152.105(c)(3); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 5, paragraph 2

Superdeductive value (section 402(d)(2)(A)(iii)) is proper as a means of appraisement, so long as the cost of processing in the United States may be determined by sufficient information and if the time limitations are satisfied.
542765 dated Apr. 20, 1982.

Defective parts imported to be repaired and resold in the United States should be appraised under the superdeductive value method of appraisement, reasonably adjusted under section 402(f) of the TAA.
543123 dated Dec. 20, 1983.

In determining a superdeductive value, there shall be deducted from the United States resale price the value added by processing the merchandise after importation to the extent that the value is based on sufficient information relating to the cost of such processing.
543769 dated Oct. 8, 1986.

Damaged transmission cores are imported from two related companies, who previously received them from automobile dealers. There is no sales transaction. A third U.S. party rebuilds the cores. The rebuilt transmissions are sold to dealers in the U.S. at “dealer net prices,” which are reviewed and reset twice a year. The value of the cores had been based on the “superdeductive” value provision in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d), using dealer net prices at which the rebuilt transmissions are sold and by deducting the value added in the U.S., based on factory remanufacturing costs, the additional parts costs, and administrative costs. It was not possible to do this for all parts. Alternatively, a value is derived from the superdeductive value, based on the U.S. list price for a particular rebuilt transmission, adjusted by a factor, equivalent to a percentage of the current list price that takes into consideration the weighted average historical costs of rebuilding the transmission cores.
H020270 dated July 3, 2008.

transportation costs

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(3)(A)(ii) and (iii); 19 CFR 152.105(d)(2) and (3); GATT Valuation

Agreement, Article 5, paragraph l(a)(ii) and (iii)

544236 dated Oct. 31, 1988. - <u>See</u> Transportation Costs, estimated freight costs versus actual.

In a deductive value appraisement, section 402(d)(3)(A)(iii) of the TAA provides for a deduction for usual costs associated with U.S. inland freight. Where the invoice is clear as to the usual costs associated with the U.S. inland freight, the appropriate deduction will be made. However, where invoices state identical costs figures, regardless of whether the merchandise is being shipped to the distributor or directly to the importer's warehouse, the usual costs are unclear. In such a case, sufficient evidence is not available to make the adjustment.
544635 dated May 24, 1991.

The Mexican grower shipped the melons on consignment and through bill of lading to the United States. Before entering the United States, a Mexican customhouse broker cleared the shipment through Mexican Customs. Under the deductive value method, foreign inland freight may be deducted from the price for the subject merchandise imported from Mexico for which there was a through bill of lading. The customhouse charges, by contrast, are not general expenses subject to a deduction under the deductive value method.
547826 dated Jan. 22, 2002.

Because an importer imported components and changed the condition of those components into a final product for the purpose of selling that product to its customer in the United States, superdeductive value was the appropriate method of appraisement. To determine whether the importer's claimed expenses could be deducted as a profit and general expense (P&GE) or as a further processing expense, CBP looked to the generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") in the United States, and noted that a company's cost to produce a good it sold was generally differentiated from expenses included as P&GE under GAAP in the United States, and that such a cost to produce was similar to the cost of additional parts and labor that had previously been accepted as deductible values added from further processing. The importer was instructed to determine whether its claimed expenses could be classified as P&GE under GAAP in the United States, and if not, then whether it related to a cost of additional parts or labor incurred by the importer in the United States after importation. Either would be deductible for purposes of superdeductive value, as a P&GE or value added from further processing deduction, respectively; however, the importer was instructed to verify how those expenses were booked and to ensure that they were based on objective and quantifiable data.
H258738 dated Feb. 20, 2015.

DEFECTIVE MERCHANDISE

INTRODUCTION

The Customs regulations provide the following with respect to damaged goods:

(a) Allowance in value. Merchandise which is subject to ad valorem or compound duties and found by the port director to be partially damaged at the time of importation shall be appraised in its condition as imported, with an allowance made in the value to the extent of the damage . . .
19 CFR 158.12(a)

See Statement of Administrative Action.

Judicial Precedent:

United States v. Menard, Inc., 16 Ct. Int'l Trade 410 (1992).

Invoices submitted to Customs relating to current shipments did not reflect a credit issued by the seller for previously imported, allegedly defective merchandise. The seller adjusted the price actually paid or payable to give the buyer credit on imported items that were claimed to be defective. The Court indicated that the importer "failed to exercise due care in determining the proper method of declaring the value of subject entries." The Court also rejected the importer's argument that it is entitled to a recoupment against Customs' claim for lost duties based upon the duties it overpaid on the imported, allegedly defective merchandise.

Samsung Electronics America, Inc., v. United States, 904 F.Supp. 1403 (1995).

Samsung Korea sold televisions, stereos, and other electronic equipment to its related party, Samsung America. In addition to the purchase agreements, the parties entered into a Servicing Agent Agreement where Samsung Korea agreed to pay for any inspection, repair, refurbishing, or other customer requested services that Samsung America performed on the merchandise. Samsung America claimed that approximately 4.7% of the articles contained latent defects detected some time after importation. Samsung America then received compensation from Samsung Korea pursuant to its rights under the agreement. The Court held that Samsung was not entitled to a value allowance pursuant to 19 CFR 158.12. The Court indicated that when the merchandise arrived in the United States, Samsung received no less than that for which it had contracted, i.e., it did not contract only for defect-free merchandise. In addition, the Court found it inappropriate to grant relief in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3)(A)(i), which authorizes a deduction for post-importation costs incurred for construction, assembly, and maintenance of the imported merchandise. Samsung America did not incur, and consequently could not identify, the alleged post-importation maintenance costs as part of the total payment made for the imported merchandise. The court concluded that Customs correctly determined the transaction value of the merchandise using the price

that Samsung America paid, and that section 402(b)(3)(A)(i) of the TAA does not apply.

Samsung Electronics America, Inc., v. United States, 106 F.3d 376 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

In this case, the appellate court held that the lower court misinterpreted the sales contracts for the Samsung electronic equipment by incorrectly concluding that Samsung had ordered both defect-free and defective merchandise. Rather, the agreements between the parties show that Samsung "ordered only perfect merchandise and contracted specifically to address the inevitability that, despite its order, 'occasionally' some of the merchandise delivered would contain latent manufacturing defects." The court held that duties are to be assessed on the value of the goods as imported, and the value added to the goods via repair in the U.S. is added subsequent to importation. The case was remanded for a determination of the allowance to be made in the value to the extent of the damage.

Samsung Electronics America, Inc., v. United States, 35 F.Supp.2d 942 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1999), aff'd, 195 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

In the Court of Appeals' second review of this case, the court held that in order to qualify for an allowance in appraised value under 19 CFR 158.12(a), an importer must prove that a specific entry contained defective merchandise and what the allowance in appraised value should be for each entry. The Court of Appeals agreed with the Court of International Trade, finding that Samsung proved that some of the merchandise contained latent defects at the time of importation. However, the court held that Samsung failed to establish which of the subject entries contained merchandise with latent defects at the time of importation and what their reduced value was.

The court indicated that it was legally insufficient for an importer to show repair costs for a calendar year without connecting the repair costs to particular entries. Thus, the court concluded that Samsung did not prove that the repair costs were related with adequate specificity to particular entries as required by 19 CFR 158.12(a).

Fabil Mfg. Co. v. United States, 56 F. Supp. 2d 1183 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1999); rev'd by 56 F. Supp. 2d 1183 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

In this case, Fabil challenged Customs' refusal to grant an allowance in the appraised value of imported merchandise pursuant to 19 CFR 158.12(a), due to the fact that the merchandise was defective. The court determined that Fabil must provide clear and convincing evidence that the imported merchandise was partially damaged at the time of importation and that the allowance sought is commensurate to the diminution in value caused by the defect. The court could not determine whether the merchandise actually contained a defect at the time of importation. In addition, the importer could not link the allegedly defective merchandise to entries of imported merchandise.

Fabil Manufacturing Co. v. United States, 23 Ct. Int'l Trade 395 (1999), reversed and remanded, 237 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

This case is an appeal from the Court of International Trade's grant of summary judgment for the government by refusing to grant an allowance in the appraised value of imported merchandise claimed to be defective by the importer/appellant, Fabil Manufacturing. The importer/appellant purchased jackets bearing the Coca-Cola logo and imported them into the United States. The jackets were to be machine washable; however, subsequent to importation, Fabil discovered that when the jackets were washed, the logos "disintegrated and ruined the jackets", and that as a result of the defect, purchasers returned the jackets to Fabil. Essentially, the jackets were alleged to be completely worthless. The Court of International Trade, citing the authority to reduce the valuation of defective imported merchandise pursuant to 19 CFR 158.12, states that "section 158.12 requires the value for defects or damage to be associated with the entry appraised, so any refund on duty paid can be determined based on the specific entry at issue." In this case, Fabil claims that *all* the merchandise covered by the entries were defective. In these circumstances, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit found on appeal that there appears to be no reason to require Fabil to tie the defective merchandise to any entry or group of entries. Therefore, the lower court's summary judgment was reversed, and the case was remanded to that court for further proceedings.

Volkswagen of America, Inc., v. United States, 4 F. Supp. 2d 1259 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1998), cross-mot. for summ. judgment denied, 277 F. Supp. 2d 1364 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2003).

Volkswagen of America (VW) is an importer of automobiles for subsequent resale in the United States. After importation, VW discovered that some automobiles were defective, and pursuant to various consumer warranties, VW repaired the defects and tracked the repairs by Vehicle Identification Numbers (VIN's). Computer records held by VW indicated the cost of repair for each warranty repair and reimbursement by the seller for warranty repairs. In citing to 19 CFR §158.12 that allows for an allowance in value for merchandise partially damaged at the time of importation, the Court rejected Customs argument that the port director has to discover defects at the time of importation in order for 19 CFR §158.12 to apply. That section applies to defects existing at the time of importation, regardless of whether the defects are discovered by the port director at the time of importation. The Court cites Samsung III, 35 F.Supp.2d 945-46, and sets forth three requirements for an importer to successfully claim an allowance pursuant to 19 CFR §158.12. First, the importer must show that it contracted for "defect-free" merchandise. Second, the defective merchandise must be linked to specific entries. Third, the importer must prove the amount of the allowance for each entry. In this case, VW has shown that it in fact contracted for "defect-free" merchandise. The warranty itself is evidence of an intent to provide defect-free merchandise. VW also provided evidence regarding descriptions of repairs to each vehicle, and connected each vehicle repaired to a specific entry through VIN's. Finally, VW has provided detailed repair records that indicate the costs for repairs. Through the VIN's, VW can tie the repair costs to each entry. The Court denied both VW's and Customs' motions for summary judgment. Factual issues remain regarding whether defects existed at the time of importation and the amount of allowances linked to those defects, and provides the basis for new, relevant evidence to be produced by VW to meet the burden of proof at trial. In addition, the Court found it did not have

jurisdiction over the automobiles that were repaired after the date VW filed its protests.

Saab Cars USA, Inc. v. United States, 276 F. Supp. 2d 1322 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2003), relief granted in part and denied in part, No. 04-3, slip op. (Ct. Int'l Trade Jan. 6, 2004).

Saab Cars USA, Inc. imports automobiles into the United States from the Swedish manufacturer Saab Automobile AB. SAAB protested Customs' liquidation of several entries of automobiles appraised at transaction value. Saab claimed that it should receive allowances for defective merchandise under 19 CFR 158.12 for automobiles with latent manufacturing defects repaired after entry under its warranty program. The Court found that it lacked jurisdiction for claims for automobiles that were repaired after the corresponding protest was filed. The Court denied motions for summary judgment, finding that factual questions remained regarding whether defects existed at the time of importation, and the amount of allowances tied to those defects.

The court reiterated its prior holding in Slip Op. 03-82, July 14, 2003, that it has no jurisdiction where the repairs were performed after the filing of the protests. On the expenses claimed under warranty, the court analyzed the case using the 3 part Samsung test. The court accepted that SAAB contracted for defect-free merchandise. However, SAAB was also required to present objective and verifiable evidence containing some semblance of specificity which would correlate the claimed defective merchandise to particular entries and prove the amount of the allowance for each entry. With a few exceptions, the computer records submitted by SAAB, while they relate the defective merchandise to particular entries though the use of Vehicle Identification Numbers (VINs), do not describe the defects with sufficient specificity. The printouts merely list the name of the vehicle part or component that was allegedly defective; and nothing indicates how the component was defective or what type of repair was performed. (The court gives an example of one claim for "upholstery" and indicates that this item represents the utter lack of specificity that "plagues" the entire spreadsheet. No one can figure out from this one word description whether the upholstery was defective at importation.) In fact, SAAB was able to retrieve more detailed records that it submitted for a few claims, but claimed it was prohibitively expensive to do so for all entries. The court indicated that the fact that to do so would be costly does not relieve SAAB of its legal obligation to prove its entitlement to an allowance by a preponderance of the evidence. Thus, except for a few claims, the Court denied SAAB's claims for allowances under 19 CFR 158.12 for repairs made under its warranty program. As to the class of expenses known as port repairs (which are done at the port of importation), the court held that SAAB was entitled to an allowance. Although the same type of evidence was offered, the court was not concerned as it was with the warranty claims, that the repairs may have been made to fix damage resulting from intervening circumstances. The fact that the repairs were made at the port almost immediately after importation was sufficient. The port repair expenses were a smaller part of the total claim.

Volkswagen of America, Inc. v. United States, 475 F. Supp. 2d 1385 (CIT 2007), aff'd, 532 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Volkswagen imported automobiles from Volkswagen Aktiengesellschaft and Audi Aktiengesellschaft. Volkswagen sold the imported automobiles in the United States with consumer warranties. Under those warranties, Volkswagen eventually repaired purported hidden defects. Volkswagen made some repairs within a few months of liquidation; others years later. Volkswagen filed protests with Customs challenging the appraised value of the repaired automobiles and other protests against the value of automobiles that it expected would need repair later. VW based these latter requests on statistical models, which suggested that each imported automobile would, on average, have some latent, or hidden, defects. Customs denied many of Volkswagen's protests, including all of those for repairs made after the protest filing date. Volkswagen appealed Customs' denial to the CIT under 28 U.S.C. 1581(a). The CIT held it did not have jurisdiction over automobiles repaired after the date VW filed its protests because VW was not aware of the defects at the time of the protests, but the CIT took jurisdiction over automobiles repaired before the date of protest. VW also sought judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act, alleging jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. 1581(i), seeking an allowance in value pursuant to 19 CFR 158.12. The CIT dismissed VW's claim for failure to state a cause of action for which relief could be granted. This decision was affirmed on appeal where the Federal Circuit found that Volkswagen did not file a timely protest of the liquidations of the entries of the automobiles at issue in the suit and had not shown entitlement to any independent cause of action outside the typical protest procedure. The Federal Circuit further explained that a claim for valuation of partially damaged goods must be brought in a protest of liquidation under Section 1514 and that in this case Volkswagen did not plead a necessary fact to state a claim under Section 1514.

Volkswagen of America, Inc. v. United States, 484 F. Supp. 2d 1314 (CIT 2007), aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 540 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

The CIT held that: 1) it lacked jurisdiction over Volkswagen's claims with respect to repairs made after the protest date; 2) with respect to repairs made before the protest date to correct alleged manufacturing defects, Volkswagen's evidence failed to establish that the repairs related to defects existing at the time of importation; and 3) with respect to repairs made before the protest date to correct design defects in response to government recall notices, Volkswagen failed to establish that it had contracted for merchandise free from design defects. The Federal Circuit affirmed this decision in-part, and reversed-in-part-finding that 1) the CIT lacked jurisdiction over Volkswagen's claims for repairs made after the date of its protest; 2) with respect to claimed repairs not made in response to government recalls, the CIT's conclusion that Volkswagen failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that those defects existed at the time of importation was not clearly erroneous; 3) with respect to repairs made before Volkswagen's protest to comply with government recall notices, Volkswagen contracted for vehicles that were free from design defects; and 4) with respect to repairs made to comply with federal safety recall notices, Volkswagen has established that the repairs were made to correct defects existing at the time of importation and was entitled to an allowance for these repairs. The Federal Circuit held that the very nature of a government mandated safety recall established the high likelihood that any defects repaired pursuant to the recall existed at

the time of importation. This conclusion was based on the fact that federal law prohibits the importation of automobiles not in compliance with federal safety standards. The Federal Circuit remanded the case to the CIT for an examination of emissions-based recalls.

Rehearing denied by Volkswagen of Am., Inc. v. United States, 2008 U.S. App. LEXIS 25392 (Fed. Cir., Nov. 20, 2008).
On remand, Judgment entered by Volkswagen of Am. v. United States, 614 F. Supp. 2d 1335, 2009 Ct. Intl. Trade LEXIS 23 (Ct. Int'l Trade, Apr. 15, 2009).

The CIT found that there is a similarly high likelihood that any repairs due to federal emissions recalls relate to defects existing at importation and that Volkswagen was entitled to its claimed allowance.

Headquarters Rulings:

allowance in price

544371 dated June 11, 1990. - See Discounts, price actually paid or payable.

Ceiling fans are imported into the United States by the importer from various vendors and are accompanied by invoices that list an original and an adjusted price. The importer pays the adjusted price that is determined by a set percentage, labeled as a defective allowance and deducted from the original price. The method described is used by the vendors to reimburse the importer for damaged or defective goods in a current shipment. The figure ranges from 1 – 7 percent, depending on the vendor and its prior two-year history of shipping defective goods. The defective allowance is not part of the price actually paid or payable.
544762 dated Jan. 17, 1992; 544841 dated Jan. 17, 1992.

No allowance is made in the value of merchandise where it is claimed that the merchandise is defective but no evidence is presented to support that claim. Despite being asked by Customs for information regarding the claim that the merchandise was defective, the importer failed to provide documentation.
544879 dated Apr. 3, 1992.

An allowance can be made in the value of imported merchandise to the extent of the claimed damage if the import specialist determines at the time of importation that the merchandise was in fact defective.
544973 dated Jan. 11, 1993.

The importer received gloves from the foreign seller; those gloves were found to be defective. The seller was promptly notified of the defect in writing, and the seller acknowledged the defect and explained the cause. The importer was then compensated for the defect, thereby changing the price actually paid or payable. The refund, together with the notice sent to the seller and the seller's written acknowledgment in return, suffices

to permit an allowance in the value of the gloves.
545231 dated Nov. 5, 1993.

An importer of automobiles alleges that vehicles staged at the dock in Japan for shipment to the United States were exposed to an acid rain shower and were damaged. By authority of 19 CFR 158.12(a), the vehicles that were defective at the time of importation are entitled to an allowance in their value to the extent of the damage. With regard to vehicles that are repaired, an allowance in the value of the vehicles may be made equal to the repair costs in instances where Customs is satisfied that the repairs were made on account of acid rain damage and reasonable and well-documented repair costs are presented to Customs.
545192 dated Jan. 4, 1995.

Insufficient evidence has been submitted for corroborating the importer's claim that the imported dresses were defective at the time of importation. Although the importer has submitted some evidence pertaining to the price at which it intended to sell the imported merchandise and the price at which it was eventually sold, this evidence is insufficient to establish that the merchandise was defective at the time of importation. A lower resale price than that which was originally anticipated could result from a variety of factors. Consequently, no adjustment in the appraised value is warranted.
545658 dated Feb. 3, 1995.

The importer purchased shorts from various foreign sellers. Subsequent to importation and sale in the United States, customers of the retailer began returning the shorts with complaints that the zippers were defective. Some of the shorts were repaired and invoices documented the actual repair costs. The importer agreed to pay the retailers a certain sum for the retailer's costs of recalling and returning the merchandise, lost profits, and lost customer goodwill. An allowance in the value of the repaired imported shorts may be made equal to the demonstrated repair costs. Allowances based on the resale price of the shorts less the buyer's expenses, the sale allowance paid by the buyer to the retailer, or the difference between the original sale price and the resale price of the merchandise are impermissible. Such allowances can not be made where the buyer fails to prove that the resale prices—allowances and expenses must have a direct correlation to the extent of the damage.
545534 dated May 15, 1995.

The imported merchandise was appraised based upon the price specified in the contract on the pro-forma invoice submitted at the time of entry. However, the importer claims than an allowance should be given because the imported product did not meet the specifications of the contract and, consequently, the seller reduced the price. Based upon the evidence submitted, Customs is satisfied that the merchandise was imported in a defective condition and that an allowance should be made in this case.
545959 dated Apr. 22, 1996.

The importer purchased wearing apparel from a related party seller and then sold the merchandise to its U.S. customer. The U.S. customer returned the merchandise to the

importer and claimed that the garments were defective. The importer then sold a portion of the merchandise to other retailers at a lesser value than anticipated. Insufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate any correlation between the claimed value allowance and the extent of the damage. In addition, insufficient evidence was presented to show that the price actually paid or payable by the importer was lowered due to the defects or that the amounts the importer indicated in its charge back statement reflected the extent of the damage or defect. No allowance for the claimed defective merchandise is warranted.

546150 dated July 11, 1996.

The importer purchased yarn from a foreign seller and then resold the yarn to a company in the United States. During the dying process, it is alleged that the yarn would not dye properly because it was contaminated with polypropylene and vegetable matter. The foreign seller was notified and the importer received a credit to cover the cost of removing the contaminants. The importer has not provided sufficient, independent evidence that corroborates the claim that the yarn was defective at the time of importation. An analysis of the yarn by a Customs laboratory indicates that the sample was composed wholly of wool fibers, and that the yarn was not contaminated or defective. There is insufficient evidence to support a finding that the imported merchandise was partially damaged at the time of importation; therefore, no adjustment in the appraised value is warranted.

546354 dated July 19, 1996.

There is insufficient evidence available to substantiate the importer's claim that the imported merchandise was defective when imported or to indicate that the merchandise was of a lesser quality than that which was ordered. Regarding the alleged defect, there is no evidence of communications between the importer and its supplier or between the importer and its customers. The price reduction is not considered in determining transaction value.

546311 dated Sep. 19, 1996.

Imported merchandise, which is of a lesser quality than ordered and paid for, should be granted a defective merchandise allowance and appraised at a lower value. However, adjustments can only be made where there is clear and convincing evidence to establish that the merchandise was defective at the time of importation. Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the merchandise was imported in a defective condition and that there was any correlation between the claimed value allowance and the extent of the alleged damage. No allowance for the claimed defective merchandise is warranted.

546661 dated Oct. 7, 1998.

Sufficient evidence was provided to establish that the merchandise was defective at the time of importation and that a price reduction occurred between the buyer and foreign seller for the defective merchandise. Thus, the imported merchandise is appraised pursuant to the transaction value with an allowance granted pursuant to 19 CFR 158.12 in the amount of the price adjustment.

547062 dated May 7, 1999.

Sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate that the merchandise was damaged at the time of importation and should be appraised in its lesser condition as imported. The actual repair costs were, in fact, a measure of the extent of the damage to the merchandise. Therefore, an allowance in appraised value of the subject merchandise may be equal to no more than the amount of the actual repair costs. No allowance should be made for the expenses for overseeing and examining the repair work, transportation involved in the repair work, and the expense of the warehouse facility. Those costs are not the actual costs of the repair work and should not be included in the calculation of the allowance because those expenses do not have a direct correlation to the extent of the damage.
547042 dated June 17, 1999.

The information provided was insufficient to establish that the imported merchandise was defective, in that it didn't show a value allowance that correlated to the claimed defective nature of the imported merchandise. Therefore, an allowance pursuant to 19 CFR 158.12 for the merchandise is not warranted.
546761 dated Sep. 23, 1999.

The defective allowances paid by the manufacturer to the importer for warranty service are rebates.
Any rebate of, or other decrease in, the price actually paid or payable that is made or otherwise effected between the buyer and seller after the date of the importation of merchandise into the United States shall be disregarded in determining the transaction value. Additionally, the port will not award a defective merchandise allowance when the allowance sought is an estimate that is not tied to specific entries and where the importer can not demonstrate a link in diminution in value due to defects in specific merchandise to particular entries.
548093 dated Apr. 26, 2002; <u>aff'd</u> by 548184 dated Nov. 5, 2002.

An affidavit submitted by the importer is not sufficient to establish that the imported merchandise was damaged or defective at the time of importation. Further, the importer has not established that the shipments in issue were found by the port director to be entirely without commercial value such that it is entitled to an allowance of duties on the grounds of non-importation.
548390 dated Jan. 12, 2004.

The imported merchandise was defective at the time of importation and an allowance under 19 CFR § 158.12 is appropriate. The protestant has provided clear and convincing evidence that the merchandise was defective at the time of importation.
548462 dated Jan. 19, 2005.

The merchandise is not eligible for a defective merchandise allowance under 19 CFR § 158.12. There is nothing in the record to indicate that the importer contracted for garments that were any different from the imported garments, including with respect to general quality and color. The importer did not provide objective and verifiable evidence

with some semblance of specificity concerning the alleged defect in the merchandise. No documentation was submitted concerning an alleged admission on the factory's part that the merchandise was defective. Finally, no documentary evidence was submitted to establish that payments were actually made by the manufacturer to the importer or its agent as compensation for the alleged defective merchandise.
548507 dated Jan. 25, 2005.

The protestant has not satisfied by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to an allowance under section 158.12 because it has not established that the goods were damaged or defective at the time of importation or different in quality from those for which it contracted. The price adjustments that are alleged to have occurred between the importer and the sellers or manufacturers do not by themselves establish that the imported goods were in fact actually damaged or defective for the purpose of section 158.12.
548635 dated Apr. 7, 2005.

Sufficient evidence was presented to substantiate that the imported merchandise was of a lesser quality than that which was ordered. A written compensation agreement between the importer and the foreign manufacturer states that the parties agree that the merchandise contained manufacturing defects and that the defects resulted in a product that did not meet the importer's specifications. The agreement sets forth an amount that the parties agree represents the fair costs of the defects and stipulates that the manufacturer will credit this amount on future payments it receives from the importer. An allowance in the value of the imported merchandise based on the amount agreed to by the importer and the manufacturer as representing the fair cost of the defects may be granted. However, the importer is not entitled to recover the freight, handling, and storage charges that it incurred in connection with the rejection of the merchandise, as well as the costs associated with preparation of the merchandise for the secondary market. In addition, the allowance in value may not be based on the resale price of the merchandise in the secondary market, as the importer did not present any evidence correlating the resale price to the extent of the damage.
H014663 dated Feb. 13, 2008.

The importer received orders from its customer for women's coats and, in turn, placed orders with the seller. The importer tested the coats after importation and found that the vast majority were defective. The importer submitted to CBP email communication with the seller to prove they ordered defect-free merchandise. Besides the email communication, the importer did not provide any documents such as manufacturing specifications or production sheets to show that it contracted for coats from fabrics of a specified quality. The importer did not prove the amount for an allowance in the value of the imported merchandise since it did not present evidence establishing that the seller accepted the debit note to the seller or that payments were actually made by the seller to the importer as allegedly agreed upon. The importer did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to an allowance under 19 CFR 158.12.
H130303 dated June 22, 2014.

H241893 dated June 26, 2014 – See Discounts, price actually paid or payable.

defective parts returned to the U.S.

543123 dated Dec. 20, 1983. - See Deductive Value, superdeductive value.

Defective parts returned to the United States for replacement are not considered "sold" for exportation to the United States, and transaction value is eliminated as a means of appraisement.
543288 dated Nov. 26, 1984.

543637 dated Dec. 2, 1985. - See Repairs, repairs in the U.S.

544377 dated Sep. 1, 1989. - See Repairs, repairs in the U.S.

Defective consumer products are sent to Mexico for repair. After repair the product is returned to the individual consumer in the U.S. along with the defective parts that are beyond repair. Defective parts may be appraised under the fallback valuation method using sales of similar or identical merchandise sold for the scrap value of the raw materials.
H044166 dated Jan. 23, 2009.

defective merchandise imported

19 CFR 158.12(a)

The claim that merchandise purchased and appraised at a certain level of quality is in fact of a lesser quality than that which was ordered must be supported by clear, concise, and convincing evidence.
543106 dated June 29, 1983.

Where it is discovered subsequent to importation that the merchandise being appraised is defective, allowances will be made. However, the importer has failed to establish by satisfactory evidence that the merchandise was imported in a damaged condition. Therefore, no adjustment may be made in this case.
543091 dated Sep. 29, 1983.

543123 dated Dec. 20, 1983. - See Deductive Value, superdeductive value.

The importer submitted sufficient evidence for Customs to conclude that aircraft components, in their condition as imported, were defective. Where it is discovered subsequent to importation that the merchandise being appraised is defective, allowances will be made. In this case, the dutiable value should be represented by the manufacturer's statement of the "realistic scrap value" of the merchandise.
543240 dated Aug. 10, 1984.

The importer returned certain defective equipment to the manufacturer and, in return, the manufacturer provided a refund to the importer. Under the circumstances in this case, an allowance is made for the defective merchandise that is returned.
543537 dated Feb. 14, 1986.

The importer purchased blouses from a foreign seller. Upon importation, the blouses were shipped to the retailer's individual stores. After the retailer began to sell the blouses, it was discovered that there were deficiencies in the stitching of the blouses. The retailer returned the unsold merchandise to the importer and cancelled the balance of its purchase orders. Upon being made aware of the defective blouses, the importer refused delivery of additional shipments of the merchandise. The importer later sold all the blouses for which it had accepted delivery on an off-price basis. The importer has been unable to negotiate a settlement with the foreign seller. There is insufficient evidence from which the Customs can determine that the imported merchandise was partially damaged at the time of importation. The importer must provide clear and convincing evidence to support a claim that merchandise purchased and appraised as a certain quality was in fact of a lesser quality, thus warranting an allowance in duties. The remedies available under 19 CFR 158.11 and 19 CFR 158.12 are not applicable. The importer is not entitled to an adjustment in appraised value of the blouses.
544986 dated Mar. 21, 1994.

The importer failed to provide sufficient evidence that the imported merchandise was of a lesser quality than that ordered. The importer is not entitled to an allowance in the appraised value of the imported merchandise.
545613 dated May 31, 1994.

546761 dated Sep. 23, 1999 - <u>See</u> Defective Merchandise, allowance in price.

The importer claimed that the jackets were defective after discovering that they were not water-resistant at the time of importation. The importer failed to present purchase orders or invoices attesting to the fact that water-resistant jackets were ordered, nor is there objective evidence from an unbiased source that the jackets were defective at the time they were imported to the U.S. There is insufficient evidence to support a finding that jackets were defective at the time of importation. Accordingly, the importer is not entitled to an adjustment in the appraised value of the imported merchandise.
547060 dated Mar. 8, 2000.

With respect to the shipments of wearing apparel in the first protest claim for which a full refund is requested, there was no evidence that the imported merchandise was entirely without commercial value. Because the importer had not met the requirements of showing that the imported merchandise under consideration was completely without any commercial value, it was not entitled to refunds of duties due to destroyed, abandoned or non-imported merchandise, under 19 C.F.R. § 158. However, for the entries covered by the second protest, the importer established that the merchandise was damaged and contained numerous defects at the time it was imported into the United States. Because the merchandise imported into the United States was of a lesser quality than the

merchandise ordered and paid for by the importer, an allowance in the value of the merchandise based on the extent of that damage in the shipments in accordance with 19 C.F.R. § 158.12(a) was allowed. The amount of the valuation allowance was determined to be equal to the refund the importer received from its overseas vendor, because of the defects in the imported merchandise. Therefore, the appraisement of the imported merchandise was adjusted by an allowance determined by subtracting the amount of the refund attributable to the shipments in that protest from its original entered value.
H256777 dated June 5, 2015.

in-transit damage to imported goods

Merchandise dutiable under transaction value does not include the value of repairs for in-transit damage that occurred in a third country and which merely restores the merchandise to its original condition, even if replacement parts were needed. However, the addition of parts to merchandise while in a third country when that addition enhances the value of the merchandise may be sufficient to make the third country the country of exportation, and rendering transaction value inapplicable.
542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39); modified by 543737 dated July 21, 1986. See also Assists, materials, components, parts and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

price renegotiation

The Statement of Administrative Action provides that where it is discovered subsequent to importation that the merchandise being appraised is defective, an allowance will be made. If the defect is discovered within the statutory protest
period, and the protesting party submits evidence that the price was lowered due to a defect, an allowance should be taken into account.
543061 dated May 4, 1983.

Merchandise that does not meet contractual terms requiring visas for entry will not be considered as "defective goods." A post-importation price reduction is not considered in determining the price under transaction value.
543609 dated Oct. 7, 1985.

543537 dated Feb. 14, 1986. - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, post-importation refund.

subsequently imported merchandise discounted

543772 dated July 11, 1986. - See Indirect Payments, reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt.

543766 dated Sep. 30, 1986; 543830 dated Nov. 7, 1986- See Indirect Payments, reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt.

The importer is owed a credit as a result of defects in a prior shipment and this credit is applied against a later shipment. Although it was not intended at the time that the initial shipment was imported that a part of its purchase price would be applied to other goods, the overpayment on the initial shipment is an indirect payment for part of the later shipment.
543830 dated Nov. 7, 1986.

The first inquiry involved the importer negotiating a price reduction for defective or nonconforming merchandise once a deficiency was discovered after importation. CBP found that since the actual discount or price adjustment was not determined until after importation, the discount should not be considered part of transaction value. Further, CBP found that this arrangement was not a formula because the final determination for a reduction in price depended on a subjective factor within the control of the importer, i.e., importer's examination of the goods after importation. The second inquiry involved the renegotiation of the price for the merchandise in subsequent shipments due to product deficiencies in previous shipments. CBP found that this was an acceptable price actually paid or payable if supported by documents such as invoices and proof of payment indicating that the importer and the vendors agreed to the price reduction before the merchandise was imported in the U.S. Under the third inquiry, CBP found that a price reduction on subsequent shipments due to a previous shipment which was found to be defective was considered an indirect payment of a debt by the importer and therefore was part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
H261556 dated June 25, 2015.

warranty provisions

The consideration paid for imported merchandise, i.e., the price actually paid or payable, includes all charges paid for any warranty that is a guarantee that the merchandise will be free from any defects. The warranty attaches to and is an integral part of the imported merchandise and the payments made for this warranty are part of the consideration paid for the merchandise. The charge at issue is properly part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
542699 dated Mar. 10, 1982.

543142 dated May 7, 1984; 543180 dated July 17, 1984 - See Repairs, warranty provisions.

544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989, modified by 548557 dated Oct. 20, 2004 – See Assists, assist definition.

The importer sells imported merchandise to U.S. consumers and guarantees the quality of the merchandise by means of a warranty. Initial returns of defective merchandise are repaired by the importer and resold as second quality merchandise. The importer also contracts with unrelated service centers to repair defective merchandise. These service centers invoice the importer for the total cost of repair. The amount for the warranty is included in the total payment transferred from the importer to the foreign seller in

exchange for the imported merchandise. It is properly part of the price actually paid or payable and dutiable pursuant to transaction value.

544394 dated Oct. 9, 1990; 544368 dated Oct. 9, 1990; 544370 dated Oct. 9, 1990; 544574 dated Nov. 14, 1990.

DIRECT COSTS OF PROCESSING

INTRODUCTION

19 CFR 10.178- Direct costs of processing operations performed in the beneficiary developing country.
(a) Items included in the direct costs of processing operations. As used in [section] 10.176, the words "direct costs of processing operations" means those costs either directly incurred in, or which can be reasonably allocated to, the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the specific merchandise under consideration. Such costs include, but are not limited to: (1) All actual labor costs involved in the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the specific merchandise, including fringe benefits, on-the-job training, and the cost of engineering, supervisory, quality control, and similar personnel; (2) Dies, molds, tooling, and depreciation on machinery and equipment which are allocable to the specific merchandise; (3) Research, development, design, engineering, and blueprint costs insofar as they are allocable to the specific merchandise; and (4) Costs of inspecting and testing the specific merchandise.
(b) Items not included in the direct costs of processing operations. Those items which are not included within the meaning of the words "direct costs of processing operations" are those which are not directly attributable to the merchandise under consideration or are not "costs" of manufacturing the product. These include, but are not limited to: (1) Profit; and (2) General expenses of doing business which are either not allocable to the specific merchandise or are not related to the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the merchandise, such as administrative salaries, casualty and liability insurance, advertising, and salesmen's salaries, commissions, or expenses.

Headquarters Rulings:

direct costs of processing operations

19 CFR 10.178

If costs for certain research and development necessary for the production of imported merchandise are not included in the appraised value of imported merchandise, then such costs would not be included in the "direct costs of processing operations" for purposes of GSP.
T.D. 81-282 dated Oct. 16, 1981.

543155 dated Dec. 13, 1983. - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, direct costs of processing.

543159 dated May 7, 1984. - See Computed Value, profit and general expenses.

Freight and handling costs are not costs incurred in the production of the imported merchandise and, therefore, may not be included as part of the direct costs of processing operations. However, such costs may be included in the cost of materials produced in the beneficiary developing country to the extent provided for in section 10.177(c)(1)(ii) of the

Customs regulations. In addition, costs incurred for "fuel and other materials" and "electricity" may be included in the direct costs of processing operations only to the extent that they are allocable to the specific merchandise and are related to the production of the merchandise.

543538 dated July 31, 1985.

DISCOUNTS

INTRODUCTION

The following section in the Customs regulations provides guidance with respect to discounts:

Price actually paid or payable- (1) General. In determining the transaction value, the price actually paid or payable will be considered without regard to its method of derivation. It may be the result of discounts, increases, or negotiations . . . .
(emphasis added)
19 CFR 152.103(a)(1)

The regulations further cite an example which is relevant: Example 5. A seller offers merchandise at $100, less a two percent discount for cash. A buyer remits $98 cash, taking advantage of the cash discount.
The transaction value is $98, the price actually paid or payable.
19 CFR 152.103(a)(1), Example 5.

Additionally, the Statement of Administrative Action states the following:

Changes in a price actually paid or payable which are arrived at subsequent to the time of importation shall not be taken into account in determining a transaction value. This would apply to renegotiation, deferred quantity discounts, or rebates. (emphasis added)

GATT Valuation Agreement:

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinions 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 regarding Cash Discounts state the following:

Advisory Opinion 5.1
1. When, prior to the valuation of imported goods, a buyer has availed himself of a cash discount offered by the seller, should that cash discount be allowed in determining the transaction value of the goods?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:
Since the transaction value under Article 1 of the Valuation Agreement is the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods, the cash discount should be allowed in determining the transaction value.

Advisory Opinion 5.2
1. When a cash discount offered by the seller is available but payment for the goods has not yet been made at the time of valuation, would the requirement of Article 1.1(b) of the Agreement [condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined] preclude using the sale price as a basis for the transaction value?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:

The fact that a cash discount, although available, has not been availed of because payment has not yet been made at the time of valuation, does not mean that the provisions of Article 1.1(b) apply; there is, thus, nothing that precludes using the sale price in establishing transaction value under the Agreement.

Advisory Opinion 5.3
1. When a cash discount is available to the buyer but payment has not been made at the time of valuation what amount should be accepted as a basis for transaction value under Article 1 of the Agreement?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:
When a cash discount is available but payment has not yet been made at the time of valuation, the amount the importer is to pay for the goods should be taken as the basis for transaction value under Article 1. Procedures for determining what is to be paid may vary; for example, a statement on the invoice might be accepted as sufficient evidence or a declaration by the importer as to the amount he is to pay could be the basis for action, subject to verification and to possible application of Articles 13 and 17 of the Agreement.

Advisory Opinion 15.1 deals with Quantity Discounts and states the following:

1. Quantity discounts are deductions from the price of goods allowed by the seller to customers according to the quantities purchased over a given basic period.
2. The GATT Valuation Agreement makes no reference to a standard quantity which would need to be taken into consideration when deciding whether the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods is a valid basis for the determination of the Customs value under Article 1.
3. It therefore follows that for Customs valuation purposes it is the quantity which has determined the unit price of the goods being valued when they were sold for export to the country of importation that is relevant. Thus quantity discounts arise only when it is shown that a seller sets the price for his goods according to a fixed scheme based upon the quantity of the goods sold. Such discounts fall into two broad categories:
(1) those established prior to the importation of goods, and
(2) those established subsequent to the importation of
goods.
4**.** These considerations are illustrated by the following examples.
General facts
5. There is demonstrated evidence that the seller offers the following quantity discounts on the goods purchased within a given specified period e.g. a calendar year. 1 to 9 units - no discount; 10 to 49 units - 5% discount; over 50 units - 8% discount. In addition to the above discounts a further discount of 3% is granted at the end of a specified period calculated retrospectively by reference to the total quantity purchased in that period.
Example 1
6. First situation: Importer B in country X purchases and imports 27 units in a single shipment. The invoice price reflects a 5% discount.
7. Second situation: Importer C in country X purchases 27 units in a single transaction at a price which reflects a 5% discount but imports them in 3 separate shipments each

comprising 9 units.

Valuation treatment

8. In both situations, the Customs value is to be determined on the basis of the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods, i.e., those prices reflecting a 5% discount which contributed to the setting of those prices.

Example 2

9. Subsequent to the purchase and importation of the 27 units, importers B and C purchase and import within the same calendar year a further 42 units (i.e., a total of 69 units each). The price charged to both B and C for the second purchase of 42 reflects an 8% discount.

10. First situation: Importer B's first purchase of 27 units and the second purchase of 42 units are the subject of two separate contracts which are entered into in the context of an initial general agreement which provides for the cumulative progressive discounts between the buyer and seller.

11. Second situation: The position is as in the first situation above except that importer C's purchases are not the subject of an initial agreement. The cumulative progressive discounts are however offered by the seller as a feature of his general terms of sale.

Valuation treatment

12. With respect to both situations the 8% discount on the 42 units is a feature of the seller's price; it contributed to the setting of the unit price of the goods when they were sold for export to the country of importation. It therefore follows that it should be allowed in determining the customs value of those goods.

13. In this respect the fact that the quantity discount is granted by the seller taking into account quantities purchased previously by the buyer does not means that the provisions of Article 1.1(b) apply [condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined].

Example 3:

14. In this example, the position is as in example 2 above except that the discounts are also granted retrospectively. In each case the importer purchases and imports 27 units and a further 42 units within the same calendar year.

15. For the first shipment of 27 units B is charged a price which reflects a 5% discount and for the second shipment of 42 units, the price charged reflects an 8% discount with an additional reduction representing a further discount of 3% on the first shipment of 27 units.

Valuation treatment

16. The 8% discount on the 42 units should be allowed in determining the Customs value of the imported goods. However, the additional 3% discount
granted retrospectively should not be allowed for the second importation as it did not contribute to the setting of the unit price of 42 units being valued but relates to the previously imported 27 units. As to the treatment to be accorded by Customs to the 27 units, guidance is already provided in advisory opinion 8.1 on credits in respect of earlier transactions [see, chapter on INDIRECT PAYMENTS, infra] and commentary 4.1 on price review clauses [see, chapter on FORMULAS IN DETERMINING THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE, infra].

Example 4

17. After all importations during the specified period have been completed, an accounting is taken. On the basis of the total quantity which had been imported during the period, the

importer qualifies for an additional 3% discount.
Valuation treatment
18. The discount of 3% granted retrospectively cannot be taken into account for the reasons set out in paragraph 16. However, it should be noted that the Committee has already provided guidance in advisory opinion 8.1 on credits in respect of earlier transactions and commentary 4.1 on price review clauses.

Headquarters Rulings:

early payment discount

The importer and manufacturer have agreed, prior to exportation of the merchandise, that an early payment discount will be applied if payments are made prior to the date payment is required under a purchase order. Where it is established that such a discount is agreed upon prior to exportation, and the price actually paid or payable reflects the discount, then the discount is taken into account in determining transaction value.
544791 dated Mar. 11, 1992.

A discounted price must be agreed upon and effected prior to importation in order for the discounted price to constitute the price actually paid or payable. The importer did not submit evidence indicating that it took advantage of a two percent "45 day discount" that the importer alleges was agreed to by the seller. Because no evidence of the discount was presented, it is not considered in the determination of transaction value.
546037 dated Jan. 31, 1996.

Prior to exportation of goods, an early payment discount was negotiated which would apply if the importer paid the vendor prior to the date agreed upon for payment. Payment was normally made after importation. If documentation reflected a discount arrangement prior to exportation of the goods, the early payment discount may be taken into account in determining the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise.
H021424 dated Feb. 3, 2009.

The invoices and the proof of payments shown on the Debit Advices from the buyer to the vendors, indicate that the parties agreed to a one percent discount. Because the invoices are dated earlier than the CF 28 before the merchandise was shipped to the United States, it was found that the one percent discount was agreed to before the merchandise was imported into the U.S., and should be included in determining the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise. So long as the invoices reflect a discount, that discount should be included in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
H048152 dated Apr. 30, 2009.

While there was no written agreement between protestant and seller regarding the unconditional percentage discount, the discount agreement was negotiated sometime in 2003. In a letter written after the date of importation of the merchandise, the seller confirmed the discount and that it was not subject to a minimum purchase. Most

importantly, the discounted amount was reflected on the invoice from the seller to the protestant and on the entry documentation. Accordingly, the discount could be used to determine the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H057716 dated Jun. 30, 2009.

An early payment discount negotiated prior to exportation of the goods may be taken into account in determining the price actually paid or payable if the importer submits to CBP at entry an invoice that shows agreement on an early payment discount prior to importation and that early payment was made.
H090177 dated Nov. 26, 2010.

price actually paid or payable

19 CFR 152.103 (a) (1)

A discount will be considered in determining transaction value as long as the discount is actually taken so as to reduce the net amount "actually" paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for export to the United States.
542559 dated Aug. 18, 1981.

Where a seller discounts its price for certain merchandise to a buyer, and the discount is agreed to and effected prior to importation of the merchandise, the discounted price clearly constitutes the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
543302 dated Nov. 1, 1984.

543537 dated Feb. 14, 1986. <u>See</u> Rebates Subsequent to Importation, post-importation refunds.

The importer and its related party manufacturer have agreed to a .75 percent discount that is given on every shipment to cover any defective merchandise. This discount is deducted from the FOB Hong Kong value of the merchandise and is reflected on the commercial invoice. Because the price actually paid or payable reflects the discount, this discount should be taken into account in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544371 dated June 11, 1990.

A U.S. company solicits orders in the United States for printing paper. The company's role is that of a sales agent for the sellers. The sellers offer a range of discounted prices from the list prices, which are known as market, grade, quantity and merchant discounts. The discounts are either conditional or unconditional. A discount is unconditional when there are no specified purchasing obligations placed on the customer. A conditional discount is monitored for performance compliance where a customer is to fulfill specified purchasing obligations. Market, merchant and grade discounts are unconditional, and quantity discounts are conditional. The unconditional discounts are figured into the value declared at entry and are reflected on the invoices presented to Customs. In cases where a conditional discount is granted at the time of order placement because the order meets

the size required for a quantity discount, no amount is rebated and the discount is figured into the declared value at the time of entry and is reflected on the invoice presented to Customs. However, there are situations with regard to the conditional discounts where the discounts are credited to the customer's account at the end of the obligatory period. In such cases, the discount is not reflected in the entered value because it is not credited to the customer's account until after the time of entry. With respect to both the unconditional and conditional discounts that are indicated on the invoice at the time of entry when no amount is rebated, these discounts are taken into consideration in determining transaction value. In those instances where the customer has not yet fulfilled the specified purchasing obligation at the time of entry, the conditional discounts are not taken into consideration in determining transaction value.
545659 dated Oct. 25, 1995.

An importer receives a five percent discount from its supplier of costume jewelry. The supplier has agreed to the discount because the importer is remodeling its retail stores, and the supplier is contributing to the remodeling in hopes that the stores will attract more customers and boost sales. The discount is unconditional and is not taken in satisfaction of a debt owed by the seller. In addition, the discount is agreed to and is in effect prior to the importation of the merchandise. The five percent discount is not included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise if it is reflected on the invoice presented to Customs at the time of importation.
547144 dated Nov. 20, 1998.

Prior to the importation of the merchandise, the importer and its foreign supplier agree to a specific percentage discount deducted from the supplier's price. The discount is treated as a contribution toward an employee training program and reflected in the foreign supplier's invoice to the importer, with no specific
obligations or restrictions on the importer. The documentary evidence supports the existence of the discount and establishes that it was agreed to before the time of entry. The discounted price constitutes the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
563419 dated May 4, 2006.

A foreign seller and unrelated U.S. retailer implemented two discount programs. The first is governed by a signed agreement and reduces the seller's price by 10 percent. The 10 percent discount is comprised of a 3 percent Merchandise Service Allowance, a 5 percent General Advertising Allowance, and a 2 percent Volume Rebate Allowance. Under the second program, the seller's net sales price is reduced by 2.38 percent and applied to all sales to the U.S. retailer's divisions. The discounts are described in the U.S. retailer's vendor information sheets and vendor allowance sheets, which establish that the discounts were in effect after the sheets were signed by both parties. In addition, the discounts are taken automatically without further obligation by the U.S. retailer. The discounted prices, which were agreed to prior to importation and applied unconditionally, constitute the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise, assuming the transaction value method may be used to appraise the imported merchandise.
W563462 dated Oct. 11, 2006.

Spectra imports automotive radiators from its unrelated supplier, Fruitage International Co., LTD ("Fruitage"), located in Taiwan. The pro forma invoice and the subsequent detailed invoices issued by Fruitage to Spectra on November 11, 2011 indicate 4% warranty and 1.5% competitive discounts provided by Fruitage to Spectra. The warranty and competitive discounts are factored into the value declared at the time of entry. The issue is whether the warranty and competitive discounts, as reflected in the invoices between Spectra and its foreign seller, should be taken into account in determining the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. CBP ruled that Spectra sufficiently documented that it agreed with its foreign supplier to the warranty and competitive discounts prior to the importation of the merchandise. Therefore, these discounts should be taken into account in determining the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H218255 dated June 7, 2012.

The importer and unrelated foreign seller agreed to a specific percentage discount from the seller's price of the merchandise in advance of importation. Sample documents were submitted to support the existence of the discounts and indicate that the importer and the sellers agreed to the discounted amounts reflected on the documents. There were no purchasing obligations placed on the importer and the discounts were unconditional. Accordingly, CBP found that the specified discounts may be taken into account in determining the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise.
H215556 dated July 17, 2012.

Protestant imports aircraft components from its unrelated supplier located in Canada. The imported merchandise had been entered at the value declared on the applicable commercial invoices based on values that reflected a 50% discount from the supplier's catalogue price. Protestant states that the correct value should have been based on a complex mathematical calculation provided for in the Side Letter. According to the terms of the Side Letter, the parties agreed prior to importation that Protestant would receive a maximum discount of 85% or a minimum discount of 65%. The issue is whether a discount, which Protestant and its foreign seller agreed to prior to importation, should be included in determining the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. CBP found that based on the documentation submitted, the discount in question should be included in determining the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise, since this discount is effected prior to the date of importation.
H197899 dated Sep. 26, 2012.

A defective merchandise discount, which was provided to cover any defective merchandise, was agreed to by the seller and the importer prior to the importation of certain tires. The discount was unconditional in nature since it was a fixed percentage, and the importer received it regardless of whether it had actual defective merchandise or not. Based on the documentation submitted and since the discount was effected prior to the date of importation, it may be taken into account in determining the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise.
H241893 dated June 26, 2014.

The importer purchased brass rods from a foreign supplier under a "toll agreement," which allowed the importer to receive a 70% rebate/discount if the importer returned the "scrap shavings" to the supplier. However, the importer made entry and paid duties on the full value of the goods without accounting for the discount and sought a refund of what was claimed to be an overpayment of duties. CBP has consistently enumerated three criteria in determining whether a discount or price adjustment should be considered part of the transaction value of imported merchandise: 1) the discount or price adjustment must be agreed upon prior to importation; 2) the importer must be able to furnish CBP with sufficient documentary evidence to support the existence of the discount and establish that it was agreed to before the time of entry; and 3) the discount or price adjustment must be unconditional, or if conditional, all the conditions must be met prior to importation. CBP found that the first criteria was not met because while the supplier was contractually bound to repurchase up to 70% of the brass rods, it was not bound to discount its price for the imported brass rods. The second criteria was not met because a written agreement provided by the importer was entered into after the date of importation and the invoices did not reflect a reduction or a discounted price. The third criteria was not met because the importer had the right to return scrap shavings of the brass rods and the supplier was contractually bound to repurchase up to 70% of the brass rods, but not required to discount its price for the imported brass rods.
H240546 dated July 28, 2014.

Protestant imported Lotus Evora vehicles into the United States, purchased from its related party in China. Protestant declared value for the vehicles in the amount of $1,997,182.00. The Port applied the rate advance to the imported merchandise and utilized the value of the imported merchandise declared at the time of filing entry summary to calculate the appropriate amount of duty owed. Protestant claimed that the incorrect value was applied and declared discounts ranging from 58.2% to 63.38% to CBP at the time of protest. CBP denied the protest because the Protestant failed to demonstrate that the relationship between it and the seller did not influence the discounted price.
H256333 dated Mar. 3, 2015.

quantity discounts

See Statement of Administrative Action; GATT Valuation Agreement, CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 15.1.

The importer receives a quantity discount, i.e., the inclusion of an additional piece of merchandise when a specific number of items have been purchased (one extra with the purchase of ten). The price actually paid or payable is based upon the entire shipment and not upon the value of each individual article. The quantity discount is disregarded in determining transaction value.
542741 dated Mar. 30, 1982.

A retroactive volume discount received after the importation of the merchandise is not

considered in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
543662 dated Jan. 7, 1986.

The unit purchase price of merchandise is determined by a schedule in the contract, which provides for a price reduction as the quantity purchased increases. The contract specifically provides for a purchase price adjustment if the minimum number of items is not purchased. The buyer's payment to the seller represents the price actually paid or payable.
544205 dated Dec. 12, 1988.

Prior to the importation of the merchandise, the importer and the foreign vendor/seller agree to a volume discount program wherein the seller discounts its price for certain merchandise. The discount is agreed to and effected prior to the importation of the merchandise. The discounted price constitutes the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
547210 dated Mar. 25, 1999.

renegotiation of price

The buyer and seller agree that merchandise is to be exported on a specified date. The merchandise is shipped subsequent to that date and the importer refuses to pay for the goods at the negotiated price. Rather than cancel the contract, the parties agree to a reduction in price. The price actually paid or payable in this case is represented by the original contract price. These prices were in effect when the merchandise was sold for exportation. Nothing in the original agreement between the parties allowed for a price reduction due to the seller's late delivery. The price was not reduced prior to exportation and the discount is disregarded in determining transaction value.
544628 dated Mar. 11, 1992.

546132 dated Apr. 10, 1996. <u>See</u> Indirect Payments, reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt.

The renegotiated invoice price, accounting for both late delivery and a faster, more costly means of transportation, appropriately represents the transaction value. The terms of sale changed from FOB Port of Origin to C&F Port of Destination, so that the invoice price took into consideration the price reductions as negotiated by the buyer and the seller prior to shipment.
547178 dated Jan. 13, 1999.

Federal-Mogul imported hub assemblies from a Korean company. In an agreement concluded prior to the sale or importation of the goods, annual rebates were provided based on certain percentages of sales made by Federal-Mogul. After the goods were imported, the Korean company made a partial refund of the money back to Federal-Mogul. This payment was considered a rebate made or put into effect after the merchandise was imported. The rebates were disregarded in determining transaction value.

H042055 dated Apr. 17, 2009.

Certain bread products were entered by the importer at a unit price of $3.59 per 10-unit box. Subsequent entries were entered with a unit price of $3.00 and then $2.50 per 10-unit box. The importer claimed that transaction value was the appropriate basis of appraisement, at the prices noted on the invoices issued by the unrelated manufacturer to the importer. The importer claimed that due to CBP's classification of the goods under a provision carrying a 100% duty as opposed to a free rate of duty, the manufacturer agreed to grant the importer a substantial price reduction so that the importer could continue to supply its primary customer in the U.S. CBP found that the documents submitted including copies of CBP Form 7501, CBP Form 3461, invoices from the manufacturer to the importer, packing lists, checks payable to the manufacturer, as well as the bills of lading for the merchandise, supported the importer's claim that the merchandise was renegotiated at a discounted price. Additionally, the dates noted on the invoices from the manufacturer to the importer and the entry dates on the CBP Form 7501 for the nine entries at issue indicated that the importer and the manufacturer agreed to the price reduction before the merchandise was imported into the U.S. Accordingly, the imported merchandise could be appraised under transaction value based on the prices noted on the invoices issued by the manufacturer to the importer.

H016107 dated Mar. 16, 2011.

DUTIABLE VALUE

INTRODUCTION

Headquarters Rulings:

appraised value versus dutiable value

Appraised value has a meaning that is distinct from the meaning of dutiable value. Appraised value means the final determination by Customs, pursuant to section 402 of the TAA, as to the full value of the imported merchandise. Dutiable value refers to that portion, if any, of the appraised value of the imported article upon which duty is actually assessed.
542095 dated June 24, 1980; 543319 dated Jan. 17, 1985; 544198 dated Aug. 29, 1988.

Where a rate of duty is regulated by the value of imported merchandise, the term "value" refers to the appraised value of the merchandise, determined in accordance with section 402 of the TAA. Accordingly, the value of U.S. origin containers classified in subheading 9801.00.10, HTSUS, is part of the appraised value of the imported merchandise. The term "value" in subheading 9902.71.13, HTSUS, refers to the appraised value of the imported merchandise.
545224 dated Sep. 19, 1994; modified by 546043 dated Nov. 30, 1995, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995.

DUTIES AND TAXES

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (3) (B) states the following:

The transaction value of imported merchandise does not include any of the following, if identified separately from the price actually paid or payable and from any cost or other item referred to in paragraph (1) . . . (B) The customs duties and other Federal excise tax on, or measured by the value of, such merchandise for which vendors in the United States are ordinarily liable.

Similarly, in determining deductive value, the TAA states:

The price . . . shall be reduced by an amount equal to - . . . the customs duties and other Federal taxes currently payable on the merchandise concerned by reason of its importation, and any Federal excise tax on, or measured by the value of, such merchandise for which vendors in the United States are ordinarily liable.
19 U.S.C. 1401a(d) (3) (A) (iv)

The corresponding regulations with respect to the above-cited provisions regarding duties and taxes are 19 CFR 152.103(i)(2) and 19 CFR 152.105(d)(4), respectively.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable, in relevant part states:

The customs value shall not include the following charges or costs, provided that they are distinguished from the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods: . . . duties and taxes of the country of importation.

Regarding a deductive value appraisement, Article 5, paragraph (1)(a)(iv), allows for a deduction from the price for:

. . . the customs duties and other national taxes payable in the country of importation by reason of the importation or sale of the goods.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 3.1 states:

1. When the price paid or payable includes an amount for the duties and taxes of the country of importation, should these duties and taxes be deducted in those instances where they are not shown separately on the invoice and where the importer has not otherwise claimed a deduction in this respect?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:

Since the duties and taxes of the country of importation are by their nature distinguishable from the price actually paid or payable, they do not form part of the Customs value.

In addition, with regard to the treatment of anti-dumping and countervailing duties when applying the deductive method of valuation, CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 9.1 states:

1. When imported goods which are subject to anti-dumping or countervailing duties fall to be valued by the deductive method under Article 5 of the Agreement, should those duties be deducted from the selling price in the country of importation?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs valuation expressed the following view:
In the determination of Customs value under the deductive method, anti-dumping and countervailing duties should be deducted under Article 5.1(a)(iv) as Customs duties and other national taxes.

Judicial Precedent:

Century Importers, Inc., v. United States, 22 Ct. Int'l Trade 821 (1998).

The issue before the Court of International Trade was whether the importer had established that a deduction from the invoice price should have been made for the amount of duties paid in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise. Century Importer, a subsidiary of the buyer, Miller Brewing Company, imported beer from a related seller, Molson Brewing Company. At the time of the importations, the normal duty rates were replaced by a 50% rate of duty. Century paid the duties and was later reimbursed by Molson, subsequent to importation. Customs appraised the beer using transaction value based on the invoice price because there was no evidence that the invoice price included the applicable duties. The CIT held in favor of Century deciding that the claimed deduction for the applicable duties was in fact warranted. The court concluded that there was an error in the preparation of the entry papers so that the duty-paid nature of the transaction was not indicated at the time of entry. The court indicated that there is nothing in the statutes or regulations that indicates that the failure to identify the "duty paid" status of a sale at the time of entry is an error which may never be corrected. In addition, a repayment of identified duties is not a "rebate of price" within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4) which excludes rebates or other price reductions in the determination of transaction value.

Century Importers, Inc., v. United States, 205 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000), vacating and rev'g 22 Ct. Int'l Trade 821 (1998).

The Court in this case reversed the decision of the Court of International Trade in holding that Customs should have allowed a deduction for duties paid by the importer and subsequently reimbursed by the seller, after importation. Century Importer, a subsidiary of the buyer, Miller Brewing Company, imported beer from a related seller, Molson Brewing Company. At the time of importation, the normal duty rates were replaced by a

50% rate of duty. Century paid the duties and was later reimbursed by Molson, subsequent to importation. Century claimed that in calculating the duties on the imported beer, Customs should have deducted the reimbursed duties from the invoice price. The Court applied the relevant statutory formula, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3) that excludes customs duties from the transaction value if identified separately to Customs. The record indicates that the parties did not identify these duties separately, and therefore, Customs has no authorization to deduct these duties from the price calculation. The Court further stated that because Molson reimbursed the duties after the date of importation, that the post-importation action was in fact a rebate that, pursuant to section 1401a(b)(4)(B), is disregarded in the determination of transaction value.

Headquarters Rulings:

appraised value

545224 dated Sep. 19, 1994; modified by 546043 dated Nov. 30, 1995, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995. – See Dutiable Value, appraised value versus dutiable value.-

To the extent that an importer's listing of "duties" and "port fees" meant customs duties, harbor taxes or merchandise processing fees paid by the United States vendor, then such amounts would be deductible under this section.
H258738 dated Feb. 20, 2015.

currently payable

19 U.S.C. 1401a(d) (3) (A) (iv); 19 CFR 152.105(d) (4); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 5, paragraph l(a)(iv); See Figure Flattery, Inc. v. United States, 720 F. Supp. 1008 (1989), aff'd 907 F.2d 141 (1990), cited in chapter on DEDUCTIVE VALUE, supra.

542439 dated June 12, 1981; aff'd by Figure Flattery, id. – See Deductive Value, duties currently payable.

deduction from transaction value

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3)(B); 19 CFR 152.103(i)(2); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable; CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 3.1

The duty that is to be deducted from a CIF duty-paid price is the actual duty due on the transaction. The excess estimated duty is an additional payment made to the seller, as this amount inures to the seller's benefit.
542401 dated May 21, 1981.

A state sales tax is deductible from the selling price of goods as a cost of erection and installation when the party responsible for the erection and installation of the goods pays

such a tax.
542451 dated June 4, 1981 (TAA No. 27).

The proper amount of Customs duties to be deducted from the total price actually paid or payable, where an invoice indicates that a specified dollar amount has been included for such duties, is the amount "currently payable on the imported merchandise by reason of its importation."
542524 dated July 15, 1981 (TAA No. 34).

A Puerto Rican excise tax paid by the seller and included in the invoice price is not a deductible charge under transaction value.
542512 dated July 21, 1981 (TAA No. 36).

542467 dated Aug. 13, 1981; modified by 542874 dated Aug. 27, 1982. – See Transportation Costs, estimated freight versus actual

In determining the deduction for duties from a CIF duty-paid charge, the applicable rate of duty is based upon the rate that is in effect at the time of entry.
542874 dated Aug. 27, 1982; modifies 542467 dated Aug. 13, 1981.

A state sales tax based upon the value of foreign materials and engineering is dutiable under transaction value because the tax is neither a federal tax nor is it part of erection or installation costs. No authority exists to exclude the sales tax from the transaction value of the merchandise.
543161 dated Jan. 3, 1984.

State sales taxes are deductible from the selling price of goods as a cost of erection and installation when the party responsible for the erection and installation of the goods pays such taxes.
543263 dated Sep. 5, 1985.

The amount of Customs duties to be excluded from transaction value is the amount currently payable on the full appraised value of the imported merchandise. The amount of Customs duties to be deducted in this case should
be calculated based upon the sum of the invoice price and the value of the assists (less U.S. freight and brokerage fees).
543557 dated Oct. 2, 1985.

Countervailing duties assessed on imported merchandise, if identified separately from the price actually paid or payable, are to be deducted from transaction value.
543963 dated Sep. 11, 1987; modified by 544722 dated June 4, 1991.

In most instances, a CIF delivered duty paid price does not include anti-dumping duties, countervailing duties, or marking duties. Therefore, these items would usually not be deducted from a CIF delivered price to determine the price actually paid or payable.
544722 dated June 4, 1991; modifies 543963 dated Sep. 11, 1987.

Antidumping duties forming part of a CIF duty-paid price, provided they are identified separately from the price actually paid or payable, constitute Customs duties and other federal taxes and should not be included in the transaction value of imported merchandise determined under section 402(b) of the TAA.
545304 dated Jan. 4, 1994.

546037 dated Jan. 31, 1996. - See Transportation Costs, international freight deduction.

The transaction value of imported merchandise does not include any cost incurred for Customs duties associated with the imported merchandise, if such duties are identified separately from the price actually paid or payable. The actual U.S. duties, not the estimated duties, are excluded from the price actually paid or payable.
546111 dated Mar. 1, 1996.

The antidumping duties to be deducted from the price actually paid or payable pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3) are the actual antidumping duties, which are determined at the time of liquidation based on the rate in effect for the subject entries. Therefore, the rate of antidumping duties deductible from the price actually paid or payable is $21.83 per metric ton. Post-importation price adjustments do not affect the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547612 dated Dec. 27, 2001.

The importer utilizes the services of a logistics company to prepare export documentation, payment of terminal charges, and other origin related services. Of the services provided, the fees charged by the logistics company are terminal handling charge, container seal fee, origin handling, documentation fee, AMS cargo declaration data charge, equipment interchange receipt, container freight station, clearance & customs, and value added tax ("VAT") which are incident to the international shipment of the merchandise. The VAT is a tax imposed by the foreign government on the freight services of an international freight forwarder performed in the foreign port. The VAT is excluded from the price paid or payable to the extent that the VAT assessed represents a tax on the freight services of an international freight forwarder and not a tax on the merchandise.
H264877 dated July 10, 2015.

identified separately requirement

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 3.1

The amount of a countervailing duty is separately identified on the consumption entry with respect to the imported merchandise. This provides sufficient
identification of the countervailing duty and this amount is to be deducted from transaction value.
543963 dated Sep. 11, 1987; modified by 544722 dated June 4, 1991.

The specific amounts involved in the terms of sale, "DEQ duty and ADD paid," are considered part of the duty-paid price, provided they are identified separately from the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, they constitute Customs duties and/or other federal taxes and should not be included in the transaction value of imported merchandise under section 402(b) of the TAA.
546191 dated Apr. 12, 1999.

The importer paid internal Canadian taxes for the purchase of an automobile. These taxes were separately identified in the bill of sale. Assuming that the taxes were refunded to the importer, they are not considered a condition of sale. When taxes paid in the country of exportation are refunded to the importer, then those taxes are not included in the price actually paid or payable.
548128 dated July 15, 2002.

A United States resident purchased an automobile imported from Canada. The buyer paid the entirety of the purchase price, including the separately itemized amount for a “goods & services tax” (GST). The GST is not properly included in the transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable, nor is it an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
548161 dated Aug. 21, 2002.

offsetting overpayment of duties

An importer may not offset a current duty obligation based on a claim that excess duties were paid for mold charges attributable to prior shipments of past entries which all have been liquidated.
545417 dated May 27, 1994.

In accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1514 and 1520, Customs is without legal authority to reduce the importer's 1992 duty liability to account for overpayments of duties reflected through the cost reconciliations submitted from 1988 to 1991.
545578 dated Sep. 13, 1994.

547037 dated July 12, 1999. - <u>See</u> Transportation Costs, estimated freight versus actual.

Based on the evidence presented, the additional duties paid as a result of the EC Banana Regime Sanctions are included in, or form part of, the duty paid price for the subject merchandise and should be excluded from the price actually paid or payable pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 402(b)(4)(A) of the TAA. The 1.4 percent rate of duty was not the actual rate of duty applied to the merchandise; therefore, it was not the proper rate to use to determine the amount to be excluded from the price
for duties. Rather, the actual rate of 100% should have been used to calculate the non-dutiable charges.
547677 dated June 30, 2000.

The importer failed to account for future rebates determined by the fluctuation in market prices. If the rebates are not accounted for at the time of entry, this failure precludes the use of these rebates as reimbursements that may offset the duties owed on the royalty payments in a prior disclosure.
548055 dated Mar. 14, 2002.

Customs does not have the legal authority to reduce an importer's current duty liability to account for alleged overpayments that were not protested by the importer.
548096 dated June 4, 2002.

special safeguard duties (SSG)

The United States imposes additional Special Safeguard (SSG) duties on certain agricultural goods pursuant to Article 5 of the Uruguay Round's Agreement on Agriculture. These duties are imposed if the price at which a product enters falls below a specified trigger price, or if the volume of such imports exceeds a specified trigger level. For the U.S., the schedule of agricultural goods and the SSGs for those goods are set out in subchapter IV of Chapter 99, HTSUS. Appraised value for imports into the U.S. is normally reported and calculated on an FOB basis, with freight reported separately. The procedures for assessment of price-based SSGs as set forth in Article 5 are based on CIF prices, both for the initial determination of trigger prices and for the price of each shipment. Therefore, Customs should use CIF prices in the administration of price-based Special Safeguard (SSG) duties.
548367 dated Oct. 22, 2003.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

INTRODUCTION

The Foreign Trade Zones Act provides that merchandise may be brought into foreign trade zones and "may be stored, sold, exhibited, broken up, repacked, assembled, distributed, or otherwise manipulated, or be manufactured except as otherwise provided in this chapter, and be exported, destroyed, or sent into Customs territory of the United States. . . ." 19 U.S.C. 81c (1982).

19 CFR 146.65(b) states the following:

(b) Valuation - (1) Total zone value. The total zone value of merchandise provided for in this section will be determined in accordance with the principles of valuation contained in sections 402 and 500 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 1401a, 1500). The total zone value shall be that price actually paid or payable to the zone seller in the transaction that caused the merchandise to be transferred from the zone. Where there is no price paid or payable, the total zone value shall be the cost of all materials and zone processing costs related to the merchandise transferred from the zone.
(2) Dutiable value. The dutiable value of merchandise provided for in this section shall be the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise in the transaction that caused the merchandise to be admitted into the zone less, if included, international shipment and insurance costs and U.S. inland freight costs. If there is no such price actually paid or payable, or no reasonable representation of that cost, the dutiable value may be determined by excluding from the zone value any included zone costs of processing or fabrication, general expenses and profit and the international shipment and insurance costs and U.S. inland freight costs related to the merchandise transferred from the zone. The dutiable value of recoverable waste or scrap provided for in [section] 146.42(b) will be the price actually paid or payable to the zone seller in the transaction that caused the recoverable waste or scrap to be transferred from the zone.

Judicial Precedent:

Goodman Mfg., L.P. v. United States, 855 F.Supp. 1313 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1994), rev'd, 69 F.3d 505 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

This case involves the valuation of privileged merchandise (steel) transferred from Goodman's foreign trade subzone into Customs territory. Goodman used all of the 28,109 pounds of steel in its production of heating furnaces and from this production, resulting in 2,652 pounds of steel scrap, which was entered and

appraised based on the transaction value of its transfer from the subzone and entry into domestic commerce. Customs calculated the value of the steel by subtracting freight, insurance and the sale price received from the scrap dealer who purchased the steel scrap from the full price paid for all 28,109 pounds of steel admitted to the foreign trade zone. The Court held that Goodman did not overcome the presumption of correctness attached to Customs' valuation and upheld Customs' interpretation of 19 U.S.C. 81c.

Goodman Mfg., L.P. v. United States, 69 F.3d 505 (Fed. Cir. 1995), rev'g, 855 F.Supp. 1313 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1994).

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit reversed the Court of International Trade's decision. At issue was the appropriate allowance to be made for waste or scrap when determining the dutiable value of privileged foreign merchandise entered from a foreign trade zone. The appellate court determined that the allowance to be made for the subject steel scrap should represent the difference between the market value of the privileged steel initially brought into the zone, i.e., the quantity of steel scrap multiplied by the value per pound of the privileged foreign steel, and the market value of the steel scrap, i.e., the transaction value of the steel scrap. The court indicated that the calculation of duties would be consistent with the language, or mandates, included in 19 U.S.C. 81c and 19 CFR 146.65(b)(2) concerning the dutiable value of such privileged foreign merchandise.

Headquarters Rulings:

assists

The value of assists provided by the importer must be included in the dutiable value of merchandise when the merchandise is withdrawn from a foreign trade zone.
544250 dated July 26, 1991; 555053 dated July 26, 1991; 544572 dated Aug. 5, 1991.

design and development costs

The importer purchased automobile components from its related party in Japan and brought them into its foreign-trade subzone (FTSZ). In the FTSZ, the components were combined with domestic components to produce finished automobiles that were subsequently sold to two related U.S. companies. The automobiles manufactured in the FTSZ by the importer were originally designed and developed by the related party in Japan. As part of the overall transaction, the two U.S. companies agreed to reimburse the importer's related party for the costs incurred in connection with the development of the vehicles produced by the importer. The dutiable value is based on the price actually paid or payablefor merchandise in the transaction that caused the merchandise to be admitted into the zone. The payments in this case are made indirectly by the two U.S. companies, on behalf of their related party buyer, to the Japanese parent. The payments for the design and development of the imported components constitute part of the price actually paid or payable.
544694 dated Feb. 14, 1995.

merchandise processing fee

The merchandise processing fee is assessed on the total zone value of motor vehicles produced in the foreign trade zone, which includes the value of domestic status merchandise and other U.S. origin value added in the foreign trade zone.
545721 dated Feb. 27, 1995.

valuation

In the instant case, merchandise is not sold for exportation to the United States but rather, it is consigned to the importer until sold in the United States. The fact that the merchandise entered a foreign trade zone after importation does not in any way negate the proper application of section 402 of the TAA.
542748 dated Mar. 31, 1982.

Foreign steel coil is imported and admitted to a foreign trade zone (FTZ) in nonprivileged status. The steel coil is manufactured into steel body stampings. Incident to this manufacture, the coil must be cut to produce blanks, generating scrap. The complete body stampings are then entered for consumption, duty is paid, and the stampings are readmitted to the FTZ in privileged domestic status. The dutiable value of the body stampings includes the total cost of the steel coil used in the manufacture of the stampings, but a deduction is permitted for the value of the recoverable scrap generated as a result of the processing performed in the zone.
543048 dated June 17, 1983; aff'd by 543197 dated May 23, 1984.

There is no transaction value for parts withdrawn from a foreign trade zone in the same condition in which they were entered where the importer's accounting systems can only identify an average price for each part. Under such circumstances, the next legally available alternative method of valuation must be used.
543095 dated Jan. 5, 1984.

A U.S. company purchases bearings from a related manufacturer and admits the bearings into a FTZ in nonprivileged foreign status. The U.S. company resells the bearings to an unrelated purchaser who transfers the merchandise to another FTZ where nonprivileged foreign status is retained. The bearings are incorporated into finished automobiles and withdrawn from the FTZ. The automobiles are neither produced in nor sold for exportation from a foreign country and, therefore, transaction value, deductive value, and computed value cannot be satisfactorily determined. Resort must be made to an alternative value under section 402(f).
543396 dated Aug. 23, 1984.

With respect to programmed production equipment entering a foreign trade zone, the total zone value of the equipment includes the full value of the software, as reflected in the foreign manufacturer's commercial accounts, as well as programming costs incurred in the FTZ. This value is then reduced by international shipment and insurance costs as well as costs and expenses incurred in the zone (programming costs) to arrive at the final

dutiable value.
543391 dated Feb. 18, 1987.

The zone value is the price actually paid or payable in the transaction that caused the generator to be transferred from one subzone to another. Pursuant to 19 CFR 146.65(b)(2), the dutiable value of the generator is the zone value, less any included zone costs of processing or fabrication, general expenses and profit and any costs related to international shipment and insurance costs, and U.S. inland freight costs. In the instant case, there are no adjustments to be made to the zone value.
544818 dated Apr. 1, 1993.

Leather or hide is admitted to a FTZ for cutting into shoe parts and manufactured into shoes. After cutting, some of the leather will not be used in the shoe production and is destroyed as scrap (due to flaws and irregularities). Some unused, extra leather will be used for a future cutting operation and is returned to inventory. When manufacturing the shoes from the shoe parts, more leather is rendered to scrap through the trimming process. Because the leather scrapped in both stages of production, as opposed to the leather returned to inventory, may be considered "used" in the manipulation or manufacture of the footwear, the former but not the latter would be included in the transaction value of the leather used in the manufacture of the footwear. The allowance made for the leather waste is calculated by taking the difference between the market value of the privileged leather initially brought into the zone and the market value of the leather scrap. In this case, because the leather was destroyed, with no market value, a full value allowance reflected by the market value of the privileged leather initially brought into the zone is appropriate.
546190 dated July 31, 1996.

The proper method of appraisement for merchandise entered into the Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) consisting of non-privileged foreign status plastic housing, domestic status bulbs, and domestic status blister pack & carton should be appraised based upon the value of the foreign plastic housing and not the domestic packaging on the foreign status cartons which are crushed in the FTZ and entered into Customs territory separately as scrap or waste. Thus, non-privileged foreign status cartons which have been crushed and bundled in the FTZ, should be appraised pursuant to 19 CFR 146.65(b)(2) at the price actually paid to the importer for the recyclable waste as set forth on the commercial invoice or the price paid to the zone seller for the recyclable waste.
547142 dated May 12, 1999.

The importer claims that merchandise deteriorated while stored in the FTZ because it depreciated in value as a result of age and changing fashions. The imported garments do not quality for an allowance of deterioration under 19 CFR 146.65(b)(3), in that the claim of deterioration of the merchandise occurred after the date of importation and it did not involve moisture, impurities or perishable merchandise. Also, there is no indication that the importer suffered a casualty, loss or theft. Therefore, the merchandise is subject to appraisement based on the transaction that caused the merchandise to be admitted to the FTZ.

547936 dated Aug. 3, 2001.

Foreign sellers retain title to merchandise admitted into a Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) until it is purchased and withdrawn from the FTZ by the importer. Therefore, there is no price actually paid or payable upon which to base the dutiable value of the merchandise admitted to the FTZ. In such instances, the dutiable value is based on the total zone value, i.e., the price actually paid or payable to the zone seller in the transaction that causes the merchandise to be transferred from the zone, less any costs specified in 19 CFR 146.65(b)(2).

H010949 dated July 31, 2007.

Foreign sellers retain title to merchandise admitted into a Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) until it is purchased and withdrawn from the FTZ by the importer. Therefore, there is no price actually paid or payable upon which to base the dutiable value of the merchandise admitted to the FTZ. The price that the importer will actually pay for the merchandise fluctuates, as it is determined pursuant to a formula that incorporates publicly reported prices of metals used in the merchandise. The dutiable value of the merchandise will be based on the total zone value, i.e., the price actually paid or payable to the zone seller in the transaction that causes the merchandise to be transferred from the zone, less any costs specified in 19 CFR 146.65(b)(2). However, the foreign seller must submit a "Separate Value" for the merchandise when it is admitted to the FTZ using Customs Form 214. As the price actually paid for the merchandise will not be known until it is purchased in the zone by the importer, CBP does not object to the proposal to use the value of the most recent sale between the foreign seller and the importer for identical or similar merchandise as the basis of the separate value declared on Customs Form 214.

H017624 dated Sep. 28, 2007.

H086775 dated Mar. 12, 2010 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, price renegotiation.

FORMULAS IN DETERMINING THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE

INTRODUCTION

In determining transaction value, the Customs regulations provide:

(a) Price actually paid or payable - (1) General. In determining transaction value, the price actually paid or payable will be considered without regard to its method of derivation. It may be the result of discounts, increases, or negotiations, or may be arrived at by the application of a formula, such as the price in effect on the date of export in the London Commodity Market. The word "payable" refers to a situation in which the price has been agreed upon, but actual payment has not been made at the time of importation. Payment may be made by letters of credit or negotiable instruments and may be made directly or indirectly. (19 CFR 152.103(a)(1))

GATT Valuation Agreement:

CCC Technical Committee Commentary 4.1 deals with Price Review Clauses, and states:

1. In commercial practice some contracts may include a price review clause whereby the price is only provisionally fixed, the final determination of the price payable being subject to certain factors which are set forth in the provisions of the contract itself.
2. The situation can occur in a variety of ways. The first is where the goods are delivered some considerable time after the placing of the original order (e.g., plant and capital equipment made specially to order); the contract specifies that the final price will be determined on the basis of an agreed formula which recognizes increases or decreases of elements such as cost of labour, raw materials, overhead costs and other inputs incurred in the production of the goods.
3. The second situation is where the quantity of goods ordered is manufactured and delivered over a period of time; given the same type of contract specifications described in paragraph 2 above, the final price of the first unit is different from that of the last unit and all other units, notwithstanding that each price was derived from the same formula specified in the original contract.
4. Another situation is where the goods are provisionally priced but, again in accordance with the provisions of the sales contract, final settlement is predicated on examination or analysis at the time of delivery (e.g., the acidity level of vegetable oils, the metal content of ores, or the clean content of wool).
5. The transaction value of imported goods, defined in Article 1 of the Agreement, is based on the price actually paid or payable for the goods. In the Interpretative Note to that Article, the price actually paid or payable is the total payment made or to be made by the buyer to the seller for the imported goods. Hence, in contracts containing a review clause, the transaction value of the imported goods must be based on the total final price paid or payable in accordance with the contractual stipulations. Since the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods can be established on the basis of data specified in the

contract, price review clauses of this type described in this commentary should not be regarded as constituting a condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined (see Article 1.1(b) of the Agreement).
6. As to the practical aspects of the matter, where the price review clauses have already produced their full effect by the time of valuation, no problems arise since the price actually paid or payable is known. The situation differs where price review clauses are linked to variables which come into play some time after the goods have been imported.
7. However given that the Agreement recommends that, as far as possible, the transaction value of the goods being valued should serve as a basis for Customs value, even though it is not always possible to determine the price payable at the time of importation, price review clauses should not, of themselves, preclude valuation under Article 1 of the Agreement.

Headquarters Rulings:

pre-determined formula agreed to between parties

19 CFR 152.103(a)(1); CCC Technical Committee Commentary 4.1

The importer purchases generators on a CIF, duty-paid, installed price. The purchase price includes amounts for assembling the generators subsequent to their importation into the United States. An escalation provision contained in the contract sets forth a formula which allows the amount of escalation to be determined from certain indices when they are published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The escalation amounts are calculated monthly in proportion to the work performed and invoiced. The formula for determining the escalation amount was arrived at prior to the importation of the merchandise and, therefore, the escalation payments attributable to the dutiable portions of the contract price should be taken into account in determining the price actually paid or payable.
542671 dated Mar. 15, 1982.

In situations in which the price actually paid or payable is determined pursuant to a formula, a firm price need not be known or ascertainable at the time of importation, although it is necessary for the formula to be fixed at that time so that a final sales price can be determined at a later time on the basis of some future event over which neither the seller nor the buyer has any control.
542701 dated Apr. 28, 1982 (TAA No. 47).

In the event that the price actually paid or payable is to be ascertained according to a formula that is in existence prior to the exportation of the goods, the price has been set prior to exportation. Even though it may not be possible at the time of exportation to ascertain an exact dollar amount owed for the goods, a price actually paid or payable has been established.
543189 dated Oct. 19, 1983.

In a contract for the sale of merchandise, the parties derive the price actually paid or payable from a formula based upon the importer's industrial engineering standards and

actual production rates in the United States, subject to anticipated period adjustments. At the time of entry, duties are deposited based upon standard production costs. Subsequently, it is discovered that the actual costs are lower. The price actually paid or payable is represented by the price derived from the pricing formula, i.e., that which takes into account the subsequent adjustment for actual costs.
543285 dated Mar. 20, 1984.

A price that requires adjustment, either upward or downward, determined pursuant to a formula, represents transaction value. The formula must be in existence prior to the date of exportation. Because the formula is in existence prior to the date of exportation, there is no rebate effected after the date of importation, even though the price may not be ascertainable until after the date of importation.
543352 dated Mar. 30, 1984.

543089 dated June 20, 1984 - See Currency Conversion, formulas used in determining the price actually paid or payable.

Although a firm price is not ascertainable at the time of importation, a fixed formula or methodology exists which is determined prior to importation so that a final sales price can be subsequently determined. The adjustments made to the provisional price indicated on the invoice at the time of entry do not constitute either rebates or decreases in the price actually paid or payable. Duties are deposited based upon the provisional invoice price with an adjustment to be reported at the end of a six-month period.
543917 dated Aug. 27, 1987.

543940 dated Nov. 4, 1987 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, formula used in determining transaction value.

543983 dated Dec. 2, 1987. - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, formula used in determining transaction value.

The importer obtains samples from a manufacturer located in Hong Kong. Mutilated prototype samples are shipped to the importer for approval. Once approved, the importer instructs the manufacturer to produce additional samples in order for the importer to solicit orders. An amount paid on an annual basis, which totals the value set forth on the invoices for all the individual shipments of samples during the year, represents the transaction value of the imported samples.
544317 dated Apr. 24, 1990.

544364 dated Oct. 9, 1990. -See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, formula used in determining transaction value.

Where the price actually paid or payable is not certain at the time of importation, appraisement under transaction value is still appropriate as long as a fixed formula or methodology exists for later determining the price. Such a formula must be determined prior to importation of the merchandise and also must be based on a future event over

which neither the seller nor the buyer has any control. In this case, the price actually paid or payable is not ascertainable under the formula derived by the parties. The uncertainty regarding payment precludes appraisement of the merchandise under transaction value.
545622 dated Apr. 28, 1994; revokes 544812 dated Mar. 3, 1994.

545532 dated Sep. 14, 1994. - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, post-importation refund.

Transaction value is rejected in this case as a means of appraisement because the price actually paid or payable cannot be determined. The alleged formula agreed to between the parties in determining the price actually paid or payable allows for adjustments that can be renegotiated and are within the control of the parties.
544840 dated Sep. 29, 1994; aff'g 544707 dated July 16, 1991.

545388 dated Oct. 21, 1994. - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, formula used in determining transaction value.

Customs has the authority to appraise merchandise pursuant to a formula using transaction value so long as a final sales price can be determined at a later time on the basis of some future event or occurrence over which neither the seller nor the buyer has any control. Where the future event is subject to the control of the seller or buyer, however, the formula is unacceptable under the transaction value. In this case, the actual final price for the imported merchandise is arrived at through negotiations that may continue after the merchandise is imported into the United States. These negotiations take into account any discounts, rebates or other sales price adjustments. The parties exercise control over whether and to what degree the price is adjusted. This control eliminates consideration of the pricing methodology as an acceptable formula, and transaction value is not appropriate in appraising the merchandise.
545618 dated Aug. 23, 1996.

At the time of importation, the price for the imported merchandise is subject to change based on formula pricing and currency fluctuations. The price at the time of importation is not a fixed price and it is subject to year-end adjustments, which may not result in a fixed price until fifteen months after importation. The ultimate purchase price of the merchandise is dependent upon the gross annual production of the product worldwide and the invoice between the parties is a good faith estimate submitted at the time of importation. Transaction value is not applicable as a method of appraisement in this case. This is not an acceptable formula as provided for in 19 CFR 152.103(a), as a means of determining the price actually paid or payable.
546421 dated Mar. 27, 1998.

The importer intends to import merchandise from its related party seller based on a provisional price. At a time specified in the contract, the actual price is determined through the application of an agreed-upon formula between the parties. The final sales price is determined based upon a set price that is published in a certain publication on a specified future date. This standard in determining the price is a future event over which

neither the seller nor the buyer has any control, and the formula upon which to determine the price is agreed to prior to the exportation of the goods. The agreed-upon formula between the parties is sufficient to establish a price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise pursuant to transaction value.
546736 dated Mar. 31, 1998.

A U.S. importer is importing workstations that may be divided into "split shipments." A "split shipment" occurs when components of the whole are divided into two or more shipments and processed as separate Customs entries. The formula proposed by the importer ascertains a value for an individual workstation trim unit, which, when all individual workstation values are combined, accounts for the total contract price paid from the buyer to the seller for the workstations. The proposed formula is an acceptable apportionment method for the split shipments. This assumes the results are reasonable, verifiable, and in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
547313 dated July 19, 1999.

currency conversion

543094 dated Mar. 30, 1984; 543252 dated Mar. 30, 1984. – See Currency Conversion, formulas used in determining the price actually paid or payable.

543089 dated June 20, 1984 - See Currency Conversion, formulas used in determining the price actually paid or payable.

price actually paid or payable

"Commissions" paid to the buyer by the seller for lost profits under a sales agreement and payments made by the seller to the buyer under a second agreement are not made pursuant to a formula for purposes of 19 CFR 152.103(a)(1). The payments cannot be deducted from the CIF price to arrive at the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
544464 dated Apr. 30, 1991.

A U.S. importer purchases frozen vegetables and mushrooms in jars from its wholly-owned Mexican subsidiaries. The invoices submitted for appraisement reflect transfer, or estimated, prices based on an “export invoice pricing policy.” The importer effects payments via lump sum monthly transfers in response to the exporter’s request for funds, without regard to specific entries. An aggregate average price, as opposed to an entry specific price, is derived from the prices set by the Mexican exporters and which fluctuate based on actual costs and shipping volume. This method of pricing does not represent a formula nor does it result in a fixed price for the merchandise. In addition, evidence has not been provided concerning the circumstances of sale between the related parties that would indicate that their relationship did not influence the price actually paid or payable. Transaction value is not applicable as a means of appraisement.
546231 dated Feb. 10, 1997.

The importer intends on purchasing scrap gold from a company located in Grand Cayman, British West Indies for the purpose of refining its precious metal content. The final purchase price the importer will pay for the scrap gold is based on a percentage of the spot price of the gold, i.e. the current price at which a troy ounce of gold can be bought or sold on the Comex division of the New York Mercantile Exchange, after the scrap is imported and certain tests conducted. Although the price paid or payable is not certain at the time of importation, appraisement under transaction value is appropriate so long as before exportation of the merchandise, a fixed formula or methodology for determining the sale price is established by an objective standard over which neither party has control.
H133039 dated Feb. 25, 2011.

W548314 is a revocation of Headquarters Ruling Letter ("HRL") 547654. In HRL W548314, CBP expanded its interpretation of "objective formula," allowing importers to claim post-importation adjustments. CBP stated that when companies use inter-company transfer prices for purchases from related party sellers, any post-importation price adjustments may form part of the customs value, and should therefore be reported to CBP if the adjustments meet the requirements of the new ''five factor'' test for formula pricing. In addition, importers must continue to demonstrate that the ''circumstances of sale'' test is met showing that the related-party status does not influence the adjusted price declared as the customs value. Importers are also strongly encouraged to use reconciliation to report their post-importation adjustments.
W548314 dated May 16, 2012.

The importer is an exclusive distributor of motor vehicles purchased from the seller/manufacturer (parent company) for re-sale in the U.S. market. The importer made post-importation adjustments pursuant to a bilateral APA subject to Headquarters Ruling Letter ("HRL") H029658 dated December 8, 2009; however, these adjustments were referred to and booked as "marketing support" payments. In this case, the parent company made payments to the importer as reimbursement of media and production costs and incentive expenses. The importer argued that these payments are part of the transaction value formula set forth in the importer's APA that was approved as the basis of appraisement in H029658 (claiming duty refunds). CBP determined that the importer could not claim these post-importation adjustments because these adjustments did not relate to the value of the merchandise since (1) adjustments were not booked as Costs of Goods Sold ("COGS"), the COGS, which represents the price actually paid or payable remained unchanged); (2) payments were classified as a reduction in marketing expenses in accordance with companies' financial support agreement, and it was indicative of the fact that the related parties did not intend the payments to affect COGS; (3) profitability was adjusted for tax purposes; (4) "marketing support" payments were not covered transactions under the APA and did not represent part of the price actually paid or payable. In reaching this conclusion, CBP also considered the nature of payments and what these payments are supposed to achieve.
H125118 dated Sep. 12, 2014.

provisional price

The fact that the price actually paid or payable for purposes of transaction value may be unknown at the time of exportation does not prevent appraisement under transaction value where the price is subject to a formula. However, in this case, there is no price actually paid or payable for shipments of merchandise that are entered under the provisional price because the price is subject to adjustment after exportation without the benefit of a formula. The absence of a firm price for the merchandise imported under these entries prevents appraisement pursuant to transaction value.
544666 dated Apr. 5, 1993.

Under the terms of a "Purchase and Sale Agreement," the buyer purchases and imports from the seller in order to satisfy all of its requirements for the use of a certain chemical in the manufacture of a pesticide product. The agreement establishes a provisional price. This price represents the seller's full cost to produce the chemical at a fixed exchange rate, but does not include an amount for profit. At the end of each contract year, the provisional price is adjusted to reflect the seller's overall cost of production, which includes overhead and other costs. The agreement requires the seller to notify the buyer of the provisional price at the beginning of each contract year. The buyer is then obligated to generate statements, based on the provisional price, showing its anticipated profit on sales. If the profits are unsatisfactory for either party, the parties enter into good faith negotiations to arrive at new cost numbers on which to recalculate profit figures. The formula pursuant to which the price of the imported base chemical is determined is not acceptable for transaction value purposes because the price actually paid or payable is unknown at the time the merchandise is shipped. The final price for each contract year is not set until the seller determines its overall costs for that year.
545609 dated Aug. 11, 1995.

546231 dated Feb. 10, 1997 - <u>See</u> Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

The contract between the seller and the buyer provided that invoice prices would be paid at the time of entry, based upon the expected prices for the forthcoming months. Actual revenues and costs incurred were calculated at the end of each month. The amounts of the actual revenues and costs incurred were within the control of one of the parties. There was a difference between the estimated paid costs at the time of entry and the actual costs or "prices" calculated a month later according to the contract. The buyer seeks a refund from Customs for the portion of duty paid on the estimated cost "price." Although the contract specified a method that would be used to determine the price for the product and arguably could be viewed as a formula for such, it is not a formula upon which transaction value can be based. If a future event in the formula is subject to the control of either the seller or the buyer, then the formula fails to establish a "price actually paid or payable" pursuant to transaction value.
547493 dated Mar. 14, 2002.

The price payable by the importer was unknown at the time of shipment and the formula for calculating the price was based on the average of the Mid West Transaction Price

published in Platts for the month that the shipment is made. The invoice accompanying the shipment recited a "provisional price." The importer pays the invoice that recites the provisional price. Thereafter, on a monthly basis, Rio Tinto recalculates the price for the ingot and issues the customer a credit or a debit. The pricing formula constituted the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The existence of a volumetric discount, to the extent that it was in effect prior to importation, was outside both seller and buyer control as well.
H023813 dated Dec. 1, 2008.

sufficient information available to determine price actually paid or payable

Where the invoice price to a buyer is based on standard costs, but variances from standards are known at the time of importation and reconciliation is made at reasonable intervals, the price actually paid or payable is the amount paid after adjustments for the variances.
542975 dated Mar. 9, 1983 (TAA No. 60).

543352 dated Mar. 30, 1984. - See Formulas in Determining the Price Actually Paid or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

GENERALLY ACCEPTED ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(g)(3) states:

For purposes of this section, information that is submitted by an importer, buyer, or producer in regard to the appraisement of merchandise may not be rejected by the customs officer concerned on the basis of the accounting method by which that information was prepared, if the preparation was in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The term "generally accepted accounting principles" refers to any generally recognized consensus or substantial authoritative support regarding -
(A) which economic resources and obligations should be recorded as assets and liabilities;
(B) which changes in assets and liabilities should be recorded;
(C) how the assets and liabilities and changes in them should be measured;
(D) what information should be disclosed and how it should be disclosed; and
(E) which financial statements should be prepared.
The applicability of a particular set of generally accepted accounting principles will depend upon the basis on which the value of the merchandise is sought to be established.

The parallel Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.102(c)(1) through (3).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Interpretative Notes, General Note, Use of generally accepted accounting principles, paragraph 1, is similar to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(g) (3).

In addition, paragraph 2 of the same General Note, with respect to generally accepted accounting principles, states:

For the purposes of this Agreement, the customs administration of each party shall utilize information prepared in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles in the country which is appropriate for the Article in question. For example, the determination of usual profit and general expenses under the provisions of Article 5 [deductive value] would be carried out utilizing information prepared in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles of the country of importation. On the other hand, the determination of usual profit and general expenses under the provisions of Article 6 [computed value] would be carried out utilizing information prepared in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles of the country of production. As a further example, the determination of an element provided for in Article 8.1(b)(ii)

[tools, dies, moulds and similar items used in the production of the imported goods] undertaken in the country of importation would be carried out utilizing information in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles of that country.

Headquarters Rulings:

apportionment and depreciation of assists; 19 CFR 152.103(e)

542302 dated Feb. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 18) - See Assists, apportionment of assists.

542356 dated Apr. 13, 1981 (TAA No. 24); 542477 dated July 27, 1981. – See Assists, apportionment of assists.

542361 dated July 14, 1981; overruled on other grounds by 544858 dated Dec. 13, 1991. – See Assists, apportionment of assists.

542519 dated July 21, 1981 (TAA No. 35). - See Assists, apportionment of assists.

543233 dated Aug. 9, 1984. - See Assists, depreciation of assists.

Assets having a useful life of more than one year are capital assets subject to depreciation over their useful lives. While generally accepted accounting principles allow expensing the cost of an asset in the year of acquisition when its cost is insignificant and the asset is held for over one year, this should not be construed to mean that the asset has a zero book value. While the value of fully depreciated assists is limited to transportation costs to the foreign plant, capital assets (assists) which are permitted to be expensed by GAAP are not necessarily assets with a zero book value for Customs valuation purposes. Such assets require the determination as to what, if any, book value remains if being depreciated over their useful lives.
543450 dated June 25, 1985.

543806 dated Mar. 12, 1987 - See Assists, apportionment of assists.

544194 dated May 23, 1988; Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 22, No. 25, June 22, 1988 – See Assists, drawback on assists.

544243 dated Oct. 24, 1988; 544256 dated Nov. 15, 1988. – See Assists,

transportation costs.

If development, plans, sketches, etc., are used in the production of merchandise that is only partially for export to the United States, or if the assists are used in several countries, then the costs of these assists may be apportioned to the imported merchandise in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
544337 dated Apr. 9, 1990.

547936 dated Aug. 3, 2001. - See Foreign Trade Zones, valuation.

computed value

GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Use of generally accepted accounting principles, Paragraph 2

542325 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 23). - See Computed Value, cost of fabrication.

542658 dated Jan. 12, 1982 (TAA No. 44); 542873 dated July 20, 1982 (TAA No. 44, Supp. No. 1) – See Computed Value, cost of fabrication.

543276 dated May 15, 1984. - See Computed Value, profit and general expenses.

In determining the computed value of imported merchandise, Customs relies upon information derived from the commercial accounts of the foreign assembler. If those accounts reflect a loss during a separate accounting period from that during which the merchandise under consideration is assembled, this loss may not be carried forward to offset profits, if any, realized during the latter period. Additionally, even if the account reflects that the loss is experienced during the same account period as the period during which the merchandise is assembled, it is necessary for the importer to establish that offsetting the loss against future profits is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles applied in the country of production.
543857 dated Feb. 18, 1987.

The importer owns a maquiladora facility in Mexico. The importer opened the facility in 2009 as a finishing plant for denim jeans imported, marketed, and distributed by the importer in the United States. The importer enters the merchandise imported from Mexico pursuant to the computed value method of appraisement. For fiscal year 2011, The importer included a complete 12-month period of costs in its budget for its maquiladora facility, including production and labor costs, and administrative, general, and overhead expenses. These expenses were incorrectly reported because the maquiladora only operated as a production facility for eight out of the twelve months in 2011. Therefore, the importer proposed to reduce the amount for direct labor costs, overhead production costs, and general and administrative costs, appearing on the books of the maquiladora, by 66.66% to reflect the four months of 2011 during which no garments were produced by the maquiladora. CBP determined that the importer must report its final actual costs to CBP in accordance with GAAP, reducing the amount for the direct labor costs,

overhead production costs, and general and administrative costs, to reflect the fact that the maquiladora in Mexico was only opened for eight months in 2011.
H242984 dated Feb. 19, 2014.

interest expense

542849 dated Aug. 6, 1982. - See Computed Value, profit and general expenses.

543031 dated Apr. 12, 1983. - See Interest Charges, computed value.

rejection of accounting system

19 U.S.C. 1401a(g)(3); 19 CFR 152.102(c)(3)

If information submitted by an importer in regard to the appraisement of merchandise is prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, then such information may not be rejected by Customs on the basis of the accounting method by which that information is prepared. However, the transaction value derived from such value information may be rejected as not being in accordance with section 402(b).
543095 dated Jan. 5, 1984.

repairs

When merchandise is returned to the United States for repair, adjustments to the original purchase price in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles are made in order to properly appraise the merchandise.
543637 dated Dec. 2, 1985.

start-up costs

Start-up costs in excess of those amounts normally anticipated (excess costs) may be accounted for under transaction value through the use of an excess costs account which is periodically updated. The excess costs may then be amortized over the current and future production of goods and reflected in their transfer price in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
543153 dated May 1, 1984.

zero-value assists

See this chapter, section on apportionment and depreciation of assists, supra.

IMPORTER'S OPTIONS

INTRODUCTION

With respect to the statutory hierarchy and what option the importer has regarding this hierarchy, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(a) states:

In General. (1) Except as otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, imported merchandise shall be appraised, for the purposes of this Act, on the basis of the following -

(A) The transaction value provided for under subsection (b).
(B) The transaction value of identical merchandise provided for under subsection (c), if the value referred to in subparagraph (A) cannot be determined, or can be determined but cannot be used by reason of subsection (b)(2).
(C) The transaction value of similar merchandise provided for under subsection (c), if the value referred to in subparagraph (B) cannot be determined.
(D) The deductive value provided for under subsection (d), if the value referred to in subparagraph (C) cannot be determined and if the importer does not request alternative valuation under paragraph (2).
(E) The computed value provided for under subsection (e), if the value referred to in subparagraph (D) cannot be determined.
(F) The value provided for under subsection (f), if the value referred to in subparagraph (E) cannot be determined.

(2) If the value referred to in paragraph (1)(C) cannot be determined with respect to the imported merchandise, the merchandise shall be appraised on the basis of the computed value provided for under paragraph (1)(E), rather than the deductive value provided for under paragraph (1)(D), if the importer makes a request to that effect to the customs officer concerned within such time as the Secretary may prescribe. If the computed value of the merchandise cannot subsequently be determined, the merchandise may not be appraised on the basis of the value referred to in paragraph (1)(F) unless the deductive value of the merchandise cannot be determined under paragraph (1) (D).
(3) Upon written request therefor by the importer of merchandise, and subject to provisions of law regarding the disclosure of information, the customs officer concerned shall provide the importer with a written explanation of how the value of that merchandise was determined under this section.

19 CFR 152.101(c) states:

Importer's option. The importer may request the application of the computed value method before the deductive value method. The request must be made at the time the entry summary for the merchandise is filed with the port director (see 141.0a(b) of this chapter) [definition of entry summary]. If the importer makes the request, but the value of the imported merchandise cannot be determined usingthe computed value method, the merchandise will be appraised using the deductive value method if it is possible to do so. If the deductive value cannot be determined, the appraised value will be determined as provided for in [section] 152.107.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

The importer's option regarding the use of computed value prior to deductive value is provided for in Article 4, and in Interpretative Notes, General Note, Sequential application of valuation methods, Paragraph 3.

Headquarters Rulings:

computed value versus deductive value

19 U.S.C. 1401a(a); 19 CFR 152.101(c); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 4 and Interpretative Notes, General Note, Sequential application of valuation methods, Paragraph 3

542765 dated Apr. 20, 1982. - See Computed Value, election by importer between computed and deductive value.

If transaction value and transaction value of identical or similar merchandise cannot be determined, then the Customs value will be based upon deductive value, unless the importer has elected computed value.
543912 dated Apr. 19, 1988.

elimination of transaction value

19 U.S.C. 1401a(a); 19 CFR 152.101(b); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 4

542972 dated Jan. 6, 1983. - See Sequential Order, hierarchy of valuation methods.

INDIRECT PAYMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The price actually paid or payable is defined in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (4) (A) as follows:

The term "price actually paid or payable" means the total payment (whether direct or indirect, and exclusive of any costs, charges, or expenses incurred for transportation, insurance, and related services incident to the international shipment of the merchandise from the country of exportation to the place of importation in the United States) made, or to be made, for imported merchandise by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller. (Emphasis added)

The corresponding Customs regulation defines the price actually paid or payable in 19 CFR 152.102(f) (same language as statute).

In addition, 19 CFR 152.103(a)(2) states:

Indirect payment. An indirect payment would include the settlement by the buyer, in whole or in part, of a debt owed by the seller, or where the buyer receives a price reduction on a current importation as a means of settling a debt owed him by the seller. Activities such as advertising, undertaken by the buyer on his own account, other than those for which an adjustment is provided in [section] 152.103(b), will not be considered an indirect payment to the seller though they may benefit the seller. The costs of those activities will not be added to the price actually paid or payable in determining the customs value of the imported merchandise.

Also, 19 CFR 152.103(a)(1), Example 4 states:

Company X in the United States pays $2,000 to Y Toy Factory abroad for a shipment of toys. The $2,000 consists of $1,850 for the toys and $150 for ocean freight and insurance. Y Toy Factory would have charged Company X $2,200 for the toys; however, because Y owed Company X $350, Y charged only $1,850 for the toys. What is the transaction value?
The transaction value of the imported merchandise is $2,200, that is, the sum of the $1,850 plus the $350 indirect payment. Because the transaction value excludes CIF charges, the $150 ocean freight and insurance charge is excluded.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 8.1 deals with credits in respect of

earlier transactions, and states:

1. How are credits made in respect of earlier transactions to be treated under the Valuation Agreement when valuing goods that have received the benefit of that credit?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:

The amount of the credit represents an amount already paid to the seller and accordingly is covered by the Interpretative note to Article 1 on "price actually paid or payable" which specifies that the price actually paid or payable is the total payment of the imported goods made, or to be made, to the seller. Thus the credit is part of the price paid and for valuation purposes must be included in the transaction value.
The treatment to be accorded by Customs to the previous transactions which gave rise to the credit must be decided separately from any decision on the proper Customs value of the present shipment. The decision whether adjustment may be made to the value of the previous shipment will depend on national legislation.

Headquarters Rulings:

advertising expenses

19 CFR 152.103(a)(2)

The importer and the manufacturer have entered into an agreement for the purchase of vodka. The contract specifically provides for a minimum amount to be expended by the buyer on advertising. Although this may benefit the seller indirectly, the advertising costs are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
544482 dated Aug. 30, 1990.

compensation for assists as indirect payments,

See also, chapter on PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE, infra.

543324 dated Aug. 8, 1984. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect payments.

Monies paid directly or indirectly by the buyer to the manufacturer of the imported merchandise for the purpose of defraying the manufacturer's tooling expenses are not included in any of the assist categories. Therefore, the tooling payments are not dutiable as assists. Moreover, in this case, the amount paid to the seller for tooling is not paid by the buyer but rather, is paid by the ultimate purchaser. This amount is not part of the price actually paid or payable by the buyer to the seller for the imported merchandise.
543293 dated Jan. 15, 1985; overruled by 543574 dated Mar. 24, 1986.

Payments made by the ultimate purchaser in the United States, through the importer, to the manufacturer are not considered assists. However, these payments are part of the

price actually paid or payable as indirect payments.
543574 dated Mar. 24, 1986; overrules 543293 dated Jan. 15, 1985.

Payments made by the ultimate U.S. purchaser, through the U.S. subsidiary/importer, to the foreign manufacturer/seller for use in the production of tooling necessary to produce the imported merchandise are indirect payments and part of the price actually paid or payable.
543882 dated Mar. 13, 1987; aff'd by 554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989.

Payments made by the buyer to the seller for tooling are indirect payments and part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
543951 dated Sep. 23, 1987.

543983 dated Dec. 2, 1987. - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect payments.

The foreign seller has agreed with the ultimate purchaser in the United States to be reimbursed for all tooling expenses. The importer will not receive or transmit to the related party foreign seller any of the funds used to pay for the tooling. This payment is furnished indirectly by the buyer and is part of the price actually paid or payable.
543967 dated Dec. 17, 1987.

part of the price actually paid or payable as an indirect payment,

See also, chapter on PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE, infra.

Payment by a buyer to a corporation for services performed for the benefit of a seller may constitute an indirect payment to the seller that should be included in transaction value. Payment by a buyer for services not performed for the benefit of a seller does not form part of transaction value.
542975 dated Mar. 9, 1983 (TAA No. 60).

Payments for product liability insurance made by the buyer to a third party insurer are be part of the price actually paid or payable as indirect payments. A condition of the sale required the seller to obtain suitable insurance and bear the cost thereof.
542984 dated Apr. 8, 1983.

Advancement of funds by the buyer to the seller and which is repaid by the seller to the buyer by reducing the invoice price for the merchandise is part of the price actually paid or payable.
543426 dated Mar. 15, 1985.

543584 dated Aug. 30, 1985. - See Assists, engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production.

If the buyer of merchandise pays the seller/manufacturer to produce tooling necessary in

the production of the imported merchandise, such payment is included in the price actually paid or payable as an indirect payment.
543595 dated Apr. 17, 1986.

H235895 dated Aug. 22, 2014 – See Assists, engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production.

reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt

19 CFR 152.103(a)(2); GATT Valuation Agreement, CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 8.1

A credit for a preexisting debt owed by the exporter is deemed to be an indirect payment made by the buyer and is included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
543152 dated June 6, 1984.

The importer receives a markdown on future shipments to compensate for air freight charges that it paid collect on late delivery by the seller. This credit on the future shipments represents an indirect payment and is part of the price actually paid or payable.
543771 dated July 11, 1986.

The importer receives a credit on future shipments of merchandise in settlement of a claim for previously imported merchandise that was defective and/or second quality. The markdown represents an indirect payment and is part of the price actually paid or payable for the subsequent shipment.
543772 dated July 11, 1986.

Reductions in price for current shipments in satisfaction of a debt owed the buyer by the seller resulting from the previous shipment of defective goods constitute indirect payments and are part of the price actually paid or payable.
543766 dated Sep. 30, 1986; 543830 dated Nov. 7, 1986.

543830 dated Nov. 7, 1986. - See Defective Merchandise, subsequently imported merchandise discounted.

A reduction in the net price of merchandise sold to the importer due to a debt owed to the buyer by the seller does not preclude the use of transaction value but rather, the reduction in price represents an indirect payment and is included in the price actually paid or payable.
543877 dated Mar. 17, 1987.

Cigarettes are imported into the United States. The importer submits an invoice to Customs that indicates a $320 per case price and a $319 per case discount. The importer alleges that the cigarettes should be appraised at $1 per case. The per case reduction in price represents a credit to the importer for a previous shipment involving slow-moving goods. The reduction in price is not to be considered in determining the price actually

paid or payable for the current shipment. This claimed reduction in price represents satisfaction of a debt owed the buyer by the seller resulting from the previous shipment and constitutes an indirect payment which is part of the price actually paid or payable.
546132 dated Apr. 10, 1996.

The importer purchases fabric from its related party in Russia. A trade debt has developed between the parties with regard to shipments to the United States. The importer has received approximately 67% of the amount of fabric that it has actually contracted for and has paid in full for the entire amount. The trade debt occurred because the importer paid the seller for the fabric faster than the seller was able to ship the fabric. In order to repay the debt, the parties have agreed to sign a contract for a certain amount of fabric at $1.50 per meter, but the importer will actually pay the seller only $1.30 per meter until the trade balance is repaid. The invoice price of $1.50 per meter represents the price actually paid or payable for the fabric. The difference in the invoice prices and the actual payments is part of the transaction value as indirect payments.
546364 dated Dec. 19, 1996.

H261556 dated June 25, 2015 – <u>See</u> Defective Merchandise, subsequently imported merchandise discounted.

INSURANCE COSTS

INTRODUCTION

The price actually paid or payable is defined in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A) as the "total payment (whether direct or indirect, and exclusive of any costs, charges, or expenses incurred for transportation, insurance, and related services incident to the international shipment of the merchandise from the country of exportation to the place of importation in the United States) made, or to be made, for imported merchandise by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller." (emphasis added)

The parallel Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.102(f).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 8, paragraph 2, states:

In framing its legislation, each Party shall provide for the inclusion or the exclusion from the customs value, in whole or in part, of the following:
(a) the cost of transport of the imported goods to the port or place of importation;
(b) loading, unloading and handling charges associated with the transport of the imported goods to the port or place of importation; and
(c) the cost of insurance.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 13.1 limits the scope of the word "insurance" under Article 8.2(c) of the Agreement. The Technical Committee expressed the following opinion:

It is apparent from the context of paragraph 2 of Article 8 that paragraph concerned charges connected with the shipment of the imported goods (cost of transport and transport-related costs). Hence the word "insurance" used in subparagraph (c) should be interpreted as referring solely to insurance costs incurred for the goods during the operations specified in Article 8.2(a) and (b) of the Agreement.

Headquarters Rulings:

deduction for cost of insurance from CIF price

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A); 19 CFR 152.102(f)

Insurance premiums, incurred by a seller to insure against the non-payment of merchandise, passed through to the U.S. buyer as part of a CIF duty-paid price, are part of the price actually paid or payable.
542857 dated July 14, 1982.

If the amount paid by the buyer of imported merchandise for marine insurance differs from

the amount paid by the seller to obtain the insurance, then the proper deduction from the price actually paid or payable in a CIF transaction is the actual amount paid to the insurance company for the insurance coverage.
543827 dated Mar. 9, 1987.

Importer utilizes a related non-vessel operating common carrier “NVOCC” to assist with a variety of origin related services. Certain charges for international transportation, insurance, and other services incident to the international shipment of the merchandise are included in the vendors’ sales price (CIF port of destination terms of sale). Importer provided documentation from sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consisted of commercial invoices and packing lists from the seller to the buyer, waybills issued by the NVOCC and a carrier, freight memos issued by the NVOCC to the seller, a publishing order issued to the NVOCC, and a certificate of marine cargo insurance issued by an insurance company. CBP found that based on the information presented, the international freight, insurance, bunker fuel adjustment, and AMS fees may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise provided that all documentary requirements are satisfied.
H196897 dated Mar. 13, 2012.

product liability insurance payments

As a condition of the sale for export, the seller is required to obtain product liability insurance and bear the cost thereof. Although the buyer pays the third party insurer directly, the insurance is in the seller's name and is required as a condition of the sale. The premium payments are indirect payments made to the seller and accordingly, are part of the price actually paid or payable.
542984 dated Apr. 8, 1983.

INTEREST CHARGES

INTRODUCTION

Judicial Precedent:

Luigi Bormioli Corp., Inc. v. United States, 24 Ct. Int'l Trade 1148 (2000), aff'd, 304 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

This case involves the assessment of duties on charges claimed to be *bona fide* interest charges excludable from transaction value. Based upon the criteria set forth in T.D. 85-111, Customs found and both courts agreed, that the plaintiff did not establish that the charge should be excluded from transaction value.

The CAFC affirmed the CIT's decision upholding the T.D. regarding interest charges, finding that the criteria set forth in the T.D. closely mirror the operative language of a decision by the Committee on Customs Valuation of the GATT. The CAFC found that the GATT decision is consistent with the statute and the T.D. is consistent with the GATT. The court concluded that the T.D. applied to Bormioli and that Bormioli did not meet at least one of the criteria for interest payments, i.e., that the finance agreement be in writing. The court also was not persuaded by plaintiff's other arguments including the fact that the IRS had apparently concluded that the charges in issue were interest charges.

Skechers U.S.A., Inc. v. United States, 25 I.T.R.D. 2050 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2003).

The court in this case held that the plaintiff has failed to present evidence that its financing arrangements satisfied the written financing agreement requirement in T.D. 85-111. The court stated that the importer must establish that the claimed interest charges meet the requirements as set forth in T.D. 85-111. The court stated that to meet the requirements of T.D. 85-111, not only must there be a written financing agreement, but it must govern the payments at issue. Except for three entries specifically mentioned by the court, the importer failed to present evidence that it complied with the terms of its written financing agreements. Thus, the requirements of T.D. 85-111 were not met, and the payments were dutiable since they were not *bona fide* interest payments, and Customs' motion for summary judgment was granted.

Headquarters Rulings:

pre T.D. 85-111, July 17, 1985

Interest payments made by a buyer to a third party, unrelated to a seller, are not part of transaction value. Interest payments made by a buyer to a seller as part of the invoice transaction are part of transaction value.
542275 dated June 11, 1981 (TAA No. 31).

Where a buyer makes interest payments to a seller as part of an overall financing arrangement between parties, such payments are not part of the amount paid or payable

for the merchandise, and are therefore not part of transaction value.
542627 dated Dec. 17, 1981 (TAA No. 43).

A financial arrangement between the importer and the exporter, under which the importer, in effect, loans the exporter resources necessary to enable the exporter to fulfill the importer's orders, is analogous to a financing system not related to the price actually paid or payable, and is not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
542666 dated Jan. 26, 1982 (TAA No. 45).

The question of whether a financial arrangement between the buyer and seller is part of the price actually paid or payable is a question of fact which must be determined on the basis of evidence available with regard to that particular transaction.
542703 dated Aug. 25, 1982 (TAA No. 50).

Interest payments made by the buyer to the seller are not included in the price actually paid or payable where the payments are part of a separate, overall financing arrangement between the parties that bears no relationship to a particular sale.
542869 dated Oct. 13, 1982.

Payments for interest made by the buyer to the seller arranged as part of the invoice transaction are part of the total payment made to the seller and, therefore, are part of transaction value.
543023 dated Mar. 17, 1983.

T.D. 85-111, dated July 17, 1985; treatment of interest charges

Interest payments, whether or not included in the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise, should not be considered part of the dutiable value provided the following criteria are satisfied: (1) the interest charges are identified separately from the price actually paid or payable; (2) the financing arrangement in question is made in writing; (3) when required to do so by Customs, the buyer can demonstrate that the goods undergoing appraisement are actually sold at the price declared as the price actually paid or payable, and the claimed rate of interest does not exceed the level for such transaction prevailing in the country where, and at the time, the financing was provided.
T.D. 85-111 dated July 17, 1985.

Interest payments, whether or not included in the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise, will not be considered part of dutiable value, provided the criteria set out in T.D. 85-111 are satisfied.
543531 dated Apr. 30, 1985; 544082 dated Sep. 19, 1988; 544155 dated Dec. 16, 1988, aff'd by 544321 dated May 16, 1989.

An amount paid by the importer to the foreign seller, which represents a reimbursement of the interest charges that the foreign seller paid to a third party, is a dutiable expense. This payment does not fall into the purview of T.D. 85- 111, which excludes interest from

the dutiable value of goods.
543765 dated Aug. 8, 1986.

An amount paid by the importer to a foreign seller, which actually represents reimbursement for the interest charges that the foreign seller pays to a third party, is dutiable. Such a reimbursement does not fall within the purview of T.D. 85-111 (clarified by General Notice, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 23, July 26, 1989), which excludes interest from the appraised value of goods.
544610 dated Dec. 23, 1991.

The interest charges incurred by the supplier and paid by the importer are not the type of interest charges provided for in T.D. 85-111, which excludes interest from transaction value. T.D. 85-111 applies to interest charges incurred for the payment of imported merchandise, not for the financing of component materials included therein. In this case, the interest charges are incurred by the supplier in financing its acquisition of components for the merchandise to be manufactured. The payments made by the importer to the supplier to reimburse the supplier for the interest charges are part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545606 dated Nov. 30, 1994.

No written agreement exists between the buyer and seller regarding the interest charges at issue. The price of the imported merchandise includes an amount for interest. In addition, the buyer did not book the interest charges as an interest expense in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Accordingly, the interest charges are included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable.
545984 dated May 16, 1995; <u>clarified</u> <u>by</u> 546030 dated June 13, 1995.

The buyer purchases automobile tires from its related party seller. The price of the merchandise includes an amount for interest. There is a written financing agreement between the buyer and seller, dated August 5, 1994, and the buyer records the interest amounts on its books as interest expense in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The interest payments are identified separately from the price actually paid or payable. Accordingly, the interest charges are not included in transaction value.
546030 dated June 13, 1995; <u>clarifies</u> 545984 dated May 16, 1995 (the parties entered into a written agreement and followed the requirements of T.D. 85-111).

There exists no written financing agreement between the related parties with regard to alleged interest paid by the buyer to the seller in the importation of merchandise. In addition, no evidence has been submitted to support a determination that the claimed interest rate did not exceed the prevailing rate for similar transactions in the country where the loan was made. The requirements of T.D. 85-111 have not been met and therefore, the finance charges paid by the buyer constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545818 dated June 29, 1995.

The criteria of T.D. 85-111 and the clarification have been met; therefore, the finance charges at issue are not included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The rate of interest is not excessive in light of the fact that the buyer is a relatively new company with no credit history and lacks substantial assets. The rate agreed to between the parties is appropriate, reasonable, and reflects the level for such transactions prevailing in the country where, and at the time, such financing was provided.
546262 dated Nov. 29, 1997.

An analysis regarding the dutiablity of interest payments pursuant to T.D. 85-111 is not warranted when neither the interest charges nor related service fees are paid directly or indirectly to the actual sellers of the imported merchandise. Since the parties do not have a buyer/seller relationship, and neither the interest payments or service fees inure directly or indirectly to the benefit of the unrelated, foreign seller-manufacturers, a review of T.D. 85-111 is not warranted. The interest payments and finance service charges paid to a lender that is not also the seller should not be included in the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value.
548316 dated July 16, 2003, modified by W548547 dated Mar. 7, 2006, see, chapter ASSISTS, management services, salaries, infra.

clarification regarding treatment of interest

General Notice, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 23, July 26, 1989.

Customs interprets the term interest to encompass only *bona fide* interest charges, not simply the notion of interest arising out of a delayed payment. *Bona fide* interest charges are those payments that are carried on the importer's books as interest expenses in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles. To demonstrate that the goods are actually sold at the price declared, the buyer must be able to prove that the price actually paid or payable for identical or similar goods sold without a financing arrangement closely approximates the price paid for the goods being appraised.
544334 dated June 27, 1989; 544395 dated Nov. 2, 1990.

Bona fide interest payments are considered to be payments that are carried on the importer's books as interest expenses in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles. In the present case, the importer does not book the payments to the seller as an interest expense and, therefore, does not meet the evidentiary requirements that are set out in the clarification regarding the treatment of interest.
544580 dated Mar. 1, 1991.

assists

Interest free loans and other financial assistance are not considered to be assists within the meaning of the term under the Trade Agreements Act of 1979.
542166 dated Feb. 12, 1981 (TAA No. 17).

computed value

542849 dated Aug. 6, 1982. - <u>See</u> Computed Value, profit and general expenses.

Interest expense is considered to be an organizational cost of doing business and a general expense in determining the computed value of imported merchandise. Generally accepted accounting principles do not provide for a proration of interest expense merely because the asset acquired with the loan is utilized less than 100% in the production process.
543031 dated Apr. 12, 1983.

543159 dated May 7, 1984. - <u>See</u> Computed Value, profit and general expenses.

financing arrangement

The interest payments made by the importer to the Korean bank are indirect payments to the seller; they are not part of an overall financing arrangement, nor are they provided for in a written financing agreement. Therefore, they are to be included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545277 dated June 14, 1993.

The importer reimburses one of its parent companies/seller for costs incurred due to the importer's delayed payment settlement. Interest accrues on the importer's books, and the parent makes the interest payments directly to the bank for the late payments. The payments are part of the total payment to the seller for the imported merchandise and therefore, part of the price actually paid or payable. The payments do not constitute *bona fide* interest charges, but rather the payments represent interest arising out of delayed payment. Even if the interest charges had been *bona fide*, they would have been included in transaction value because there is no written finance arrangement specifying the interest rate or the manner for determining such a rate.
546056 dated Mar. 22, 1996; <u>modified</u> <u>by</u> 546399 dated Mar. 20, 1997.

The importer purchases finished bicycles and bicycle parts from foreign suppliers for sale in the United States. A Taiwanese supplier negotiated with the importer regarding the supply of products. These negotiations resulted in a series of memoranda, which culminated in a "Memorandum of Intent." This memorandum contained provisions regarding the financing arrangements involved in purchasing products, including the rate of interest. Although the memorandum is unsigned, the evidence establishes that both parties agreed to the terms set forth. The informality of the written communication between the parties does not negate the existence of the written financial arrangement governing the transactions as long as the evidence shows that the parties agreed to the terms. Although T.D. 85-111 requires that the financing arrangement be in writing, there is no requirement that it must be in one document, signed by both parties, rather than in multiple documents. In this case, the evidence establishes that the parties agreed to a financing arrangement that was specified in writing in the "Memorandum of Intent" and

other documents. The interest payments to the seller are not dutiable.
546396 dated Nov. 29, 1996.

Various documents may be considered as a whole to determine whether they constitute a *bona fide* written financing arrangement. The first document is the correspondence between the parties regarding the applicable interest rate for transactions within the specified time period and a formula utilized by the bank in calculating the interest rate. The second document is a letter between the parties explaining that the bank had increased the rate of interest applicable to overdue invoices during a certain time period. The third document is also the correspondence between the parties indicating the interest rate that is to be applied. Finally, the fourth document consists of additional correspondence that confirms the interest rate. These letters and documents set forth the applicable interest rate, as well as a methodology by which the interest is determined and under what circumstances interest accrues. Accordingly, there exists an arrangement put into writing in which the parties understand and agree to the interest rate charged for financing the transactions. In addition, the interest charges are identified separately from the price actually paid or payable, and the charges are comparable to the prevailing rate for transactions in the same country where the financing is obtained. The interest charges are not to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546399 dated Mar. 20, 1997; <u>modifies</u> 546056 dated Mar. 22, 1996 (additional evidence presented regarding the existence of a written financing arrangement).

The importer submitted "interest invoices" and "declarations" regarding the alleged interest paid in lieu of a written financing arrangement as required by T.D. 85-111. The documents submitted were executed subsequent to the transactions at issue, and do not constitute documents from which a written financing agreement may be verified. It is our conclusion that these documents do not satisfy the requirement of T.D. 85-11 that the financing arrangement in question was made in writing. If a written financing arrangement did not exist at the time of the relevant transaction, the payments alleged to constitute interest must be included in the price actually paid or payable.
548332 dated Oct. 31, 2003.

The importer paid interest payments to unrelated vendors pursuant to written agreements and paid procurement service payments to a related party. In addition, the dutiability of an entry in the importer's General Ledger Journal regarding "cost of PVC bags sent to China" and a reimbursement payment to a related party for sample were examined. The importer also questioned whether interest payments were dutiable. CBP determined that the interest payments paid by the importer were dutiable because the written agreements were not followed. The procurement service payments were not dutiable as part of transaction value with the exception of amounts attributable to design work undertaken by a related party's designers. The design work constituted an assist. The General Ledger Journal entry for "cost of PVC bags" was determined to be packing costs and as such dutiable as part of transaction value. The samples were provided to the buyer, the importer, by a related party, and were not provided to the manufacturers or sellers of the importer products. Therefore, the samples were not considered dutiable as part of

transaction value. CBP found the interest payments were dutiable as the transactions took place prior to the effective dates of the written agreements. CBP also rejected the argument that a demand for payment letter from a port was an interpretative ruling or decision within the meaning of 19 USC 1625.
W563534 dated May 6, 2009.

separately identified from price

The importer has provided a sample invoice that shows a CIF price, inclusive of interest, from which interest of five percent is deducted in order to arrive at a CIF price, net of interest. In T.D. 85-111 (provides that interest payments are not to form part of dutiable value if certain criteria are met), one of the requirements listed is that the interest charges must be identified separately from the price actually paid or payable. Here, the charges are distinguishable from the price and there is a written financing agreement. In addition, the interest rate does not appear to be excessive. Accordingly, the conditions imposed by T.D. 85-111 have been met, and the interest charges are not dutiable.
545094 dated Apr. 1, 1993.

The payments made by the buyer to the seller for the interest charges are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise, provided that the payment is charged to an interest expense account, and that, if required, the buyer can prove that the subject merchandise is actually sold at the price declared, and the claimed rate of interest does not exceed the level for such transaction prevailing in the country where and when the financing was provided.
544970 dated Oct. 20, 1993.

Although the seller's invoices separately identify interest charges from the price actually paid or payable, the interest payments are not recorded separately from the purchases on the importer's books in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The payments are not *bona fide* interest payments and, accordingly, are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
546070 dated Apr. 25, 1996.

The importer has not provided any evidence to establish that the alleged interest charges are recorded on its books as interest expenses in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles. The importer does not carry the charges labeled as interest on the seller's invoices as interest expenses on its books, but rather, as part of the CIF price of the goods. In addition, the importer has not shown that the claimed rate of interest does not exceed the level for such transactions prevailing in the country where, and at the time, the finance was provided. The claimed interest charges are included as part of the transaction value of the merchandise.
546349 dated Aug. 23, 1996.

BASF imported a wide range of chemical and related products from its parent company. BASF was deducting payments from the customs value of the imported merchandise, as non-dutiable charges, based on the company's analysis of criteria outlined in T.D. 85-

111. Specifically, BASF excluded the interest payments made to its parent company from the dutiable value of the merchandise pursuant to its written interest agreement, executed on October 11, 1985 and provided for CBP's review in HRL H544155 dated December 16, 1988, HRL 544321 dated May, 16, 1989, and HRL 544580 dated March 1, 1991. However, in 2004, BASF changed its terms of payment without amending its written agreement. In its decision CBP notes that the real issue is whether the interest was calculated in accordance with the terms provided for in the agreement. CBP determined that it was not, and since the company failed to follow the terms of the existing written agreement, the interest payments were found to be dutiable.
H259861 dated Jan. 28, 2015.

INVOICING REQUIREMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Note: See, 19 CFR 141.81 through 141.92 for complete requirements regarding invoicing.

Headquarters Rulings:

inconsistent documents presented at time of entry, T.D. 86-56

Imported merchandise entered or withdrawn from a warehouse for consumption is not to be accepted when documents are presented to Customs, which contain overstatements, understatements or omissions in price or value information.
T.D. 86-56 dated Feb. 20, 1986.

If an importer provides an acceptable explanation for differences in the price or value information in visas and invoices, then the entry may be accepted by Customs. Additional legitimate reasons for differences in the entry documentation may exist, and in these cases, Customs will act in accordance with the policy set forth in T.D. 86-56.
543731 dated May 1, 1986.

Any differences or inconsistencies in the documentation presented to Customs shall be considered as an indication that one or more of such documents contains false or erroneous information. Where a visaed invoice or document is presented to Customs containing erroneous price or value information, such invoice or document can only be corrected by the presentation to Customs of a new corrected document or invoice stamped with the visa of the country of origin.
543792 dated Aug. 14, 1986.

The visaed invoice submitted by the importer indicates the price for the merchandise. The commercial invoice indicates both the price of the goods and the quota (not a lump sum but, rather, an indication as to what portion of the total represents the price of the merchandise). The documentation is acceptable and entry of the merchandise is allowed.
543825 dated July 7, 1987.

The value of merchandise for appraisement purposes is represented by the manufacturer's invoice, i.e., the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise. The visaed invoice corresponds with the quota seller's invoice that represents both the price of the goods plus the cost of the quota. There is no indication on the visaed invoice as to what portion of the total represents the price of the merchandise or the amount of the quota. The importer has presented to Customs a visaed invoice, which contains erroneous value information and is inconsistent with other documentation presented by the importer. Accordingly, the entries are rejected until a corrected visaed invoice is received.
543809 dated Nov. 5, 1987; 543908 dated Apr. 19, 1988.

Several middlemen purchased wearing apparel from manufacturers, located primarily in

China, at various prices in order to fulfill contracts with a third-party purchaser. The third-party purchaser subsequently breached the contract and did not take delivery of the merchandise. In order to quickly relinquish themselves of this seasonal merchandise, the middlemen contracted with another importer for the purchase at a reduce rate. The transaction value is represented by the "settlement price." Furthermore, evidence of the original invoice price and the "settlement price" should be provided. Assuming the relevant commercial documentation is submitted, the entry may be made (T.D. 86-56 does not preclude entry) using the original visaed invoice price and transaction value as represented by the "settlement price."
544432 dated Jan. 17, 1990.

In the instant case, the values indicated on the visaed invoices are not always consistent with the C&F values on the commercial invoices. On the basis of the information submitted, the dutiable value of the imported merchandise is properly determined by using the total visaed invoice amounts less actual ocean freight charges.
544581 dated Feb. 25, 1991.

Visaed invoices, presented to Customs at the time of entry, indicate a specific price for imported merchandise. The United States purchaser, who had originally ordered the merchandise, subsequently canceled the order. The importer then purchased the merchandise at the "cancellation price," which is subsequently lower. The importer presented invoices with the "cancellation price" after entry. The merchandise should be appraised pursuant to the price that is indicated on the visaed invoice rather than at the "cancellation price" as indicated by the importer.
544773 dated Apr. 3, 1992.

A discrepancy between the visaed invoice price of imported merchandise and a renegotiated invoice price of the merchandise does not mandate rejection of the entry, provided that the importer supplies Customs with commercial documentation sufficient to show that the difference between the original purchase price and the renegotiated price is due to a late delivery.
544911 dated Apr. 6, 1993.

545239 dated June 30, 1993 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, additional payments made by the buyer to the seller.

The importer has submitted visaed invoices that differ from the commercial invoices and packing lists. The visaed invoices leave 19,600 dozen articles, weighing 1752 kilograms with a value of $18,717.89, unaccounted for on the entry summary. The importer states that the visaed invoice is incorrect and that the price paid for the merchandise is that shown on the commercial invoice. The importer claims that a corrected visa was requested, but through inadvertence, the value of the shipment was not corrected. In view of the inconsistencies between the visaed invoices and the commercial invoices and packing lists, and the failure of the importer to submit documentation to explain the inconsistencies, the appraised value is properly determined using the amount on the

visaed invoices.
544847 dated Sep. 3, 1993.

The importer contracts with a company to supply luggage to be sold in the importer's stores. The supplier subsequently contracts with the seller to produce the luggage and export it to the United States. The importer establishes a letter of credit in favor of the supplier in the amount of the purchase price of the luggage. The supplier then assigns its right to the letter of credit to the seller. The seller subsequently pays a portion of the amount to the supplier as compensation for its role in the transaction. The supplier never takes title to the merchandise. Instead, the seller sends the merchandise to the port of export, at which point the importer takes title and assumes risk of loss. The visaed invoice accurately reflects the purchase price received by the seller, i.e., the total payment by the importer to the seller. The visaed invoice is acceptable under T.D. 86-56.
545416 dated Dec. 10, 1993.

Wearing apparel is imported from various countries. When a shipment is to be sent by air rather than by sea, the importer pays the costs of air freight, and the suppliers reduce the price of the merchandise accordingly. Neither the original nor the renegotiated price includes shipping costs. A new purchase order is used which reflects the renegotiated price. These arrangements are made prior to the exportation of the merchandise. However, it may not be possible to obtain revised visaed invoices. As long as the evidence submitted establishes that the price reductions are agreed to before the merchandise is exported to the United States, the renegotiated price constitutes the price actually paid or payable. In addition, the differences in the invoice values have been adequately explained in accordance with T.D. 86-56, and the documents need not be returned for correction.
545628 dated July 29, 1994.

A Canadian middleman sells wearing apparel of Romanian origin to customers in the United States. The merchandise is shipped directly from the Romanian supplier to the U.S. customers. Due to the fact that the Canadian middleman does not want to disclose to its U.S. customers the price it pays to the supplier,
the visaed invoice presented to Customs does not state any price or value information. The commercial invoices reflect the price between the Canadian middleman and the U.S. customers. A visaed invoice that contains no value or price information is unacceptable under T.D. 86-56.
546077 dated Aug. 22, 1995.

There are discrepancies between the prices stated on the commercial invoices and those reflected on the visaed invoices. Customs liquidated the entries with ad valorem duties assessed on the basis of the greater of the amounts shown on the visaed invoices. In accordance with T.D. 85-86, the discrepancies between the commercial and visaed invoices raise the presumption that either or both of the documents contain false or erroneous information in regard to appraisement. Customs has made this presumption in the instant case and it is incumbent upon the protestant to establish, to the satisfaction of the Customs officer, that the price stated on the invoice was, in fact, the price actually

paid by the importer. Merely stating that the importer paid the commercial price is insufficient. Instead, the protestant needed to provide documentation that supported its claimed value and an explanation of the discrepancy between the commercial invoice and the visaed invoice. Such documentation would have included but not been limited to a written agreement between the importer and seller/middlemen, a purchase order between the two, and/or, most importantly, proof of payment between the two parties.
547842 dated May 7, 2002.

separately identified from the price actually paid or payable

See also chapter on POST-IMPORTATION CHARGES, infra.

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (3) (A) (i); 19 CFR 152.103(i) (1) (i)

542611 dated Sep. 22, 1981 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, identified separately from the price actually paid or payable.

543331 dated June 14, 1984 - See Post-Importation Charges, construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance charges.

Payment made for performance bond insurance coverage which is included in the price actually paid or payable must be separately identified in order for the cost to be deducted pursuant to section 402(b)(3)(A)(i). Otherwise, it would remain part of the price actually paid or payable.
543567 dated Jan. 17, 1986.

LEASE TRANSACTIONS

INTRODUCTION

In 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1), transaction value is defined as "the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States. . . . " (emphasis added)

The parallel Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.103(b).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 1, paragraph 1, corresponds with 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1).

In addition, CCC Technical Committee Study 2.1 discusses the treatment of rented or leased goods, and states the following:

1. Transaction value, the primary method of valuation under the Agreement, is based on the price actually paid or payable for the goods when sold for export to the country of importation.
2. Advisory Opinion 1.1 on "the concept of sale in the Agreement" states that hire or lease transactions by their very nature do not constitute sales, even if the contract includes an option to purchase the goods. Therefore for such cases, the transaction value method is precluded and it becomes necessary to determine the Customs value under other methods, in the order prescribed by the Agreement.
3. Where goods which are identical or similar to the rented or leased goods are sold for export to the country of importation, it would be possible to establish the Customs value on the basis of Articles 2 and 3.
4. However, in cases where these two Articles cannot be used, Article 5 [deductive value] must next be considered. Since by their nature rented or leased goods would not themselves be sold in the country of importation, Article 5 would apply only if identical or similar imported goods were sold in the country of importation. If not, it will be necessary to try to establish the Customs value under Article 6 [computed value].
5. Once the possibility of establishing the Customs value under Articles 2 to 6 has been exhausted, Article 7 [value if other values cannot be determined] must then be invoked under which various approaches are possible.
6. In the event of the goods being valued under Article 7, the methods laid down in Article 1 to 6 inclusive, applied with reasonable flexibility, should be used first.
7. If under Article 7 the Customs value cannot be determined by flexible application of Articles 1 to 6, it may be established using other reasonable means provided that they are not precluded by Article 7.2 and are consistent with the principles and general provisions of the Agreement and Article VII of the GATT.
8. For instance, valuation could be based on the use of valid list prices (for new or used goods) for exportation to the country of importation. In the case of goods which have been used, valuation may be based on a valid list price for new goods in the absence of a valid

list price for used goods. However, since the goods would have to be valued with reference to their condition at the time of importation, such list prices for new goods must be adjusted to take into account the depreciation and obsolescence of the goods being valued.

9. Another possibility would be recourse to expert advice acceptable to both customs and importer. The value so determined should be in conformity with the provision of Article 7 of the Agreement.

10. In some cases, rental contracts include an option to buy. This option may be given at the beginning, during or at the end of the basis contract period. In the first case valuation should be based on the option price. In the last two cases, rental payments provided for in the rental contract plus the residual sum required may provide a basis for the determination of the Customs value.

11. In cases where there is no option to buy, valuation under Article 7 could also proceed on the basis of the rental charges paid or payable for the imported goods. To this end, the aggregate rental expectations during the economic life of the goods may serve as a basis. Care needs to be taken with respect to certain cases where the rental charges can be quoted higher in order to secure amortization of the goods within a period shorter than the economic life of the goods.

12. Determination of the economic life of the goods may at times create practical problems, such as in industries where the rate of technology change is rapid. While the past experience of the life of identical and similar goods might be useful, in most cases a solution is likely to be found by consulting with specialized firms in co-operation with the importer. It should also be noted that a distinction will have to be made with regard to economic life of new and used goods, such as using "the whole economic life" for new goods and "the remaining economic life" for used goods.

13. Once the total rental charges have been determined, certain adjustments may be necessary to establish the Customs value, in the form of either additions or deductions depending upon the terms of the contract and the principles underlying the Agreement. Where probable additions are concerned, dutiable elements not already included in the rental charges should be taken into account. In this respect, the factors listed in Article 8 could provide some guidance. In respect of deductions, any elements which are not part of the Customs value should be deducted.

14. The following example illustrates the determination of Customs value on the basis of rental charges payable. (For purposes of example, elements mentioned in Article 8 are ignored.) This approach could be applicable regardless of the duration of the contract. In cases of re-exportation of the goods before the expiration of the estimated economic life, the refund of Customs duties and taxes would be possible if the national legislation allows it.

<u>Facts of the transaction</u>

15. As a result of its expanding business, firm A of country X decides to rent anew machine from rental company B of country Y for a minimum duration of 36 months, renewable. According to the terms of the contract the erection and maintenance costs in the country of importation incurred by the importer are 20,000 c.u. per annum for the first two years of operation and 30,000 c.u. per annum for the following years, payable to the rental firm. The machine is rented at 50,000 c.u. per month inclusive of these costs and of an interest charge of 10%.

16. In view of the specific nature of the machine, none of the valuation methods (Articles 1 to 6), even applied with reasonable flexibility are appropriate. As a result of consultation between Customs and the importer, it is decided to base the Customs value on the total amount of the rent payable for the whole economic life of the machine. For that purpose it has been established that the machine can be used for five years.
17. The total amount of the rent payable over five years would, therefore, be taken as a basis for valuation. Once so determined, it is necessary to deduct from this account the costs for erection and maintenance and the interest charges.
18. The following symbols are adopted for formulating the calculation:
R = total rent payable during the full economic life of the goods
M = costs of erection and maintenance I = interest
Customs value = R - (M + I)

Additional examples are provided for in CCC Technical Committee Case Study 4.1, Treatment of rented or leased goods.

Headquarters Rulings:

elimination of transaction value

See, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1);19 CFR 152.103(b); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article1, paragraph 1.

Under circumstances where merchandise is imported pursuant to an agreement to lease with an option to purchase, the merchandise cannot be considered to be sold for exportation to the United States. Therefore, transaction value would be eliminated as a basis of appraisement.
542996 dated Mar. 4, 1983.

reasonably adjusted transaction value

The U.S. company imports equipment leased from a related company. The leased equipment cannot be properly appraised under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)-(e) of the TAA. The equipment can be appraised pursuant to section 402(f), using the transaction value method reasonably adjusted to permit the rental value of the equipment over its full economic life to represent the value of the merchandise.
545112 dated June 7, 1993.

546020 dated Apr. 17, 1996 – See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, used merchandise.

.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Headquarters Rulings:

accumulation provision

The producer manufactures a good from originating and non-originating components. Costs associated with the production of the non-originating material are not recorded on the books of the material producer but rather on the books of the material producer's parent. The applicable rule of origin for the good requires both a tariff shift and a regional value-content (RVC) test. In regard to the RVC calculation, the producer of the good wishes to accumulate certain originating costs incurred in the production of the non-originating material pursuant to the accumulation provision set forth in section 14 of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations. However, there is no authority under the accumulation provision to accumulate costs incurred by persons other than the producer of the material and therefore, the originating costs recorded on the books of the material producer's parent may not be accumulated.
545676 dated Jan. 20, 1995.

As long as the appropriate requirements are met, a Mexican producer of electrical wire harnesses may, under the net cost method, accumulate originating costs incurred in the U.S. by the importer to insulate bare, non-NAFTA originating, copper wire. In accordance with sections 14(1) and (2) of the Appendix to the final NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations (ROR), an exporter or producer of a good may accumulate the production of materials incorporated in a good, for example, processing and overhead costs, provided they are part of the net cost incurred by the producer in the production of that material and are reflected as such on the books. It is also necessary to examine sections 6(11) and 2(6) of the ROR for a determination of "net cost" and "total cost," respectively. Ascertaining "net cost" involves a calculation of the producer's "total cost."
546009 dated Dec. 4, 1995.

The cost of packing cartons of U.S. origin are recorded on the books of the producer; therefore, they are included in the total cost, but excluded from net costs. Under the net cost method, the regional value content (RVC) of a good is determined in accordance with section 6(11) of the ROR, which provides generally that the net cost of a good is its total cost less any excluded costs. For purposes of determining RVC, the term "total cost" is defined as "all product costs, period costs and other costs that are recorded, except as otherwise provided in the books of the producer without regard to the location of the persons to whom payments with respect to those costs are made" under 19 CFR pt. 181, section 2(6). The NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations section 7 allow for the exclusion of the value of non-originating packing materials in determining the value of non-originating materials. Based on the information presented, the packing costs are originating and, therefore, would not be included in the value of non-originating materials.

546838 dated Apr. 9, 1999.

Based on the evidence submitted, the bearings meet the definition of a light duty automotive good pursuant to section 2 of the NAFTA Rules or Origin Regulations. In this situation, pursuant to section 9(1) of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations, none of the non-originating materials (cage, molded seal, grease, seal, outer ring and inner ring) are listed in the Schedule IV of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations and, therefore, are not traced materials. Thus, the value of these non-originating materials is not included in the value of the non-originating materials when calculating the regional value content but they it is included in the net cost of the bearings. Therefore, the bearings in this situation meet the requirements of General Notice 12(t)/85.241(b), HTSUS, and are considered "originating goods" pursuant to General Notice 12(b)(ii), HTSUS.
547073 dated Mar. 8, 2000.

change in tariff classification

The Appendix to section 181.131, Customs Regulations, (19 CFR 181.131; the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations (ROR)), sets forth, at Part IV, section 4, the bases for determining whether a good originates in the territory of a NAFTA country. Section 4(2)(B) of the ROR provides that a good originates in the territory of a NAFTA country where each of the non-originating materials used in the production of the good undergoes the applicable change in tariff classification, set forth in Schedule I of the ROR (Annex 401 of the NAFTA), as the result of the production occurring entirely in the territory of one or more of the NAFTA countries, and the good satisfies the applicable regional value content requirement. In this instance, the processing operation in Canada does not result in a change in subheading because benzyl chloride and benzyl peroxide are classified in subheading 2916.32. Accordingly, the benzyl peroxide does not qualify as an originating good under NAFTA. In addition, because the production process does not result in a change in classification, there is no need to undertake a regional value content calculation. The good does not qualify as an originating good under NAFTA.
545761 dated Nov. 15, 1994.

A ”cold box” is produced in Canada from both originating and non-originating materials, and is classified in subheading 8419.60.1000, HTSUS. The non-originating materials used in the production of the cold box consist of columns, classified in subheading 8419.90.3000, HTSUS, and heat exchangers, classified in subheading 8419.50.1000, HTSUS. Based upon the information submitted, the non-originating materials used in the production of the good do not undergo a change in classification. The cold box does not qualify as an originating good for purposes of NAFTA under sections 4(2)(a)-(b) of the Rules of Origin Regulations, nor, based on the information submitted, does it qualify as an originating good under any of the exceptions to the change in tariff requirement set forth in sections 4 and 5 of the Rules of Origin Regulations.
546305 dated Apr. 29, 1996.

A Canadian company produces laser-based, structured light products from both originating and non-originating materials. All non-originating materials used in the production of the goods are classified elsewhere than in heading 9013, HTSUS. All of

the non-originating materials used in the production of the goods undergo a change in classification pursuant to the rule of origin set forth in General Note 12(t)/90.31(A). The goods qualify as originating goods under the NAFTA.
546612 dated Jan. 10, 1997.

The documentation submitted substantiates that the imported door handles qualify for preferential duty treatment under section 4(4)(b) of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations (ROR) as the merchandise satisfies one of the NAFTA exceptions to the change in tariff classification requirement. According to the bill of materials submitted, the regional value content of the imported leversets under the net cost method appears to exceed 50% under the net cost method. However, this assumes that the value of the non-originating materials was determined in accordance with section 7 of the ROR, and that the total cost and net cost were determined in accordance with section 2(6) and/or section 6 of the ROR. In addition, Customs assumes that the manufacturer has in its possession valid certificates of origin in respect of all materials claimed as originating.
547020 dated Apr. 9, 1999.

Based on the information presented, the vehicles do not qualify as originating goods under General Note (GN) 12(t) and thus are not entitled to duty free entry under the Automotive Products Trade Act (APTA). In order to be entered as free of duty under APTA, an imported motor vehicle must qualify as an originating good in the territory of a NAFTA party, GN 12. Under the applicable rule of origin specified in GN 12(t)/87.7, the non-originating materials used in the production of the subject motor vehicles must undergo a change in classification and the vehicles must have a regional value content of not less than 50% under the net cost method. No information was submitted in respect of either of these requirements and no information was provided to support claims that the imported merchandise qualifies as Canadian articles.
546515 dated July 7, 1999.

The imported electric garlands do not satisfy the rule of origin set forth in GN 12(t)94.8(A) because, the designation of the intermediate material notwithstanding, not all the non-originating materials, viz., the light set, undergo a change in tariff classification. In addition, the electric garlands do not satisfy the
rule of origin set forth in GN 12(t)(94.8(B) because while the rule requires, inter alia, that there be a change in tariff classification to subheadings 9405.10 through 9405.60 from subheading 9405.91 through 9405.99, none of the non-originating materials used in the production of the good are classified in subheading 9405.91 through 9405.99. The fact that a good may satisfy the regional value content component of the rule of origin does not exempt it from the requirement that there also be a change in tariff classification. Thus, the self-produced garland material qualifies as an intermediate material if so designated by the producer. The imported electric garlands do not qualify for preferential treatment under NAFTA.
547199 dated Aug. 18, 1999.

Pursuant to 19 CFR pt. 181, app., ' 7, the importer purchased non-originating heads to produce golf clubs from a Canadian company who imported the heads from China. The transaction value of each head constitutes its value for the purposes of calculating the regional value content (RVC) of each golf club. Therefore, the transaction value method to determine RVC of each golf club should be used, in that the RVC is above the 60%, as required. Complete golf clubs are classifiable under subheading 9506.31, HTSUS, and golf club parts (such as the subject heads, shafts, and grips) are classifiable under subheading 9506.39, HTSUS. Therefore, the RVC requirements have been met, and the heads should undergo the proper tariff shift to subheading 9506.31, HTSUS, as required by the General Notice 12(t)/95.6(B)(1), HTSUS. Based on these determinations, the golf clubs are eligible for preferential treatment under the NAFTA.
547540 dated Dec. 30, 1999.

The non-originating materials used in the production of the mixer assembly undergo a change in tariff classification as the result of the production process in Canada and, consequently, the mixer assembly qualifies as an originating good pursuant to General Notice 12(t)84.216(A). Assuming that the self-produced mixer assembly is designated in accordance with the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations (ROR), it will therefore qualify as an intermediate material for purposes of determining the regional value content of the imported good.
547550 dated Dec. 30, 1999.

548364 dated Oct. 2, 2003 - <u>See</u> North American Free Trade Agreement, regional value content.

de minimis rule

The importer purchases flexible lunch coolers from an unrelated producer in Mexico. The good, which is classified in subheading 4202.92, HTSUS, is produced in Mexico from originating and non-originating materials, including a non-originating nylon fabric imported from Korea and classifiable in heading 5407, HTSUS. Based upon estimates submitted by the importer, the value of the non-originating material, used in the production of the good, that does not undergo a change in tariff classification, is 6.97 percent of the transaction value of the good. Accordingly, the good qualifies as an originating good under section 5(1)(a) of the ROR. If the value of the non-originating material were to exceed seven percent of the transaction value of the good determined in accordance with Schedule II, then the good would not qualify as originating under the de minimis rule.
545963 dated May 25, 1995.

A ”Tautliner” tarpaulin system, classified in tariff item 8716.90.50, HTSUS, is designed to convert a flatbed trailer or semi-trailer into a van. The tarpaulin system is made from both originating and non-originating materials and is imported into the United States either separately, or as part of, and permanently mounted onto, a trailer or semi-trailer. In order for the “Tautliner” tarpaulin system, whether imported separately or as part of a trailer, to qualify as an originating good under section 5(1)(a) of the ROR, it is necessary to determine the transaction value of the good in accordance with Schedule II, and then

determine, in accordance with Schedule VIII, whether the value of the non-originating materials used in the production of the good is not more than seven percent of the good's transaction value. If the value of the non-originating materials used in the production of the good that do not undergo a change in classification is not more than seven percent of the transaction value of the tarpaulin system, determined in accordance with Schedule II, then the system qualifies as an originating good in accordance with section 5(1) of the ROR.
545891 dated June 23, 1995; modifies 956604 dated Sep. 26, 1994; 546055 dated July 14, 1995 (revised information submitted regarding the transaction value; the good qualifies as an originating good under section 5(1)(a) of the ROR).

A U.S. company imports broadcast receivers (Goods A and B) that are assembled by a producer in Mexico. Both Goods A and B are classified in tariff item 8529.90.99, HTSUS. With respect to Good A, three components, i.e., ceramic filters from Japan, do not undergo the required tariff shift. Regarding Good B, four components, i.e., ceramic filters and a ceramic lock, do not undergo the required tariff shift. There is no transaction value for the goods. Therefore, the de minimis calculation is based on the total cost of the good. Section 5(8) of the ROR provides for the calculating of "total cost" for the de minimis rules. From the worksheets submitted by the importer, Goods A and B qualify as originating goods under the de minimis rules. The value of the non-originating materials that do not undergo a tariff shift for Good A is approximately 4.5 percent of the total cost of the good. The value of the non-originating materials for Good B is approximately five percent of the total cost of the good.
545677 dated June 30, 1995.

An importer may use the applicable tariff shift rule, RVC requirement, or the de minimis rule, on a model by model basis, to determine whether various types of wire harnesses produced in Mexico qualify for NAFTA preferential treatment.
547956 dated Mar. 22, 2002.

regional value content

A company produces loose-leaf binders in Canada and sells them to customers in the United States. Five styles of binders are produced and information relating to the cost per unit of materials used in the production has been provided. Based upon the cost information submitted, the five styles of the good in question have a regional value content in excess of 50%. Accordingly, the good qualifies as an originating good under NAFTA.
545693 dated Sep. 29, 1994.

In calculating the total cost of the good for purposes of determining its net cost, the cost of the materials consigned to the producer and used in the production of the good is the customs value of the materials. The cost of indirect materials, research and development, engineering and salaries of U.S. personnel are not recorded on the producer's books and, therefore, are not included in the calculation of total cost.
545635 dated Nov. 29, 1994.

Two types of cruise control switches and two types of cruise and sunroof switches are imported after being produced by a Mexican company that is related to the importer. The importer consigns to the producer materials, components, tools and machinery used in the production of the goods. The cost of these items is recorded on the importer's books. In addition, the importer provides the Mexican company with purchasing, financial, sales and marketing support with respect to the goods. Because the goods at issue are provided for in a tariff provision listed in Schedule IV, the regional value content (RVC) is to be calculated under the net cost method. Based on the understanding that "total cost" consists of all product costs recorded on the books of the producer, the RVC exceeds the 50% required under the applicable rules of origin. In accordance with section 7(1) of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations, several assumptions are made in reaching this outcome. First, it is assumed that the value of the materials purchased by the importer from the United States or non-NAFTA suppliers, and shipped directly to the producer, is based on their customs value, while the value of materials purchased from the Mexican supplier is based on their value determined in accordance with Schedule VIII. Furthermore, it is assumed that the cost of transportation, customs brokerage fees, and duties and taxes are included within the value of the materials insofar as they are recorded on the books of the producer.

545675 dated Apr. 28, 1995.

The good in question, i.e., deflection yokes, is produced entirely in Mexico. The non-originating materials consist of the ferrite core, liner, cross-arm and connector, and are provided for under the HTSUS as parts of the good, and the subheading for the good provides for both the good and its parts (subheading 8540.91). The good satisfies the first two requirements of the exceptions to the change in tariff classification requirement set forth in section 4(4)(b) of the ROR. However, the non-originating materials that do not undergo a change in tariff classification (because they are classified as parts of the good and the relevant subheading provides for both the good and its parts) and the good are both classified as parts of goods in subheading 8540.91, HTSUS. Because section 4(4)(b)(iii) of the ROR requires that both the non-originating materials and the good not be classified as parts, the exception does not apply, and the good does not qualify as an originating good for purposes of NAFTA.

545974 dated May 4, 1995.

A company imports various models of wire harnesses, classifiable in the same HTS subheading, produced by its Mexican subsidiary from originating and non-originating materials. Pursuant to section 12 of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations, because all of the harnesses manufactured by the producer are classifiable in a tariff provision listed in Schedule IV, the net cost and value of the non-originating materials can be averaged to determine the regional value content. However, in accordance with section 12, the producer can only use averaging to calculate the regional value content of a good produced entirely in a single plant.

545890 dated May 22, 1995.

Connector assemblies and switch modes are assembled by a producer in Mexico and imported into the United States. The connector assemblies are classified in tariff item

8536.61.0060, HTSUS. The switch modes are classified in tariff item 8537.10.90, HTSUS. The worksheets submitted by the importer indicate that the connector assemblies contain only one non-originating material that is classified in tariff item 8532.21.99. Therefore, the good qualifies as an originating good due to the fact that the non-originating material undergoes the applicable change in tariff classification. Similarly, with respect to the switch modes, the applicable rule of origin is a change to heading 85.37 from any other heading, except from U.S. tariff item 8538.90.00A or 8538.90.00C. Based on the submitted worksheets, all of the non-originating components used in the production change from other headings to heading 85.37. In addition, none of the non-originating materials fall into the excepted U.S. tariff items. Therefore, the goods qualify as originating goods because each of the non-originating materials used in the production of the goods undergoes the applicable change in tariff classification.
545677 dated June 30, 1995.

The cost of shipping tubs is recorded on the importer's books, rather than on the producer's books. Consequently, the value of the shipping tubs and pallets is not reflected in the total cost of the goods, and no adjustment to the total cost calculation is necessary. However, if the value of the shipping tubs and pallets were recorded on the producer's books, then, under section 7(13) of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations, the shipping tubs and pallets would assume the same status as the good, i.e., originating or non-originating, and their value would be determined with respect to their customs value in accordance with Schedule VIII of the ROR.
545680 dated July 31, 1995.

A party related to the importer produces deflection yokes in Mexico. The yokes are classified in subheading 8540.91.20, HTSUS. A major component of the deflection yokes is a ferrite core classified in subheading 8540.91.50, HTSUS. The applicable rule of origin provides that a good classified in subheading 8540.91 originates in the territory of a NAFTA country where there is a change to subheading 8540.91 from any other heading. However, because the ferrite core and deflection yoke are classified in the same subheading, the deflection yoke does not qualify as an originating good because the ferrite core does not undergo a change in classification. The requirements of section 4(4)(b)(i)-(ii) of the NAFTA Rules of Origin (ROR) are satisfied. However, section 4(4)(b)(iii) of the ROR contains a further requirement that, in order for the good to originate, the non-originating material that does not undergo a change in tariff classification and the good in which that material is used must not be classified as parts of goods under a heading or subheading that provides for both the goods and its parts. Here, this requirement is not met because the ferrite core does not undergo a change in classification and is classified with the deflection yoke in a subheading that provides for the goods and its parts. Because the deflection yokes do not meet all of the requirements of section 4(4)(b) of the ROR, the exception to the change in classification requirement does not apply. A regional value content test may not be used to determine the origin of the deflection yokes.
546079 dated Nov. 22, 1995.

The importer purchases leather footwear uppers produced by its related Mexican factory

from originating and non-originating materials. Tanned leather hides from Uruguay, classified in subheading 4104.22, HTSUS, are the only non-originating material used by the producer in the production of the footwear uppers. In Mexico, the leather is sorted and graded. The leather and lining material are placed on a die-cutting machine and cut to shape. The die cut pieces include the tongue, quarter, foxing, saddle, vamp tip, out collar and eyestay. The die-cut pieces are skived on the edges and stitch marked, and the linings are stamped and sewn together. The cut pieces are assembled by sewing, and eyelets are inserted or saddles are sewn on. The completed footwear uppers are inspected and packed for shipment to the United States. The producer designates the die cut footwear parts as an intermediate material. The die-cut parts have a regional value content that is significantly less than 55% under the net cost method. Accordingly, they do not qualify as an originating material. Similarly, the footwear uppers do not have the requisite regional value content and consequently, the good is not an originating good.
546373 dated May 21, 1996.

The good in question originates under three specific scenarios set forth such that it is eligible for preferential tariff treatment under NAFTA. Subject to certain assumptions, the Mexican assembler's use of the accumulation method is acceptable for purposes of determining the regional value content of the good.
546158 dated June 13, 1996.

Where the material is imported by the producer of the good into the territory of the NAFTA country where the good is produced, the value of the material used in the production of the good is its customs value as defined in section 2(1), ROR, determined consistently with Schedule VIII of the ROR. GN 12(c)(vii); ROR, ' 7(1) and (2). Among other things, the Customs value includes costs of freight, insurance, packing and all costs incurred in transporting the material to the producer=s location and waste and spoilage resulting from the use of the material in the production of the good, minus the value of any reusable scrap or by-product. These provisions, however, do not apply to indirect materials, intermediate materials, and packing materials and containers. Based upon the information provided, Customs cannot conclude that the imported bicycles satisfy the regional value content requirement under the net cost method to qualify as originating NAFTA goods.
546437 dated Feb. 21, 1997.

The importer is transferring part of its production of wire harnesses for the automotive industry to its Mexican subsidiary. In the manufacture of these wire harnesses, the importer will use both originating and non-originating materials. The Mexican subsidiary will manufacture the harnesses and export the finished wire harnesses into the United States. Based upon the facts presented, the wire harnesses are found to be "originating goods" in accordance with the NAFTA, provided all other applicable requirements are met.
546674 dated Apr. 16, 1998.

Ski poles assembled in Canada have a regional value content of not less than 50% under the net cost method such that the ski poles qualify as original goods for purposes of

NAFTA. The ski poles meet all the requirements of subsections (i) - (iv) of section 4(4) of the Appendix to part 181, Customs Regulations, NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations (ROR). Therefore, the only issue is whether the regional value content of the imported ski poles was not less than 50% under the net cost method. In this case, the imported ski poles are originating goods under the NAFTA.
546534 dated Aug. 21, 1998.

Automotive wire harnesses are assembled in Mexico from originating and non-originating materials and imported into the United States. The wire harnesses are classified in subheading 8544.30.0000, HTSUS. Some of the wire harnesses are designed for use in the assembly of heavy duty vehicles under heading 8701, HTSUS. The methods set forth in sections 9 and 10 of the NAFTA Rules of Origin Regulations (ROR) are inapplicable; therefore, the value of the non-originating materials used in the production of the imported wire harnesses should be determined in accordance with section 7 of the ROR.
546834 dated Dec. 16, 1998.

Based on the evidence presented, the finished brake shoe assemblies qualify for the section 4(4)(b)(ii) exception to the change-in-tariff requirement of GN 12(t)/87.21. These finished brake assemblies may be eligible for NAFTA preferential treatment provided the applicable regional value content (RVC) requirement is satisfied.
547372 dated Aug. 10, 2001.

The evidence submitted shows that the importer is not the actual producer of the imported merchandise. It is the manufacturer that is the business entity incorporated under the laws of Mexico, the enterprise within the definitions of section 2(1) of the Rules of Origin. The manufacturer has a separate corporate identity, which is distinct from its parent company, the importer. In this case, the expenses were not recorded on the producer/manufacturer's books, as required by the Rules of Origin for NAFTA in order for those expenses to fall under the calculation of total costs. Therefore, personnel, depreciation, travel and scrap costs recorded on the importer's books may not be included in the calculation of total cost for purposes of determining regional value content (RVC).
547881 dated Aug. 27, 2001.

The country of origin for the collected used engines, components and parts is unknown. The engine parts that are unsuitable for use in manufacturing rebuilt engines are treated as waste and scrap. To determine NAFTA preference, the value of the used engine parts that are sold for scrap is not included as originating materials in the calculation of the regional value content (RVC) of the remanufactured goods. Thus the scrap value of the parts and components that cannot be reused should be deducted from the value of the non-originating materials, i.e., the reclaimed used parts and components.
547088 dated Aug. 29, 2002.

The unassembled differential housing will qualify as an “originating good” if it satisfies the regional value content (RVC) requirement. In this case, the net cost value method must be used to determine the RVC. For purposes of calculating the RVC of a light duty automotive good under the net cost method, the value of the non-originating materials

used by the producer in the production of the good shall be the sum of the values of the non-originating materials that are traced materials and are incorporated into the good. In this case, there is insufficient information upon which to reach a definite conclusion concerning the RVC of the differential covers. Thus, Customs cannot determine whether the unassembled differential covers qualify for preferential treatment under the NAFTA.
547736 dated Sep. 29, 2002.

Based upon the information provided, all of the materials in the production of the good (high definition digital televisions) undergo the applicable change in tariff classification, and satisfy the regional value content requirement of the good is greater than 50% under the net cost method. The merchandise qualifies as goods that originate in the territory of a NAFTA party.
548364 dated Oct. 2, 2003.

NOTICE

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(a)(3) states:

Upon written request therefor by the importer of merchandise, and subject to provisions of law regarding the disclosure of information, the customs officer concerned shall provide the importer with a written explanation of how the value of that merchandise was determined under this section.

In 19 CFR 152.101(d), the regulations state:

Explanation to importer. Upon receipt of a written request from the importer within 90 days after liquidation, the port director shall provide a reasonable and concise written explanation of how the value of the imported merchandise was determined. The explanation will apply only to the imported merchandise being appraised and will not serve as authority with respect to the valuation of importations of any other merchandise at the same or a different port of entry. This procedure is for informational purposes only, and will not affect or replace the protest or administrative ruling procedures contained in Parts 174 and 177, respectively, of this chapter, or any other Customs procedures. Under this procedure, Customs will not be required to release any information not otherwise subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552), the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), or any other statute (see Part 103 of this chapter).

In addition, 19 CFR 152.2 is relevant and states:

If the port director believes that the entered rate or value of any merchandise is too low, or if he finds that the quantity imported exceeds the entered quantity, and the estimated aggregate of the increase in duties on that entry exceeds $15, he shall promptly notify the importer on Customs Form 29, specifying the nature of the difference on the notice. Liquidation shall be made promptly and shall not be withheld for a period of more than 20 days from the date of mailing of such notice unless in the judgment of the port director there are compelling reasons that would warrant such action.

With regard to the rejection of transaction value and notice thereof, 19 CFR 152.103(m) states:

Rejection of transaction value. When Customs has grounds for rejecting the transaction value declared by an importer and that rejection increases the duty liability, the port director shall inform the importer of the grounds for rejection. The importer will be afforded 20 days to respond in writing to the port director if in disagreement. This procedure will not affect or replace the administrative ruling procedures contained in Part 177 of this chapter, or any other Customs procedures.

19 CFR 152.106(f)(2) regarding computed value states:

If information other than that supplied by or on behalf of the producer is used to determine computed value, the port director shall inform the importer, upon written request, of:

(i) The source of the information,
(ii) The data used, and
(iii) The calculation based upon the specified data,

if not contrary to domestic law regarding disclosure of information. See also [section] 152.101(d).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 16 states:

Upon written request, the importer shall have the right to an explanation in writing from the customs administration of the country of importation as to how the customs value of his imported goods was determined.

In addition, Article 11, paragraphs 1 and 2, provide for an initial right of appeal, without penalty, by the importer or any other person liable for the payment of duty, to an authority within the customs administration or to an independent body. Regarding notice of the decision on appeal, paragraph 3, states:

Notice of the decision on appeal shall be given to the appellant and the reasons for such decision shall be provided in writing. He shall also be informed of his rights of any further appeal.

If Customs appraises the merchandise pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), i.e., value if other values cannot be determined, then Article 7, paragraph 3 provides:

If he so requests, the importer shall be informed in writing of the customs value determined under the provisions of this Article and the method used to determine such value.

With respect to notice of a decision by Customs that the relationship between related parties has influenced the price of merchandise, Article 1, paragraph 2(a) states:

In determining whether the transaction value is acceptable for the purposes of paragraph 1, the fact that the buyer and seller are related within the meaning of Article 15 shall not itself be grounds for regarding the transaction value as unacceptable. In such case the circumstances surrounding the sale shall be examined and the transaction value shall be accepted provided that the relationship did not influence the price. If, in the light of information provided by the importer or otherwise, the customs administration has grounds for considering that the relationship influenced the price, it shall communicate its grounds to the importer and he shall be given a reasonable opportunity to respond. If the importer so requests, the communication of the grounds shall be in writing.

PACKING COSTS

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1) states:

TRANSACTION VALUE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE. (1) The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to - the packing costs incurred by the buyer with respect to the imported merchandise . . . .
The price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise shall be increased by the amounts attributable to the items (and no others) described in paragraphs (A) through (E) [packing costs paragraph (A)] only to the extent that each such amount (i) is not otherwise included within the price actually paid or payable; and (ii) is based on sufficient information. If sufficient information is not available, for any reason, with respect to any amount referred to in the preceding sentence, the transaction value of the imported merchandise shall be treated, for purposes of this section, as one that cannot be determined. (emphasis added)

Additionally, packing costs are defined in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(3) as the "cost of all containers and coverings of whatever nature and of packing, whether for labor materials, used in placing merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States."

In the Customs regulations, an addition to the price actually paid or payable for "packing costs incurred by the buyer with respect to the imported merchandise" is provided for in 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1)(i). The corresponding regulation regarding sufficient information of the addition is found in 19 CFR 152.103(b)(2) and 152.103(c).

"Packing costs" are defined in the Customs regulations, 19 CFR 152.102(e), as:

> Packing costs. "Packing costs" means the cost of all containers (exclusive of instruments of international traffic) and coverings of whatever nature and of packing, whether for labor or materials, used in placing merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

In Article 8, paragraph 1(a)(ii) and (iii), the following is provided:

1. In determining the customs value under the provisions of Article I [transaction value], there shall be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods:

. . . (ii) the cost of containers which are treated as being one for customs purposes with the goods in question; (iii) the cost of packing whether for labour or materials.

Headquarters Rulings:

addition to price actually paid or payable

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (1) (A); 19 CFR 152.103(b) (1) (i); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(a)(ii) and (iii)

Packing materials consisting of cardboard resale containers are to be added to the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise.
542372 dated Mar. 3, 1981.

Where charges for icing imported fruits are paid by the buyer directly to the seller as part of the price actually paid or payable, these charges are dutiable whether they are itemized separately on the invoice or paid to the seller under a separate invoice.
542491 dated June 9, 1981; 542566 dated Nov. 18, 1981.

Packing costs incurred by a buyer with respect to imported goods are part of transaction value. In the case of a sale made on an ex-factory basis, packing costs may include: costs incurred in picking up the goods from the seller at the factory, environmental conditioning, vacuum packaging, and placement of goods in export cartons or on pallets. Likewise, costs incurred subsequent to the previously described operations, i.e., delivery of the goods to the agent of the exporting carrier, are not part of the transaction value.
542834 dated July 20, 1982 (TAA No. 49).

The transaction value of imported merchandise includes the price actually paid or payable plus packing costs incurred by the buyer in shipping completely assembled items to the United States.
543817 dated Mar. 20, 1987; aff'd by 544156 dated June 3, 1988.

The retail packing operation undertaken in Mexico is included in the statutory definition of packing costs and is to be added to the price actually paid or payable. In this case, the merchandise is not packed ready for shipment to the United States until it has been packed in Mexico.
544230 dated Dec. 22, 1988.

Charges incurred by the buyer for hanging garments in containers are deemed to be packing costs. The service described is necessary to place the goods in seaworthy condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States. It is not relevant that the importer classifies the charges as "stuffing" or "GOH handling" (garments on hangers) expenses. The description is misleading and the expenses incurred are merely packing charges and are included in transaction value as packing costs.
544993 dated Oct. 9, 1992.

"Redipak" packing is a process undertaken after finished garments come off the assembly line and have been packed, twenty or more dozens, per carton. From the assembly line, the cartons containing the garments are taken to an adjoining location within the plant, and unpacked. The garments are then placed on hangers, wrapped with tissue paper, placed in polybags and packed in boxes holding between six and twelve garments. The cost of the "redipak" process is borne by the importer and is performed by the importer's related party seller. No documentation or evidence has been submitted to establish that the garments were packed ready for shipment prior to being submitted to the "Redipak" process. Therefore, the process, rather than being additional packing, is in fact the sole method of packing the garments for shipment to the United States. The packing costs are an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
544662 dated Mar. 18, 1994; modified by 545917 dated Aug. 1, 1996.

545154 dated June 3, 1994; aff'g 544708 dated Feb. 13, 1992 - See Packing Costs, hang-tags.

The container stuffing charges at issue are considered to be packing costs, and are properly added to the price actually paid or payable. The charges are packing costs incurred in placing merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States. The fact that the payment is not made to the seller is irrelevant.
545877 dated Mar. 23, 1995.

Packing costs are additions to the price actually paid or payable when not otherwise included in the price. However, based upon the facts presented, the amounts at issue are part of the price actually paid or payable, that is, part of the total payment made by the buyer to the seller. The packing operations at issue, i.e., pressing, hanging, wrapping, bagging, and repacking of certain quantities for retail sale, represent more than just packing for purposes of shipment, but rather, retail packing specifically requested and required by the buyers for purposes of selling the goods.
545917 dated Aug. 1, 1996; modifies 544662 dated Mar. 18, 1994 (additional facts presented).

The importer uses the services of a foreign "Vac Pak facility" to perform vacuum packing operations for garments purchased from an unrelated vendor. The facility is not related to the seller of the imported garments. Based upon the description provided by the importer, the vacuum charges are performed after the merchandise is packed in a manner that meets industry standards for international transportation of the merchandise. The charges that the importer incurs to a party unrelated to the seller for vacuum packing the imported garments are not packing costs within the meaning of section 402(h)(3) of the TAA, and are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546479 dated Oct. 29, 1996.

Assuming that transaction value is the appropriate basis of appraisement, the costs of opening, scanning, resealing and repacking are incurred in order to place the merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States. Provided that the costs for these operations are not already included in the price actually paid or

payable, they are considered an addition to the price actually paid or payable and are included in transaction value.
546690 dated June 18, 1997.

An importer purchases beer for import into the United States in reusable barrels on reusable pallets. In addition, the cans and bottles are imported on non-reusable pallets. The non-reusable pallets are packing materials, and as such the value of the non-reusable packing is included in the price actually paid or payable. A deposit for the reusable pallets and barrels is separately identified from the price of the imported beer on the invoice presented to Customs. The buyer remits the total invoice amount, including the deposit, to the seller. The related party seller receives the reusable barrels and pallets, and the deposit amount is credited to the importer. Each invoice bears a statement explaining that a deposit is paid to the supplier to guarantee return of the reusable barrels and pallets. Although the pallets and barrels are not of American origin, because the pallets and barrels are instruments of international traffic separately classifiable under subheading 9803.00.50, HTSUS, the value of the pallets and barrels should not be included in the appraised value of the imported beer. The deposit statement and handwritten clarification appearing on each invoice is satisfactory for purposes of identifying the amount of the deposit for the reusable items as separate from the price of the imported beer.
548257 dated Mar. 19, 2003.

The importer purchases merchandise from its related seller located in Hong Kong. The importer arranged for an unrelated third party, the service provider, to inspect the merchandise in a logistics warehouse in Hong Kong prior to shipment to the U.S. Payment for these services is billed to the importer by the service provider on a monthly basis. The payments for inspection services performed by the service provider are not included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise or as an addition thereto. The payments to the service provider for unpacking merchandise from the cartons upon arrival at the warehouse; unpacking the flat packed items from the polybags; repacking the flat packed items into polybags; hanging GOH items on hangers before quality check; removing GOH items from the hangers; repacking the merchandise into the cartons upon completion of quality check; replacing or adding care labels, made-in labels, and hangtags; and the repair actions such as cleaning, ironing, steaming, and trim cutting of the garments are dutiable as packing costs and should be added to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise. The hang tags provided by the Importer to the service provider are packing costs within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(3); therefore, the cost of these items should be added to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise. The care labels and made-in labels, which are incorporated into the imported merchandise, are assists within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(1)(A)(i) and their value should be added to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
H212283 dated June 19, 2014.

H249096 dated Mar. 17, 2015 – <u>See</u>, Transportation Costs, International Freight Deduction.

hang tags

The seller attaches price tickets and hang tags to merchandise prior to its being exported to the United States. Although payment for the price tickets and hang tags is not made to the seller of the garment, the costs of the tickets and hang tags are added to the price actually paid or payable. The price tickets and hang tags constitute "packing costs" as they are used in placing merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States. As such, the cost of these items is an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
545154 dated June 3, 1994; aff'g 544708 dated Feb. 13, 1992.

Plastic security tags purchased in China were provided to Chinese garment factories, free of charge, for attachment to garments prior to exportation to the U.S. The tags set off an alarm if passed through security devices at a retail store. The tags were suitable for repetitive use. By application of GRI 5(b), HTSUS, the security tags were not classifiable with the imported garments, and were not dutiable as packing costs.
H048276 dated Mar. 27, 2009.

packed ready for shipment to the United States, seaworthy condition

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(3); 19 CFR 152.102(e)

Costs incurred in picking up goods from the seller's factory, environmental conditioning, vacuum packaging and placement of goods in export cartons are all part of packing expenses which are incident to placing the merchandise in condition packed, ready for shipment to the United States, and therefore, are added to the price actually paid or payable. Costs incurred subsequently are not dutiable charges.
542834 dated July 20, 1982 (TAA No. 49).

Vacuum packaging by a third party, which takes place subsequent to the time the merchandise is packed ready for shipment to the United States, is not added to transaction value.
542897 dated Aug. 16, 1982; 542957 dated Nov. 26, 1982.

Expenses incurred for vacuum packaging merchandise packed in seaworthy containers prior to pick-up for vacuum packaging are not to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
543026 dated Mar. 17, 1983.

Expenses incurred for secondary packing, which is done solely to conform to the rules of the United Parcel Service (UPS), are not part of the price actually paid or payable. The merchandise is packed in condition ready for export to the United States prior to the additional packing performed only for compliance with UPS rules.
543266 dated May 1, 1984.

The fact that the importer opts to have the merchandise repacked in a second country to fit its particular needs is irrelevant to the determination that the original
packing places the merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States. The subsequent packing costs are not added to the price actually paid or payable.
543185 dated Sep. 13, 1984.

Merchandise is purchased ex-factory from China and is shipped to the buyer's agent in Hong Kong. In Hong Kong, the goods are inspected and packages are, if necessary, repacked and rearranged. In each instance, the factory's original packing suffices for export; however, due to the factory's inexperience, many shipments are sloppy by U.S. standards. The expenses incurred by the buyer for repacking merchandise are not to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
543985 dated Feb. 1, 1988.

The importer supplies the foreign vendor with a machine that consists of a compressing unit and a conveyor system to aid in the loading of tires into containers. The machine presses down on stacks of tires allowing for 2 – 3 extra layers of tires to be loaded. The importer provides the machine to the seller free of charge. The machine is not incorporated, used or consumed in the production of the tires, nor is it engineering or design work. Therefore, the machine does not fall within the any of the enumerated definitions of an assist. However, the machines are used in the packing of the tires for exportation to the United States. The tires are not ready for shipment to the United States until placed in a container, and the machine is used to pack the merchandise in a certain condition for its shipment to the United States. The cost of the machine should be added to the price actually paid or payable of the imported tires as it is considered part of the packing costs for the imported merchandise within the meaning of section 402(h)(3) of the TAA.
548286 dated Mar. 17, 2003.

The importer contracts with an unrelated third party located in the U.S. to provide
carton shipping labels and to manage label data for shipments moving directly from a foreign factory to a customer's distribution center in the U.S. The labels and data management service make the receiving process in the U.S. more efficient and less likely to have variances or errors. Based on the information provided by the requester, the merchandise is packed in condition ready for export to the United States prior to the attachment of the optional labels. The labels and data management service do not constitute packing costs as defined by section 402(h)(3) of the TAA, and as such would not need to be added to the transaction value of the instant merchandise.
548690 dated Apr. 4, 2006.

packing costs unavailable

Where packing costs are unavailable, the computed value may not be used to determine the value of the subject merchandise. Instead, a fallback method, pursuant to section 402(f), using a modified computed value should be applied. Subsequently, Customs may make adjustments and estimations for unknown

packing costs. The importer erred in a number of ways, including the following: (1) the packing costs submitted by the importer were inconsistent with the manufacturer's records; (2) the importer was not able to substantiate the reporting method; and (3) the importer could not provide invoices to support the purchase of foreign packing bags. In light of these shortcomings, it was reasonable for Customs to base the value of foreign packing on the cost of the most expensive packing bags used by the importer.
545611 dated Jan. 2, 2001.

H212283 dated June 19, 2014 – See, Packing Costs, Addition to Price Actually Paid or Payable.

U.S. packing

If packing material of U.S. origin is separately classified as U.S. goods returned, no authority exists for treating the packing as part of the appraised value of the imported merchandise.
544667 dated July 30, 1991; aff'g 544294 dated July 7, 1989.

The buyer of imported merchandise supplies U.S.-made labels and hang tags, which are affixed to imported merchandise. In their condition as imported, the labels have a self-stick backing, while the hang tags are hung onto the merchandise. The labels are considered to be assists. The value of the labels is included as part of the transaction value of the merchandise. However, the labels, while part of the appraised value of the imported merchandise, are entitled to the 9802.00.80, HTSUS, partial duty exemption. With regard to the hang tags, Customs has considered hang tags as packing material which, because returned to the United States without having been advanced in value or improved in condition while abroad, are classifiable under subheading 9801.00.10. Accordingly, the hang tags are not part of the appraised value of the imported merchandise and are eligible for duty-free treatment.
545970 dated Aug. 30, 1995.

In a prior decision, HQ 545224 dated Sep. 19, 1994, Customs classified both the imported merchandise and the U.S. origin packing, plastic containers in the appropriate HTSUS heading for toys, pursuant to GRI 1. Because the containers placed the toys in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States, the cost of the containers was considered an addition to the price actually paid or payable. Upon reconsideration, Customs determines that the U.S. origin packing materials (or containers) are classified under subheading 9801.00.10, HTSUS, separately from the imported toys. Accordingly, the value of the U.S. packing materials is not included in the appraised value of the imported toys.
546043 dated Nov. 30, 1995; Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 29, No. 51, Dec. 20, 1995; modifies 545224 dated Sep. 19, 1994 - See also Dutiable Value, appraised value versus dutiable value.

The cost of packing materials and containers incurred by the buyer is included in the statutory definition of packing costs in section 402(h) of the TAA, and generally, these

costs are added to the price actually paid or payable. However, if packing material of U.S. origin is classified under subheading 9801.00.10, HTSUS, then there is no legal authority to treat the packing as part of the appraised value of the imported merchandise because items that are separately classified must be separately appraised. In this case, the value of the U.S. packing materials or packing containers is not included in the appraised value of the imported merchandise, which consists of frozen vegetables.
546287 dated Apr. 25, 1996.

If packing material of U.S. origin is classified under subheading 9801.00.10, HTSUS, then there is no legal authority to treat the U.S. origin packing as part of the appraised value of the imported merchandise. The packaging and the merchandise are separately classified, and items that are separately classified must be separately appraised. Therefore, the value of the U.S. packing materials or packing containers is not to be included in the appraised value of the imported merchandise.
547352 dated July 8, 1999.

Econ imported toys from China into Canada. In Canada, Econ overwrapped these toys with plastic. Econ then imported these goods into the United States. According to the company's submission, the plastic overwrap was of U.S. origin; however, the imported toys were of Chinese origin. The issue was whether (1) the value of the U.S. origin packing material was included in the appraised value of the imported toys, and (2) the U.S. origin packing materials used to wrap toys in Canada were eligible for the duty exemption under subheading 9801.00.10, HTSUS, when returned to the United State. CBP found that the U.S. origin plastic was not included in the appraised value of the imported merchandise and was eligible for duty-free treatment under subheading 9801.00.10, HTSUS, upon compliance with the documentation requirements set forth in 19 CFR §10.1.
H261216 dated Feb. 11, 2015.

POST-IMPORTATION CHARGES

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3) states:

The transaction value of imported merchandise does not include any of the following, if identified separately from the price actually paid or payable and from any cost or other item referred to in paragraph (1): (A) Any reasonable cost or charge that is incurred for - (i) the construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance of, or the technical assistance provided with respect to, the merchandise after its importation into the United States; or (ii) the transportation of the merchandise after such importation.

This same provision is found in section 152.103(i)(1)(i) and (ii) of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 152.103(i)(1)(i) and (ii)).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable, corresponds with 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3).

Judicial Precedent:

See also, chapter on DEFECTIVE MERCHANDISE, infra.

Samsung Electronics America, Inc., v. United States, 904 F.Supp. 1403 (Ct. int'l Trade 1995).

Regarding post-importation charges, the Court found it inappropriate to grant relief in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3)(A)(i), which authorizes a deduction for post-importation costs incurred for construction, assembly, and maintenance of the imported merchandise. Samsung America did not incur, and consequently could not identify, the alleged post-importation maintenance costs as part of the total payment made for the imported merchandise. The Court concluded that Customs correctly determined the transaction value of the merchandise using the price that Samsung America paid, and that section 402(b)(3)(A)(i) of the TAA does not apply.

Headquarters Rulings:

construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance charges subsequent to importation

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (3) (A) (i); 19 CFR 152.103(i) (1) (i); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable

542451 dated June 4, 1981 (TAA No. 27) – See Duties and Taxes, deduction from

transaction value.

542611 dated Sep. 22, 1981 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, charges identified separately from the price actually paid or payable.

Expenses incurred by the importer in reimbursing the manufacturer in obtaining approval and certification of a machine by a testing facility in the United States is not a dutiable expense. The fee is a charge for technical assistance provided after the merchandise is imported into the United States.
543107 dated Oct. 14, 1983.

543161 dated Jan. 3, 1984 - <u>See</u> Duties and Taxes, deduction from transaction value.

On-site operating and training expenses incurred by the buyer, if identified separately on the sales invoice, are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. These fees are considered as incurred for "the construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance of, or the technical assistance provided with respect to, the merchandise after its importation into the United States."
543331 dated June 14, 1984.

543263 dated Sep. 5, 1985 - <u>See</u> Duties and Taxes, deduction from transaction value.

543567 dated Jan. 17, 1986 - <u>See</u> Invoicing Requirements, separately identified from the price actually paid or payable.

The parties entered into a contract to provide and erect concrete panels for a building being constructed in New York. A provision for repair costs is separately identified in the contract. These costs are properly deducted from the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544005 dated Aug. 16, 1988; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 544247 dated Feb. 28, 1989.

Engineering costs associated with the purchase of equipment from a related seller, if identified separately on the sales invoice, are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. These costs are considered as incurred for the "construction, erection, assembly or maintenance of, or the technical assistance provided with respect to, the merchandise after its importation into the United States."
544693 dated Sep. 10, 1991.

A contract between a foreign seller and a U.S. buyer separately identifies a New York state sales tax from the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise. In addition, evidence is submitted to indicate that the buyer paid this amount in sales taxes to the State of New York. The amount of the sales tax shown in the contract should be deducted from the price actually paid or payable to determine the transaction value of the

imported merchandise.
545731 dated Feb. 3, 1995.

The total contract price paid by the importer included amounts for warranties, installation and administration costs, and selling commissions. Although transaction value does not include any reasonable cost associated with the construction, erection, assembly or maintenance of merchandise after its importation into the United States, these costs must be separately identified from the price. The costs associated with installation and administration were not separately identified from the price and, therefore, they constitute part of the price actually paid or payable. With respect to the warranty and commission expenses, they were also included in the total contract price and are properly part of the price actually paid or payable. (Note: Customs has determined that warranty payments are an integral part of the price actually paid or payable).
545843 dated May 11, 1995.

Based upon the evidence submitted concerning various types of engineering and services included in the contract price between the parties, such services pertain to construction, assembly, or technical assistance provided with respect to the merchandise after its importation into the United States. These amounts should be excluded from transaction value.
546012 dated May 6, 1996.

A Service Agreement between the buyer and the seller in connection with the planned assembly of vehicles in a Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) provides for the development of production technology and methods to be used at the buyer's plant in the manufacture of the vehicles. In return for these services, the Agreement provides that the buyer will make payments to the seller. The payments made for consultation and advice under phases I-III of the Agreement are included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable to the extent that they relate to the imported merchandise. The payments should be apportioned to the value of the imported machinery and equipment in accordance with the method proposed by the buyer, subject to the calculation of a revised allocation factor. Payments made by the buyer pursuant to the term of the Agreement with respect to phase IV activities are not included in transaction value as an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported
merchandise. The phase IV activities relate entirely to post-importation activities; therefore, in accordance with section 402(b)(3)(A)(i) of the TAA, these amounts relate to the "construction, erection, assembly or maintenance of, or the technical assistance provided with respect to, the imported merchandise."
546697 dated Aug. 26, 1999.

A contract is between a U.S. subsidiary of a Japanese corporation and a U.S. business is for the manufacture of a hot strip and plate rolling mill in Kentucky. The U.S. subsidiary sub-contracted its manufacturing duties to the Japanese corporation and component parts for the mill were imported into the United States. The United States manufacturer invoked the liquidated damages clause of the contract, due to a scheduling delay. The appraised value of the goods procured abroad should be prorated based on the value of

the imported goods as a portion of the entire contract. The law only permits Customs to assess duties on the value of imported merchandise. Customs is not entitled to assess duties on the full contract price, thus it would be inappropriate to allow the United States subsidiary to make a deduction equal to the full amount of liquidated damages.
547924 dated Mar. 21, 2002.

post-importation services

The cost of printing and packaging T-shirts in the United States after their importation but prior to delivery to the buyer, is not part of transaction value. Likewise, in a transaction made on a CIF duty brokerage paid basis, international freight, U.S. freight, brokerage and duty are not to be included in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
543059 dated May 5, 1983 (TAA No. 62).

546697 dated Aug. 26, 1999.

post-importation transportation

See also, chapter on TRANSPORTATION COSTS, infra.
19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (3) (A) (ii); 19 CFR 152.103(i) (1) (ii); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable

543267 dated Mar. 16, 1984 - See Transportation Costs, post-importation transportation.

544332 dated Nov. 19, 1990 - See Transportation Costs, post-importation transportation.

544501 dated Oct. 18, 1991 - See Transportation Costs, post-importation transportation.

price actually paid or payable

The buyer's payments to the seller for mold costs, reimbursement for unused materials and components, and cutting dies are considered to be part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The fact that the payments occur post-importation does not preclude their being considered part of transaction value because the parties agreed at the outset of the transaction, prior to production of the merchandise, that reimbursement would occur if the required number of goods were not ordered.
544615 dated Sep. 11, 1991; modified by 544820 dated Oct. 18, 1991.

PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE

INTRODUCTION

In 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b), transaction value is defined as the following:

The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to -
(A) the packing costs incurred by the buyer with respect to the imported merchandise;
(B) any selling commission incurred by the buyer with respect to the imported merchandise;
(C) the value, apportioned as appropriate, of any assist;
(D) any royalty or license fee related to the imported merchandise that the buyer is required to pay, directly or indirectly, as a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise for exportation to the United States; and
(E) the proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise that accrue, directly or indirectly, to the seller.
The price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise shall be increased by the amounts attributable to the items (and no others) described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) only to the extent that each such amount (i) is not otherwise included within the price actually paid or payable; and (ii) is based on sufficient information. If sufficient information is not available, for any reason, with respect to any amount referred to in the preceding sentence, the transaction value of the imported merchandise concerned shall be treated, for purposes of this section, as one that cannot be determined.

In addition, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A) defines the price actually paid or payable as:

The term "price actually paid or payable" means the total payment (whether direct or indirect, and exclusive of any costs, charges, or expenses incurred for transportation, insurance, and related services incident to the international shipment of the merchandise from the country of exportation to the place of importation in the United States) made, or to be made, for imported merchandise by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller.

The corresponding regulations are 19 CFR 152.103(b) and (c) and 19 CFR 152.102(f), respectively.

Regarding sufficiency of information, 19 CFR 152.103(c) states:

<u>Sufficiency of information.</u> Additions to the price actually paid or payable will be made only if there is sufficient information to establish the accuracy of the additions and the extent to which they are not included in the price.

In addition, 19 CFR 152.103(a)(3) provides:

<u>Assembled merchandise.</u> The price actually paid or payable may represent an amount for the assembly of imported merchandise in which the seller has no interest other than as the assembler.

The price actually paid or payable in that case will be calculated by the addition of the value of the components and required adjustments to form the basis for the transaction value.

The regulations cite the following examples:

Example 1. The importer previously has supplied an unrelated foreign assembler with fabricated components ready for assembly having a value or cost at the assembler's plant of $1.00 per unit. The importer pays the assembler 50 [cents] per unit for the assembly. The transaction value for the assembled unit is $1.50.

Example 2. Same facts as Example 1 above except the U.S. importer furnishes to the foreign assembler a tooling assist consisting of a tool acquired by the importer at $1,000. The transportation expenses to the foreign assembler's plant for the tooling assist equal $100. The transaction value for the assembled unit would be $1.50 per unit plus a pro rata share of the tooling assist valued at $1,100.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 8, paragraph 1(a) through (d), of the Agreement provides for the additions to the price actually paid or payable. Paragraphs 2 through 4 state the following:

2. In framing its legislation, each Party shall provide for the inclusion in or the exclusion from the customs value, in whole or in part, of the following:
(a) the cost of transport of the imported goods to the port
or place of importation;
(b) loading, unloading and handling charges associated with the transport of the imported goods to the port or place of importation; and
(c) the cost of insurance.
3. Additions to the price paid or payable shall be made under this Article only on the basis of objective and quantifiable data.
4. No additions shall be made to the price actually paid or payable in determining the customs value except as provided in this Article.

The Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable, states:

The price actually paid or payable is the total payment made or to be made by the buyer to or for the benefit of the seller for the imported goods. The payment need not necessarily take the form of a transfer of money. Payment may be made by way of letters of credit or negotiable instruments. Payment may be made directly or indirectly. An example of an indirect payment would be the settlement by the buyer, whether in whole or in part, of a debt owed by the seller.
Activities undertaken by the buyer on his own account, other than those for which an adjustment is provided in Article 8, are not considered to be an indirect payment to the

seller, even though they might be regarded as of benefit to the seller. The costs of such activities shall not, therefore, be added to the price actually paid or payable in determining the customs value.

The customs value shall not include the following charges or costs, provided that they are distinguished from the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods;
(a) charges for construction, erection, assembly, maintenance or technical assistance, undertaken after importation on imported goods such as industrial plant, machinery or equipment; (b) the cost of transport after importation; (c) duties and taxes of the country of importation. The price actually paid or payable refers to the price for the imported goods. Thus the flow of dividends or other payments from the buyer to the seller that do not relate to the imported goods are not part of the customs value.

Judicial Precedent:

Moss Mfg. Co., Inc. v. United States, 13 Ct. Int'l Trade 420 (1989); aff'd, 896 F.2d 535 (Fed. Cir. 1990).
See also, chapter on BUYING COMMISSIONS, infra.

The Court determined that the agent in this case was a *bona fide* buying agent. However, the Court found that the payment was properly part of the price actually paid or payable. The Court held that where a payment for goods is made by the buyer to the seller with instructions to the seller to remit a portion of the payment to the buyer's agent, where the agent assisted in bringing about the sale, such a payment is a disbursement for the benefit of the seller within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) and therefore, is properly part of the price actually paid or payable.

Generra Sportswear Co. v. United States, 905 F.2d 377 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit was presented with the issue of whether quota charges were properly included in the transaction value of imported merchandise. The importer purchased cotton knit blouses from the seller in Hong Kong at a price of $6.00 each. The seller agreed to obtain type A transfer quota at $0.95 per unit. The importer paid the seller an amount for the shirts, exclusive of quota. The seller then billed the importer's buying agent for the quota charges under a separate invoice and the importer's buying agent paid for this amount. The Customs Service appraised the merchandise at $6.95 per unit by combining the amounts stated on the two invoices.

The importer filed a protest, which was denied by Customs. The importer filed suit in the Court of International Trade (CIT), challenging the denial of the protest. The CIT held the payments to be non-dutiable and ordered Customs to refund excess duties collected. The United States subsequently filed an appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which reversed the lower court's decision. The Court determined that, because the statutory language does not specifically address quota payments, the appraisal by the Customs Service was based upon a permissible construction of the statute. The Court

stated that it is reasonable to conclude that the quota charges are properly part of the "total payment . . . made, or to be made, for imported merchandise by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller." The court further stated:

“As long as the quota payment was made to the seller in exchange for merchandise sold for export to the United States, the payment properly may be included in transaction value, even if the payment represents something other than the per se value of the goods. The focus of transaction value is the actual transaction between the buyer and seller; if quota payments were transferred by the buyer to the seller, they are part of transaction value.”

In addition, the Court stated that it is irrelevant that the buyer did not pay for the quota charges directly to the seller. The payment was made on behalf of the buyer by its buying agent.

Chrysler Corp. v. United States, 17 Ct. Int’l Trade 1049 (1993).

The importer purchased engines from a foreign manufacturer. The agreement between the two parties required a minimum number of engines to be purchased, otherwise the importer would be obligated to pay shortfall and special application charges to the manufacturer. The Court stated that the shortfall fees were in the nature of a contractual "penalty," and the financial responsibility was triggered by the failure to purchase engines. The fees were not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported engines. In addition, the importer made payments to the manufacturer for tooling expenses and claimed these payments as assists. The Court agreed with Customs, finding that the payments made for tooling expenses are not assists but rather, are part of the price actually paid or payable. The Court held that the statutory requirements for an assist were not met because the manufacturer was not supplied with the actual tooling. The tooling expense was allocated over the number of engines intended to be produced rather than the actual number of engines imported.

Caterpillar Inc. v. United States, 20 Ct. Int’l Trade 1169 (1996).

Caterpillar Inc., purchased truck components from a British company. The merchandise was not exported immediately following payment, but remained in the seller’s inventory for up to five months. The British government assessed a value added tax (VAT) upon the sale of the merchandise. The invoice from the seller to Caterpillar included an amount for the merchandise and a separate amount for the VAT. At the time the parties entered into the contract, Caterpillar anticipated full refunds of the VAT and, in fact, received refunds directly from the British government of all VAT sums. Customs determined that the separately invoiced VAT amounts paid by Caterpillar were part of the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value. The Court held that Customs may not include refunded foreign VAT payments in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.

Tikal Distrib. Corp. v. United States, 24 Ct. Int’l Trade 149 (2000), aff’d, No. 00-1342 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 5, 2001) (decision without published opinion).

The issue was whether additional "exclusivity" payments made by the buyer to the seller were dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable under transaction value. In addition to paying the invoice price, Tikal had an "exclusive distributorship arrangement" with the seller whereby Tikal would pay the seller an additional five percent of its retail sales of the imported shoes. The importer argued that the additional payment was for "exclusive selling rights" and not for imported merchandise.

In ruling in the government's favor, the CIT held that Customs' interpretation was reasonable and supported by the rationale of judicial precedent. The court found Customs' consideration of the relationship between the parties a reasonable basis for analyzing the payments. The court stated:

> While not a critical requirement for inclusion in transaction value, the existence of a contractual relationship between the exporter and importer inextricably linking the sale of the goods to the importer with additional payments by the latter as a *quid pro quo* for exclusive distributorship rights on resale provides a very reasonable basis for Customs to find that the additional payments are part of the total price paid for the imported merchandise within the purview of the transaction value statute.

Tikal, 93 F. Supp. 2d at 1271. The CIT also repeated the point made in Generra Sportswear Co. v. United States, that transaction value may include payments representing something other than the per se value of the goods or charges that are not imposed as a condition of sale. The CIT decision also contains language suggesting that Customs should review bifurcated payments to a seller to determine whether the arrangements circumvent the law by simply disguising a portion of the total price paid as a payment for something else.

NOTE: Based upon Generra Sportswear Co. v. U.S., 905 F.2d 377 (Fed. Cir. 1990), U.S. Customs and Border Protection presumes that all payments
made to the seller, or a party related to the seller, by the buyer are part of the price actually paid or payable. The importer may rebut this presumption by providing evidence that clearly establishes that the payments are completely unrelated to the imported merchandise. Therefore, the analysis regarding the price actually paid or payable in Headquarters Rulings issued *prior* to Generra, may not accurately reflect the current position of CBP.

Headquarters Rulings:

additional payments made by the buyer to the seller; total payment

542401 dated May 21, 1981 - See Duties and Taxes, deduction from transaction value.

542812 dated July 19, 1982 - See Assists, tools, dies, molds, and similar items used in the production.

542831 dated Sep. 21, 1982 (TAA No. 52) – See Price Actually Paid or Payable, payments unrelated to the imported merchandise.

Although payments made by the buyer to an independent fumigator are not dutiable, payments for fumigating merchandise made by the buyer to the seller of imported merchandise are properly part of the price actually paid or payable.
542905 dated Jan. 28, 1983.

543088 dated June 28, 1983 - See, Cancellation Payments, goods not imported.

The buyer and seller of imported merchandise agree that transformers are to perform at a specified level of efficiency. If the transformers' actual efficiency exceeds that agreed-upon level, then the buyer pays an additional amount or bonus to the seller. This additional bonus is part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
543183 dated July 17, 1984.

543445 dated Oct. 23, 1985- See Cancellation Payments, goods not imported.

543770 dated Feb. 10, 1987; 544205 dated Dec. 12, 1988- See Cancellation Payments, goods not imported.

543882 dated Mar. 13, 1987; aff'd by 554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989 - See Cancellation Payments, goods not imported.

Delay payments are a separate undertaking from the payment of the purchase price of imported merchandise. These payments are in the nature of a penalty and are to be excluded from the price actually paid or payable.
543812 dated Apr. 20, 1987.

543924 dated May 29, 1987 - See Cancellation Payments, contract termination fee.

544031 dated Jan. 19, 1988 - See Cancellation Payments, goods not imported.

An additional payment that is made by the buyer to the seller represents a payment made for merchandise which was ordered but not manufactured nor ever imported. This payment is not to be construed as part of the price actually paid or payable for merchandise previously imported into the United States.
544121 dated June 24, 1988.

The importer supplies the manufacturer with fabric and trim to use in producing the final imported product sold to the importer. During the manufacturing process, it is discovered that a portion of the fabric is defective and the defective portion is not used to produce the finished garments. Rather than claim an allowance with respect to the discarded fabric in determining the value of the assist, the manufacturer adds an amount (approximately five or ten percent of the actual fabric cost) to the price paid by the buyer. There is no

authority to exclude that additional amount from the price actually paid or payable.
544082 dated Sep. 19, 1988.

The buyer and seller are obligated to a "service agreement" contract. The agreement states that the seller shall be responsible for receiving and inspecting materials, insuring delivery to the correct assembly plant, and various other administrative duties. The seller receives a commission based on the purchase price of the merchandise. The payments are tied to specific merchandise and are part of the price actually paid or payable. The commission payments are included in the dutiable value of the merchandise.
544235 dated Nov. 25, 1988.

544340 dated Sep. 11, 1990 - See Cancellation Payments, minimum quantity cancellation charges.

It is the position of the Customs Service that all monies paid to the foreign seller, or a party related to the seller, are part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise under transaction value.
544640 dated Apr. 26, 1991.

The buyer makes bonus payments to the seller, and these payments are related to delivery timing and procedures after the merchandise is manufactured. These bonus payments are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and are to be included in the transaction value of the goods.
544690 dated Aug. 5, 1991.

544615 dated Sep. 11, 1991; modified by 544820 dated Oct. 18, 1991 - See Post-Importation Charges, price actually paid or payable.

The importer purchases samples and swatches of fabric from the manufacturer for a book used to illustrate available fabrics. Newly woven fabrics are purchased, often with the manufacturer requiring the importer to pay a "trial weaving charge" in addition to the price of the actual fabric. The cost is associated with stopping a loom and setting up a new warp beam. This additional charge is part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
544654 dated Dec. 23, 1991.

The buyer makes bonus payments to the seller. The payments are made pursuant to a shipping agency arrangement whereby the buyer pays the bonus to the seller for meeting specified shipping criteria. These bonus payments are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and are included in the appraised value of the merchandise.
544787 dated Feb. 20, 1992.

The importer pays additional money to the seller for certain warehousing, storage costs, and related insurance charges. These payments are part of the price actually paid or payable. If the importer pays the warehousing, storage and related insurance costs to an

unrelated third party, then the charges are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
544758 dated Feb. 21, 1992.

Amounts paid by the buyer to the seller for "type" tests performed by the seller on the imported merchandise are part of the price actually paid or payable, and are included in the transaction value of the merchandise.
544884 dated Apr. 15, 1992.

The evidence submitted is insufficient proof that the described fees paid to the seller are actually warehousing charges or that they should be deducted from the price actually paid or payable. There is no authority to deduct such payments from the price actually paid or payable.
545061 dated Nov. 4, 1992.

The buyer purchases garments manufactured in China, the price of which is negotiated with the provincial trade authorities, rather than with the actual manufacturer of the apparel. Once the price is set, the authorities issue a visaed invoice. Recently, the factories that produce the merchandise requested that the buyer pay them a per garment fee in addition to the price negotiated with the provincial authorities. Unless the fee is paid, the garments may not be produced within the required time, if at all. The fee is paid directly to the factory and is not included in the amount shown on the visaed invoice. The fee is part of the total payment made to, or for the benefit of, the seller. The fee is determined by the seller and is for the imported merchandise. It is part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
545239 dated June 30, 1993.

The importer purchases merchandise from the foreign seller and that merchandise is not immediately exported after manufacture. As a result, the seller is required by the British tax authority to pay a "value added tax" (VAT) on the goods that are stored. The VAT is itemized separately on the commercial invoice. The buyer pays the invoiced total to the seller, including an amount for the VAT. Subsequent to the exportation of the merchandise, the foreign governmental authority refunds the amount of the tax to the importer. The VAT payments included in the price actually paid or payable are properly included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544644 dated Sep. 29, 1993.

The importer is anticipating importing equipment made in Switzerland by the seller. To date, the seller has been selling the merchandise in U.S. dollars and has met the risk of currency exchange fluctuations by hedging the contracts, i.e., placing a forward contract on currency. The cost to the seller of the hedging has been included in both the offered price of the merchandise and in the value declared for duty. The seller is now offering the importer the option of purchasing the merchandise in U.S. dollars or in Swiss francs. If the importer pays in dollars, it will be charged a separate amount to cover the cost of hedging. If the importer pays in francs, the importer hedges for its own account, in the United States, also incurring a fee. The hedging costs paid by the importer to the seller are included in the price actually paid or payable. With respect to the costs incurred by

the importer hedging for its own account, those payments are not made to or for the benefit of the seller and are not included in the price actually paid or payable.
544971 dated Oct. 20, 1993.

The invoice value of imported machinery includes an amount for an extended two-year warranty. The warranty payment is included in the total price for the merchandise. The warranty costs in question form an integral part of the merchandise upon importation. Consequently, the cost of the warranty is part of the price actually paid or payable and is dutiable under transaction value.
545153 dated Dec. 21, 1993.

The importer is a distributor of lock assemblies. Participating in a "shelter operation," the importer contracts for the assembly of locks with a "shelter," the U.S. parent of a Mexican assembler. "Pass-through" payments are made by the importer to the shelter for reimbursement to the shelter for expenses that the assembler incurs to third parties in Mexico. To the extent that the "pass- through" payments are made to the shelter, or a party related to the shelter, even though the payments may represent something other than the per se value of the assembled merchandise, all of the payments to the shelter are part of the price actually paid or payable. Even if the payments are made directly to the third party supplier for services provided by the third party, they are nonetheless part of the price actually paid or payable. Such payments are for the benefit of a party related to the shelter, and are included in the price actually paid or payable.
544764 dated Jan. 6, 1994.

The seller produces sample garments for the buyer and, on a periodic basis, issues debit notes for the design, development, and production costs associated with the samples. The sample garments are used to design wearing apparel and solicit sales orders. Included in the total cost of the samples are the cost of the fabric, the acquisition and development costs of rollers used to print the fabric, the cost of trim, labor, overhead and profit. The periodic payments covering design, development, and production costs are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported samples. In addition, the costs associated with the samples that are selected for full production should be amortized in the price of the production garments, or otherwise reflected in the transaction value of subsequently imported merchandise.
545110 dated Mar. 11, 1994.

The payments made by the buyer to the seller include amounts for engineering, assembling, testing and dismantling. These amounts are part of the purchase order price for the entire friction roller conveyor system in question. Accordingly, they are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545264 dated Aug. 12, 1994.

The seller invoices the U.S. buyer separately for imported denim goods and certain "finishing" services performed by the seller. The services include labeling, pressing, stone wash treatment, bleaching, softening, quality control and delivery. Notwithstanding the separating invoicing, the "finishing" services performed are part of the price actually

paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545490 dated Aug. 31, 1994.

In addition to the transfer price of merchandise, the buyer sends regular weekly payments to the seller which are used to pay the seller's operating expenses, including labor, overhead and administrative costs. While the amounts in question are related to the imported merchandise, they are not identified with specific shipments. The additional payments constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545456 dated Oct. 21, 1994; aff'd by 545995 dated Oct. 12, 1995.

Funds transferred by the buyer to the seller are advanced by letters of credit. The letters of credit are issued on behalf of the buyer as consideration for imported merchandise purchased from the seller. The amount of these payments exceeds the invoice value of the merchandise. Neither the financial statements of the buyer nor those of the seller support the view that the "excess" amounts of the payments are loans, and the company's books do not support this view. The payments by the buyer to the seller in excess of the invoice amount constitute payments for the imported merchandise and should be added to the price actually paid or payable.
545147 dated Nov. 4, 1994.

The buyer purchased machinery and equipment from the seller. The seller tested the machinery and equipment. The testing involved setting up and running the assembly line before the machinery was exported to the United States. The testing was conducted pursuant to a separate and subsequent agreement. Three months to a year after the merchandise was exported, the buyer received a debit note informing the buyer of the charges for the testing. The test run charges were payments made from the buyer to the seller in connection with imported merchandise. The amount paid for the post production tests performed by the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable and are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545724 dated Nov. 30, 1994.

The importer contracted with its foreign subsidiary for research, development, and engineering services for an engine design project in the United States. The subsidiary was reimbursed, on a monthly basis, by the importer for the full cost of the R&D services conducted in the United Kingdom. As part of the research and design of the project engine, the foreign subsidiary produced numerous prototype hardware items for testing. Of the sixty prototypes produced by the foreign subsidiary, only twenty prototypes were imported into the United States. The importer claims that it paid the subsidiary for services, and not for merchandise. Due to cost inefficiency, the project was abandoned and no final product was ever produced. There is no authority to exclude the R&D payments from the appraised value of the imported prototypes. The payments made by the importer are part of the price actually paid or payable. In addition, without evidentiary support for apportionment of the payment, Customs cannot determine what portion of the total payment was for the imported prototypes. Unless the importer provides documentation in support of allocating the R&D costs over the sixty prototypes, then the

total payment is considered part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported prototypes.
545320 dated Feb. 28, 1995.

545349 dated Mar. 24, 1995 - <u>See</u> Transportation Costs, estimated freight versus actual.

The importer purchased automobiles from a foreign manufacturer. Pursuant to an agreement between the parties, before production of any automobiles began, the importer paid the manufacturer $2 million in consideration for the development, engineering, and volume production of the imported automobiles. Although the payment may have been made prior to the production of any automobiles, or the importer's commitment to purchase any automobiles, the payment is part of the price actually paid or payable. Also, "production overrun" expenses, which were payments made by the importer in settlement of a dispute regarding delays allegedly caused by the importer, are part of the price actually paid or payable. In addition, a payment made by the importer to the manufacturer for design and development costs associated with a particular engine developed for the automobiles is part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported automobiles.
545500 dated Mar. 24, 1995.

545843 dated May 11, 1995 - <u>See</u> Post-Importation Charges, construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance charges.

The importer sends fabric to El Salvador for manufacturing into apparel. When the fabric and trim reach El Salvador, they are placed in a warehouse facility, located in the same commercial complex as the factory of production, where they are stored until the manufacturer is ready to move specific lots into production. The warehouse owner issues separate invoices to the importer and those invoices are paid separately from invoices issued by the manufacturer. The importer is not related to either the manufacturer or the warehouse proprietor. However, the manufacturer and warehouse proprietor are related parties. The fees paid to the warehouse proprietor, a party related to the manufacturer, are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545663 dated July 14, 1995.

In addition to the transfer price, the importer sends regular weekly payments to its related-party seller, which are used to pay the seller's operating expenses, including labor, overhead, and administrative costs. In view of the fact that there are no loan documents establishing a loan or any repayment obligation, and the financial records of the companies do not establish that the payments are loans as alleged by counsel, the cash payments in question are part of the price actually paid or payable. In fact, these payments are used to cover the seller's operating expenses, i.e., the costs incurred to assemble the imported merchandise.
545995 dated Oct. 12, 1995; <u>aff'g</u> 545456 dated Oct. 21, 1994.

The importer purchased and paid for yarn used to produce imported sweaters. The importer's broker erroneously added an amount to the invoiced value to account for

payment for the yarn used in making the sweaters. The importer has provided sufficient evidence to indicate that the payment should not have been added to the price actually paid or payable because the payment was already included in the price.
546078 dated Jan. 30, 1996.

545753 dated Mar. 8, 1996 - See Assists, Testing Costs.

546056 dated Mar. 22, 1996, modified by 546339 dated Mar. 20, 1997 – See Interest Charges, computed value.

546132 dated Apr. 10, 1996 - See Indirect Payments, reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt.

The importer has agreed to supply a U.S. company with a three-stand cold mill for the manufacture of aluminum sheets. In order to meet its contractual obligations, the importer placed two contracts with its parent company in Germany to supply certain components for the mill and to provide various engineering services. A "mill modeling charge" incurred by the importer is essentially a research and development cost associated with the operation of the mill, and only a specific amount has any relationship to the imported mill components. Only the portion of the charges that has been identified as related to the imported mill components is part of the price actually paid or payable for the components. In addition, general engineering charges that relate solely to the installation, set-up, and operation of the mill are not properly part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546000 dated Sep. 6, 1996.

An importer of garments intends to enter into a quality assurance incentive program and pay an inspection fee in the importation of merchandise. The importer will purchase garments from various factories and make arrangements with individual employees of the factories. The importer will pay these employees an inspection fee of $1 per dozen if the importer is satisfied upon receiving the merchandise that they are of first quality and meet specification. The payments to the employees of the factories (sellers) are direct payments to the sellers and are part of the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
546439 dated Sep. 30, 1996.

The importer entered into an agreement with a foreign seller to modify and adapt an automobile engine. The agreement provided that the importer would pay the seller a fee for the design and development of the engine. In addition, the agreement provided that any prototypes of the modified engines would be purchased under separate purchase orders. If the modifications proved successful, the parties would enter into a contract for the purchase and supply of production engines. The seller then produced prototypes, which were purchased by the importer. The payments for the design and development are part of the price actually paid or payable for subsequently imported production engines. In addition, payments for all the prototypes manufactured by the seller constitute part of the price actually paid or payable. The cost of the prototypes is inextricably linked

to the design and development process of the subsequently imported production engines. The price actually paid or payable for the production engines, i.e., the total payment, includes all payments for the imported merchandise.
545907 dated Oct. 11, 1996; aff'g 545278 dated Apr. 7, 1994.

Payments are made from the importer/buyer to the licensor of a pharmaceutical product for pre-clinical studies pertaining to the safety of the imported product. The licensor is related to the seller. The importer pays the licensor for the results of studies conducted by the licensor and pays for all costs incurred for certain long-term toxicity and/or carcinogenicity studies performed by the licensor. The payments are related to the imported merchandise and are part of their total payment. The pre-clinical studies to test the safety of an imported pharmaceutical product are crucial steps in the production and sale of the product. The clinical studies facilitate the subsequent production and sale for exportation of the imported product. The payments are included in the transaction value of the imported product as part of the price actually paid or payable.
545998 dated Nov. 13, 1996.

The seller bills the importer a FOB price, which is based on the manufacturer's (importer) invoice and consists of amounts for fabric assists, including that attributable to fabric waste. The amount attributable to fabric waste is subsequently deducted from the total price to arrive at the entered value. No information has been presented to rebut the presumption that such payments (fabric waste) are part of the price actually paid or payable. The payments comprise the total payment for the goods and there can be no deduction for the fabric waste; the amounts are part of the transaction value of the merchandise.
546015 dated Dec. 13, 1996.

The importer purchases textile products from a Russian factory. Recently, the importer purchased a controlling interest in the factory. There are documents indicating that there were three wire transfers in the total amount of $220,100 to the factory. Based on copies of the contracts and the wire transfers, the payments were made for the purchase of the stock and are not related to the purchase of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the payments are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546364 dated Dec. 19, 1996 - See also Indirect Payments, reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt.

The importer purchases apparel from both related and unrelated foreign suppliers. The buyer makes charges for screening and development to the suppliers. The evidence submitted supports the importer's position that the charges are not connected to or associated with the imported garments. Statements from the foreign suppliers and affidavits from foreign mills state that there were separate charges for screening and development of sample fabric yardage, which was never manufactured into actual production fabric. These costs were not absorbed into the costs of the production of the fabric and were separately charged to the foreign supplier and the importer. The screening and development charges paid to the foreign suppliers are not part of the price

actually paid or payable for the garments.
546207 dated Dec. 20, 1996.

The product liability insurance payments at issue should be included in the price actually paid or payable in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise. The payments for the insurance attaches to and forms an integral part of the merchandise upon its importation, and are thus related to the imported merchandise. The payments are included in the price, and Customs has no authority to exclude them from the price actually paid or payable.
546584 dated Sep. 10, 1997.

The information submitted is insufficient to substantiate counsel's claim that the distributorship fee is not related to the price paid for the imported merchandise. The seller and the distributors are related parties. The distributorship fee is tied to the exportation of the merchandise to the United States. Therefore, the fee is included in the price actually paid or payable.
546835 dated Jan. 11, 1999.

The delivery bonus is identified under the terms of the letter agreement in which the buyer agrees to pay the seller a specified amount for each complete week the equipment was completely delivered prior to a specified date. The term equipment, as defined in the purchase agreement, refers generally to the finished product plus certain additional terms referenced in various annexes of the purchase agreement. Thus, the delivery bonus is not linked to the imported goods, but to the completion of the finished product. Accordingly, the delivery bonus paid by the buyer to the seller is not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
567376 dated Feb. 8, 1999.

546697 dated Aug. 26, 1999 - <u>See</u> Post-Importation Charges, construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance charges.

546638 dated Oct. 4, 1999 - <u>See</u> Royalty Payments and License Fees, price actually paid or payable.

547108 dated Mar. 28, 2000 - <u>See</u> Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

The U. S. manufacturer pays a fee to the foreign manufacturer for the preparation of bid specifications and blueprints for the design and development of imported tools and gauges. The fee paid for the preparation of the items is not related to the imported tools and gauges, and the fee is not related to the design and development of the tools and gauges. Also, the U.S. manufacturer does not provide any item for use in connection with the production or the sale for export to the United States of imported gauges and tools. Therefore, based on the information provided, the fee paid for the preparation of bid specifications and blueprints is not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported tools and gauges; nor does it constitute an assist to be added to the price

actually paid or payable.
547175 dated Apr. 21, 2000.

The importer made payments to related and unrelated manufacturers to cover an increase in the cost of plastics used in the manufacture of the imported merchandise. The importer's payments to the manufacturers representing retroactive material price adjustments are considered to be part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. However, Customs erred when it value advanced the value of the merchandise in one entry to cover other entries that had long since been liquidated.
547395 dated June 30, 2000.

547534 dated Jan. 19, 2001 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, warehousing charges.

547825 dated July 16, 2001 - See Transaction Value, related party transactions.

Under an agreement, the importer may only sell the trademark merchandise to specialty and department stores and men's stores of high standing. Based on the information submitted, the trademark owner acts as an independent seller in the transactions with the importer. Therefore, the amounts paid by the importer for alleged buying commissions and handling/marketing/advertising fees are part of the transaction value for the imported merchandise, because they are paid directly to the seller of the merchandise.
547585 dated Sep. 28, 2001.

An addition to the actual price paid or payable will be made for any royalty or license fee paid by the buyer to the seller unless the buyer can establish that such payment is distinct from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The presumption that all payments made by the buyer to the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable may be rebutted. The burden of establishing that the payments are totally unrelated to the imported merchandise rests with the importer. Although designated by the importer as "royalties," these payments are actually indirect payments to the seller.
547608 dated Feb. 21, 2002.

An addition to the actual price paid or payable will be made for any royalty or license fee paid by the buyer to the seller unless the buyer can establish that such payment is distinct from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. In this case, there is no link between the licensing agreement and the importer's payments to the middleman. Nothing in the record obligates the importer to make payments related to trademark rights. On the contrary, payments relate precisely to sales for exportation of the merchandise because they are based upon a percentage of the price paid by the importer to the middleman for each importation. The payments, although identified as royalties, are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and, consequently, are to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. In addition, a handling charge appears on internal accounting documents and the charge is for the tracking and equalization of landed costs. The cost appears only on the importer's purchase order and does not represent a payment to other parties. The

handling charge is not to be included in the appraised value of the merchandise
547623 dated Feb. 21, 2002.

The license fee at issue in this case is related to license rights, technical assistance, basic support and product design and development of the finished product, not the imported merchandise. There is a rebuttable presumption that all payments made by a buyer to a seller, or a party related to a seller, are part of the price actually paid or payable. As in the instant case, an exception exists when the buyer demonstrates that such payments are completely unrelated to the merchandise. Therefore, the payments are not part of the price actually paid or payable. In addition, the payment of the royalty is not a condition of sale. The payment should not be added to the price actually paid or payable provided under section 402(b)(1)(d) of the TAA.
547761 dated Mar. 14, 2002.

The buyer pays the seller certain fees to compensate the seller for the costs associated with obtaining the permit needed to export softwood lumber to the United States. These fees are closely related to the imported merchandise and they are included in the seller's price. The described permit and service fees paid to the seller to cover costs associated with the procurement of the requisite export permit are included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
548003 dated July 16, 2002.

Counsel did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the payments made by the importer to a related seller, or a third party related to the seller, were independent and unrelated costs not associated with the imported merchandise. Counsel provided copies of the relevant license, trademark, and technical service agreements, and a short narrative for each, explaining the transactions involved. This information, by itself, is insufficient to rebut the presumption that the payments were made in exchange for merchandise sold for export to the United States. The payments made to the seller or the seller's related third parties are therefore dutiable as part of the price paid or payable.
547662 dated Sep. 20, 2002; <u>modified</u> by 548305 dated Aug. 11, 2003.

The buyer pays the foreign supplier a set amount for each article and a tooling/mold charge. Because the buyer paid the seller for the cost of the mold, there was a rebuttable presumption that the payment was part of the price actually paid or payable. Based on the information provided by the importer, the mold cost paid by the buyer is part of the price paid or payable. The cost of the mold should be apportioned over the value of the total number of items to be produced.
548196 dated Dec. 13, 2002.

The seller purchases U.S. design and engineering work, and includes these costs in its price of the imported merchandise. There is no basis to deduct these costs included in the price paid by the buyer. Therefore, these costs remain part of the price actually paid or payable for purposes of determining transaction value. The assist provision is not relevant because the U.S. design and engineering work is not provided to the seller free of charge or at a reduced cost. In addition, the provider of the U.S. design and

engineering work is not the buyer of the imported merchandise.
548276 dated Apr. 29, 2003.

The buyer is a U.S. subsidiary of the foreign parent company, and purchases merchandise from the parent seller. The parties entered into an agreement entitled a "Cost Sharing Research Agreement" which encompasses research and development expenses paid by the importer. The appraised value of the merchandise sold by the foreign parent to the related party subsidiary should include the costs incurred pursuant to the "Cost Sharing Research Agreement" for research and development of the merchandise imported into the United States.
548306 dated July 9, 2003.

548298 dated July 25, 2003 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect payments.

The importer imports merchandise for which the foreign vendors have been reimbursed by the importer for materials and/or production equipment procured by the foreign vendors and used in the production of the imported merchandise. The reimbursement payments made to the foreign vendors covers merchandise imported over numerous entries and over an extended period of time. The importer may structure the arrangements with its foreign vendors so that the reimbursement payments that are properly part of the total payment of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise may be included in the dutiable value of the first entry. (Note: This proposed transaction is acceptable provided it does not violate other provisions of Customs laws, results in no revenue reduction to the United States, does not impact the classification of the merchandise and the importer does not seek drawback).
548375 dated Oct. 30, 2003.

The appraised value of merchandise sold by foreign subsidiaries to a U.S. subsidiary buyer, all of whom are parties to a research and development expense sharing agreement, should include the research and development costs incurred for the development of the merchandise imported into the U.S. Sound corporate accounting can provide the importer with a basis for determining the percentage of research and development pool payments that were devoted to a specific project, and which percentage of pool payments are part of the price paid or payable for the developed, imported merchandise. The precise determination for the appropriate allocation of research and development payments to specific merchandise should be decided on a case-by-case basis. The payments are sufficiently direct to conclude that they be included in the price actually paid or payable.
548331 dated Oct. 31, 2003.

The royalty payments are part of the price actually paid or payable. The payments are made annually, during the term of the license agreement, and for as along as the importer uses the equipment in question. Assuming the agreement remains in force, and the equipment is used throughout its useful life, then the amount of the future royalty payments can reasonably be determined taking into account the life of the equipment and

the length of the contract. In so doing, Customs may look to the importer's books and records, and the manner in which the equipment is depreciated, provided these are in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
548373 dated Nov. 24, 2003.

548386 dated Nov. 26, 2003 - See Reconciliation.

Payments characterized as "loans," made by the buyer to the related party seller, are to be included in the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise. Costs identified as "startup costs" and claimed to be amortized over a period of time are to be included in the price paid or payable. If the importer cannot establish with sufficient information that the invoice price included these costs, they should be added.
W548475 dated Mar. 25, 2004.

The fee paid pursuant to the technical services and retail consulting agreement is part of the price paid or payable of the imported merchandise. The documentation provided does not allow CBP to conclude that some or all of the payments pursuant to the technical services and retail consulting agreement do not go to the benefit of other entities, including foreign franchisees.
548464 dated May 25, 2004, aff'g 548014 dated Sep. 13, 2002.

The subject payments or proceeds (1) are part of the price actually paid or payable; (2) constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D); and (3) constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E). 1. The ruling requester did not overcome the presumption that the payments made to its related party seller were part of the price actually paid or payable. 2. The requester has not convinced CBP that the imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. There is a link between the production and sale of the imported licensed merchandise and the payment of royalties by the buyer. The importer could not purchase the merchandise without paying the fee. 3. The seller and the licensor are related, and the buyer/importer has not established that none of the proceeds accrue directly or indirectly to the seller.
548560 dated Sep. 3, 2004.

Although the buyer does not contract to purchase a specified amount of footwear, the buyer and seller agree in writing on a purchase price, which includes a charge for tooling that is amortized over an estimated production quantity. When the production quantity is less than that estimated, the buyer reimburses the seller for any "under-amortized" tooling costs. If the production quantity is greater than forecasted, the buyer recovers the overpayment for the tooling. The payments are properly apportioned over the total number of products that the parties anticipate to be produced. Therefore, the price actually paid or payable for the imported footwear already includes the allocated tooling payments and no further adjustments are needed.
W563531 dated Oct. 27, 2006.

Where the evidence of record included an invoice from the seller to the ultimate consignee

in the amount of $187,000 and the evidence also indicated that this amount was paid to the seller in two installments, it is CBP's position, based on *Generra*, that the price paid or payable for the imported merchandise is $187,000. The protestant did not provide evidence to establish that the payments are unrelated to the imported merchandise.
H033861 dated Dec. 12, 2008.

An audit of a garment importer disclosed undeclared lump-sum payments to various foreign vendors. There were no records or procedures in place connecting the lump-sum payments to particular entries. The importer claimed that the payments were non-dutiable buying commissions but was unable to produce buying agency agreements or other documentation to substantiate that valid buying agency relationships existed. CBP value advanced an unliquidated entry by the total amount of the undeclared lump-sum payments. The importer's surety filed a protest against the value advance. CBP determined that the value advance was improper to the extent that it related to merchandise other than that covered by the entry that was value advanced. The lump-sum payments at issue could be apportioned over the entry only to the extent that they related to that particular entry.
H082455 dated Nov. 19, 2009.

Importer makes bonus payments to its vendors for on-time delivery of the imported merchandise. The bonus payments are calculated on the basis of a pre-determined formula. The bonus payments are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H082475 dated Mar. 2, 2010.

Though the total payment made from an importer to an exporter, including payments that represent something other than the per se value of a good, may be used to determine the transaction value, there must not be an absence of specific information pertaining to the transactions that account for the total payment. In this case, because the total payments included a pre-payment transaction with an absence of specific information pertaining to that particular transaction, the total payment for the imported good could not be confirmed and appraisement under transaction value was not appropriate.
H255619 dated Jan. 16, 2015.

Company A purchased and imported jewelry from its parent company, Company B. Company B purchased the imported jewelry from Company C, a related manufacturer. CBP stated that Company A satisfied the circumstances of the sale test; therefore, transaction value was the appropriate method of appraisement. CBP also determined that the administrative fee paid by Company A to Company B for certain services provided by Company B with respect to marketing, sales support, administration, information technology, finance, legal, human resources, and logistics arrangements was already included in the price declared to CBP, *i.e*. selling price. Additionally, CBP found that since this fee was already included in the price between the related parties, CBP had no authority to deduct it under 19 U.S.C. 1401a. However, had the fee not already been included in the customs value, it would not have been added as either part of the price actually paid or payable or as an addition to the price actually paid or payable under 19

U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E).
H239496 dated Mar. 13, 2015.

advertising/marketing costs

Amounts paid by an importer of vodka pursuant to an agreement between the importer and foreign vendor to share U.S. marketing costs, i.e., advertising, merchandising, promotion, market research, public relations, are not part of the price actually paid or payable. No legal authority exists to treat these advertising expenses as part of the price actually paid or payable, providing such expenditures are, in fact, for advertising and marketing. (See 19 CFR 152.103(a)(2), which excludes activities such as advertising, undertaken by the buyer on his own account, from the price actually paid or payable.)
544638 dated July 1, 1991.

allowance in price actually paid or payable

544762 dated Jan. 17, 1992; 544841 dated Jan. 17, 1992 - See Defective Merchandise, allowance in price.

544628 dated Mar. 11, 1992 - See Discounts, renegotiation of price.

No allowance is made in the value of merchandise when it is claimed that the merchandise is defective but no evidence is presented to support that claim. Despite being asked by Customs for information regarding the claim that the merchandise was defective, the importer failed to provide any documentation.
544879 dated Apr. 3, 1992.

No allowance can be made in the appraised value of imported merchandise when it is claimed that a portion of the merchandise was lost or stolen prior to importation. No documentation was submitted to substantiate the allegation that the price paid by the importer was less than the invoice price. Documentation from the seller, the shipper, or its insurer acknowledging and providing compensation for the loss of the merchandise may have been sufficient to substantiate the importer's claim.
545013 dated Oct. 8, 1992.

The merchandise invoice contains a number of additions and deductions, such as varietal premium, market adjustment, customer discount, and commitment incentive. The deduction at issue is called a “duty allowance.” It is the responsibility of the buyer to arrange for the payment of customs duties upon entry. Further, the actual customs duties payable could, therefore, be above or below the value of the duty allowance calculated using this method. The duties are not included in the price actually paid by the buyer to the seller and, therefore, are not deductible pursuant to 19 U.S.C 1401 a(b)(3)(B). In addition, the duty allowance is not equivalent to the actual customs duties. Thus, the “duty allowance” may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3)(B).
546626 dated Nov. 9, 2001.

The foreign seller supplies wearing apparel to the U.S. market exclusively through its sales to the importer. Additionally, the foreign seller provides certain technical services to the importer. The importer alleges that these services include such activities as visual merchandising, store planning, retail personnel training, etc. Pursuant to a technical services agreement, the importer compensates the seller for the services with payment in an amount equal to a fixed percentage of the importer's net retail sales of the merchandise. The importer submitted a copy of the technical services agreement to Customs. Customs cannot conclude that the fees are payments for technical services that are unrelated to the sale of the merchandise simply on the basis of the language of the technical services agreement. Without further substantiation, Customs cannot determine whether adherence to a technical services agreement was a condition for the sale of the merchandise. The fee paid by the importer is dutiable as part of the price paid or payable or, alternatively, as a proceed of a subsequent resale.
548014 dated Sep. 13, 2002.

assembly of merchandise

19 CFR 152.103(a)(3)

The appraisement of wearing apparel under transaction value includes the costs of cut, make and trim, and of odd-lot fabric, the latter to be valued at the cost of acquisition.
542181 dated Oct. 15, 1980 (TAA No. 8).

Assembly costs for an offshore drilling platform are part of the price actually paid or payable because the assembly preceded the importation of the merchandise.
543117 dated Sep. 2, 1983.

543737 dated July 21, 1986; <u>modifies</u> 542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39) – <u>See</u> Assists, materials, components, parts, and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

The proper method of appraisement in this case is transaction value, as represented by the price paid by the importer to the foreign refinery, plus the value, as an assist, of copper concentrate furnished to the foreign refinery free of charge. The transaction between the importer and the refinery represents a sale for exportation to the United States even though the price actually paid or payable to the refinery relates solely to the processing of the merchandise.
543971 dated July 22, 1987.

The price actually paid or payable may represent an amount for the assembly of imported merchandise in which the seller merely acts as assembler. The fact that the importer supplies materials for imported garments and is billed for the cut, make and trim operation does not preclude the use of transaction value.
545550 dated Sep. 13, 1995.

An article entered under subheading 9802.00.80, HTSUS, is subject to duty upon the full value of the imported assembled article, less the cost or value, within the meaning of section 10.17, Customs Regulations (19 CFR 10.17), of the U.S. components assembled therein. 19 CFR 10.17 provides that the "[v]alue of fabricated components to be subtracted from the full value of the assembled article is the cost of the components when last purchased, FOB United States port of exportation or point of border crossing as set out in the invoice and entry papers, or, if no purchase was made, the value of the components at the time of their shipment for exportation, FOB United States port of exportation or point of border crossing, as set out in the invoice and entry papers . . . ." It is Customs position that the "cost of components when last purchased," refers to the price in effect at the date of exportation. In this case, the submitted documentation reflects the cost for the U.S.-produced radios when last purchased, FOB U.S. port of export, as set out in the invoice and entry papers.
547489 dated Mar. 20, 2000.

The transactions appear to be analogous to shelter operations, which involve a U.S. corporation that is established for the sole purpose of facilitating assembly operations for third party clients in the United States. In some cases, the importer supplies the foreign assembler with either fabric cut in the United States or cut and assembled fabric sourced outside of the United States. The price declared by the U.S. importer appears to include the cost of assembly, the cost for the fabric assists, and the costs for southbound freight, which is presumptively the cost of transporting the fabric to the foreign supplier for assembly. Accordingly, the use of transaction value is appropriate so long as the relationship between the importer and the supplier did not influence the price.
547729 dated Sep. 20, 2002.

H004684 dated Mar. 16, 2007 – See Assists; materials, components, parts, and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

benefit of seller

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (4) (A); 19 CFR 152.102(f); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable; See also Moss Mfg. Co., Inc. v. United States, 13 Ct. Int'l Trade 420 (1989), aff'd, 896 F.2d 535 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

542975 dated Mar. 9, 1983 (TAA No. 60). – See Indirect Payments, part of the price actually paid or payable as an indirect payment.

A financing profit between the price of merchandise and the selling price of imported merchandise by a third party is not part of the price actually paid or payable because it does not accrue to the benefit of the seller. Therefore, it is not dutiable under transaction value.
543118 dated July 29, 1983.

543365 dated Nov. 1, 1984 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, inspection charges.

544143 dated July 5, 1988 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, payments to a third party.

The importer uses the services of a foreign quasi-governmental organization, located in the United States, which advises U.S. importers on the sourcing of products in China. In consideration for these services, the importer agrees to make monthly payments to defray a portion of the organization's operating expenses, and the services rendered will never result in the importation of merchandise. These payments are not dutiable pursuant to transaction value.

544264 dated Feb. 24, 1989.

A payment is made by the buyer to its overseas plant to compensate for management services rendered in negotiating the termination of a licensing agreement. The licensing agreement granted one of the importer's wholly owned subsidiaries the exclusive right to manufacture, sell, and distribute wearing apparel under a particular trademark. The payment is made well after the importation of the wearing apparel and is not made to the actual sellers of the imported merchandise. In addition, the payment cannot be linked to any imported goods. This payment is not included in the transaction value of the merchandise.

544276 dated Oct. 24, 1989.

Administrative services, quality control services, and supervisory functions are performed by a party related to the importer, and are under the supervision of the importer. The services include assisting the importer in determining what types of garments the manufacturers can economically make, accounting and billing services, and administrative services on an as-needed basis. The fees paid for these services are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.

544396 dated May 14, 1990.

The importer and the manufacturer have entered into an agreement for the purchase of vodka. The contract specifically provides for a minimum amount to be expended by the buyer on advertising. Although this may benefit the seller indirectly, the advertising costs are not part of the price actually paid or payable. The costs of these activities will not be added to the price actually paid or payable in determining the customs value of the imported merchandise.

544482 dated Aug. 30, 1990.

547098 dated Feb. 2, 1999 - <u>See</u> Buying Commissions, dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable.

548298 dated July 25, 2003 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect.

A sourcing fee paid by the importer to its related party is not included in the transaction value – it is not paid to or for the benefit of the seller or a party related to the seller. It is not a selling commission. The agreement between the parties provides that their

relationship is that of independent contractors, not principal and agent.
548420 dated Jan. 13, 2004.

The importer's foreign non-related buying agent purchased equipment from a non-related bar code equipment supplier and hired personnel to create bar codes and labels for shipping cartons. The importer used the information on the bar codes to facilitate the movement of its merchandise through its distribution center and was invoiced by the buying agent. The suppliers of the importer's merchandise packed all cartons in a condition ready for export, and advised the buying agent of the number or cartons and contents of each carton. The buying agent used the information to create a bar code label. The expenses incurred by the importer were not part of the price paid or payable as no payments inured directly or indirectly to the seller of the merchandise. As the imported merchandise was wearing apparel, the bar code labeling equipment was not dutiable as an assist. It was also not dutiable as packing costs, as the bar code labeling equipment and labels were not containers or coverings.
548559 dated July 7, 2004.

The importer ordered wearing apparel from the U.S. branch office of the seller. The seller purchased the apparel from an unrelated Chinese manufacturer. The importer purchased quota from a subcontractor/quota broker. The quota broker furnished the importer with an invoice reflecting each quota purchase. Prima facie, the quota payments appeared to be made from the importer to the quota broker, a party unrelated to the seller. But the quota broker bought some export visas from companies with excess textile quota, including the seller. For those transactions where the importer provided sufficient evidence to show that the quota payments do not inure to the benefit of the seller, the quota payments should not be included as part of the price actually paid or payable. For those transactions where the importer provided sufficient evidence to show that the international freight costs were included in the price paid by the buyer to the seller, a deduction may be made for international freight costs.
H028002 dated Sep. 14, 2009.

The Importer is a distributor of home textile products, including bed, table, toilet, and kitchen linens, which it purchases from various unrelated manufacturers/sellers in the Far East. The term of sale is FOB. The Importer entered into a Financing Agreement with Zetex to help finance its international trade operations. Zetex is a service company in Hong Kong and is related to the Importer within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(g). Under the terms of the Financing Agreement, the exclusive purpose of the agreement is to facilitate the financing of the Importer's transactions. Even though the Importer and Zetex are related, the companies do not have a relationship of buyer and seller. Pursuant to the Financing Agreement between these parties, the finance fees will not inure, directly or indirectly, to the benefit of the unrelated sellers/manufacturers. The manufacturers are not parties to the Financing Agreement. Finally, neither Zorlu nor Zetex are related to any of the manufacturers/sellers. Thus, CBP determined that transaction value is an acceptable method of appraisement and the finance fees need not be included in the price actually paid or payable since the lender, Zetex, is not also the seller of the merchandise proposed to be imported.

H099255 dated Mar. 24, 2010.

cancellation payments

See chapter on CANCELLATION PAYMENTS, supra.

charges identified separately from the price actually paid or payable

Engineering and set-up fees in connection with the U.S. installation of imported equipment are not to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. The purchase contract or the commercial invoice must clearly establish the separate identity of these charges.
542611 dated Sep. 22, 1981.

543331 dated June 14, 1984 - See Post-Importation Charges, construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance charges.

543567 dated Jan. 17, 1986 - See Invoice Requirements, separately identified from the price actually paid or payable.

543963 dated Sep. 11, 1987; modified by 544722 dated June 4, 1991 - See Duties and Taxes, identified separately requirement.

544005 dated Aug. 16, 1988; aff'd by 544247 dated Feb. 28, 1989 - See Post Importation Charges, subsequent to importation.

Assuming transaction value is applicable as a means of appraisement, a refundable security deposit (an amount to cover the cost of the German value added tax (VAT)), that is returned to the U.S. customer by the importer upon the arrival of the merchandise into the United States, is not added to the price actually paid or payable. The VAT payment is separately stated on the invoice, and is paid to the German government by the seller only if the merchandise is not imported into the United States within six months.
546798 dated July 31, 1998, modified by 547686 dated May 31, 2000.

A value added tax (VAT) is levied on an automobile bought in Germany, in the event that the car is not exported to the United States or Canada. However, if the car is not exported to the United States or Canada, within six months of the date of the delivery, the deposit is forfeited and paid over the German governmental authorities as the VAT. In this case, the amount deposited was refundable to the customer upon the arrival of the vehicle into the United States. Therefore, assuming transaction value is the appropriate method of appraisement, and based on the evidence available, neither the refundable security deposit nor a VAT should be included in the transaction value of the imported vehicle.
547686 dated May 31, 2000; modification of 546798 dated July 31, 1998.

547958 dated July 23, 2001 - See Transaction Value, royalty and license fees.

548161 dated Aug. 21, 2002 - See Duties and Taxes, identified separately requirement.

Under the seller's core exchange program, upon the purchase of a new or reconditioned part from the seller, its U.S. customers are required to return the defective part within a certain period of time. Under the first scenario presented, a charge is assessed upon the failure of a customer to return the faulty part within a specified time frame. Under the second scenario, the charge is required to be paid up front by the customer. Under both scenarios, the charge is assessed if the U.S. customer fails to return the faulty part. Additionally, the invoices indicate a distinction between the price for the purchased part and the charge. The charge is related to the defective parts and not related to the imported replacement parts. Therefore, the charge is not part of the price actually paid or payable. **H121800 dated Dec. 10, 2010.**

A global freight provider provides a variety of origin related services to its importer customers. The charges for the services are included in the invoice price as part of the price of the merchandise. Documentation from a sample transaction for illustrative purposes was provided. The documentation consisted of a purchase order from the importer to the vendor for certain auto accessories, a commercial invoice (indicating FOB port of export term of sale) and a packing list from the vendor to the importer, a bill of lading, a freight and transportation summary statement, a container manifest, and a freight invoice issued by the global freight provider. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by the global freight provider may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise: terminal handling charge, foreign customs clearance, carrier bill of lading fee, 10+2 management fee, port security charge, and carrier agent booking fee. However, the foreign inland freight charges should be included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise since there is no evidence of through shipment from the factory to the U.S.
H205797 dated June 7, 2012.

charges incident to the international shipment of the imported merchandise

See chapter on TRANSPORTATION COSTS, infra.

547534 dated Jan. 19, 2001 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, warehousing charges.

Company Y utilizes the services of company X for certain origin coordination, supplier/vendor communication, cargo handling, and other origin related services. Of the services provided, the fees charged by company X for 10+2 management, carrier agent booking, carrier bill of lading, CFS receiving, customs clearance, CY monitoring, documentation, equipment management, FCR/HBL issuance, LCL handling, port construction charge, port security charge, supply chain security, terminal handling charge,

and wharfage are incident to the international shipment of the merchandise. Therefore, they are excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The costs charged by X related to drayage/haulage/trucking, which occur within the country of exportation, are separately identified in the invoices from X to the suppliers. The services occur after the merchandise has been sold for export to the U.S. and there is a through shipment of the merchandise evidenced by a through bill of lading from the sellers. Accordingly, they are excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. However, the camcontrol fee charged by the local authority is not excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H092560 dated Apr. 7, 2010.

Company A imports its products from various suppliers around the world and utilizes the services of Company B to assist with the origin coordination, supplier/vendor communication, cargo handling, and a variety of other origin related services. Company B charges Company A certain fees for the services offered in arranging the shipment of the merchandise to the United States. Company B also provided documentation from two sample transactions for illustrative purposes to document the services offered. Based on the information presented, CBP determined that the following costs charged by Company B may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions: (1) documentation, equipment management, and terminal handling charges, as specified in sample transaction #1; and (2) customs clearance fee, drayage/haulage/tracking and equipment management fees, as specified in sample transaction #2. Additionally, 10+2 management fees, carrier agent booking fee, carrier bill of lading, CFS receiving fees, CY monitoring, FCR/HBL issuance fees, LCL handling fee, port construction charge, port security charge, supply chain security and wharfage fees, may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise in line with CBP ruling in H092560, provided that all documentary requirements are satisfied.
H119857 dated Sep. 9, 2010.

Company A imports its products from various suppliers around the world and utilizes the services of Company B to assist with the origin coordination, supplier/vendor communication, cargo handling, and a variety of other origin related services. Company B charges Company A certain fees for the services offered in arranging the shipment of the merchandise to the United States. Company B also provided documentation from three sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consists of freight bills/arrival notices, commercial invoices, packing lists, purchase orders, waybills, and entry summaries concerning the importation of quilts. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following costs charged by Company B may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions: (1) 10+2 management fee, carrier agent booking fee, carrier bill of lading, CY monitoring, documentation fee, port security charge, supply chain security and terminal handling fees, as specified in sample transaction ##1 and 3; and (2) 10+2 management fee, carrier agent booking fee, carrier bill of lading, CY monitoring, documentation fee, port security charge, supply chain security and terminal handling fees, and equipment management fee, as specified in sample transaction #2. Additionally,

CFS receiving, Customs clearance, drayage/haulage/trucking, LCL handling, port construction, and wharfage fees, may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise in line with CBP ruling H092560, provided that all documentary requirements are satisfied.
H119858 dated Sep. 9, 2010.

Forwarder A, a foreign freight forwarder, provides a variety of origin related services to the importer. The importer submitted sample documentation which includes: a commercial invoice (indicating FOB port of export term of sale) and a packing list from the seller to the importer, an invoice from forwarder A to the seller, a sea waybill from the seller to the importer, and an invoice from the transportation company to the seller. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by forwarder A may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise provided documentation is presented to support the claim: container yard administration charge or container freight station receiving, terminal handling, port wharfage or port construction, port security or terminal security, cargo booking, handling of documents and/or freight cargo receipt, export customs clearance. The importer did not provide evidence of through shipment from the factory to the U.S. Accordingly, the foreign inland freight charges are not deductible from the price actually paid or payable.
H144039 dated Apr. 19, 2011.

A non-vessel operating common carrier ("NVOCC") provides international transportation and other related services to the importer. The NVOCC charges the importer an Automated Manifest Processing ("AMP") fee for filing manifest information with CBP. The documents submitted included a commercial invoice for the merchandise from the seller to the importer (indicating CIF port of destination term of sale), a bill of lading issued by the NVOCC, an invoice from the NVOCC to the buyer. CBP found that based on the information presented, the AMP charge may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise as a charge incident to the international shipment of the merchandise.
H148715 dated Nov. 16, 2011.

Company A sources products from various sellers around the world and utilizes the services of Company B, a global logistics provider, to assist with the origin coordination, supplier/vendor communication, cargo handling, and a variety of other origin related services. Company B submitted documentation from three sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consists of commercial invoices (indicating FOB port of export terms of sale), purchase orders, and packing lists from the sellers to Company A for certain sporting goods, invoices (freight and transportation detailed statements) from Company B to the sellers, bills of lading, and a waybill. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by Company B may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions as costs incident to the international shipment of the merchandise: (1) carrier bill of lading, Container Yard ("CY") monitoring, documentation fee, equipment management fee, supply chain security fee, and terminal handling fee, as

specified in sample transaction #1; (2) CY monitoring, documentation fee, and supply chain security fee, as specified in sample transaction #2; and (3) 10+2 management fee, carrier bill of lading, CY monitoring, documentation fee, equipment management fee, port construction, port security, supply chain security, and terminal handling fee, as specified in sample transaction #3. Additionally, carrier agent booking, Container Freight Station ("CFS") receiving, foreign customs clearance, Less than Container Load ("LCL") handling, and wharfage fees may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise provided that all documentary requirements are satisfied.
H179139 dated Oct. 11, 2011.

Company A sources products from various sellers around the world and utilizes the services of Damco, a global logistics provider, to assist with the origin coordination, supplier/vendor communication, cargo handling, and a variety of other origin related services. Damco provided documentation from three sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consists of purchase orders from the importer to the sellers, commercial invoices (indicating FOB port of export terms of sale), and packing lists from the sellers to the importer for certain footwear, invoices from Damco to the sellers, and waybills. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by Damco may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise: (1) documentation fee, Container Yard ("CY") monitoring, supply chain security fee, 10+2 management fee, carrier bill of lading, and terminal handling fee, as specified in sample transaction #1; (2) 10+2 management fee, carrier bill of lading, CY monitoring, documentation fee, equipment management fee, foreign customs clearance, port security, supply chain security fee, and terminal handling fee, as specified in sample transaction #2; and (3) 10+2 management fee, carrier bill of lading, CY monitoring, documentation fee, supply chain security fee, terminal handling fee, and the Advance Manifest Surcharge ("AMS") declaration fee, as specified in sample transaction #3. Additionally, carrier agent booking, Container Freight Station ("CFS") receiving, Less than Container Load ("LCL") handling, port construction, and wharfage fees may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise provided that all documentary requirements are satisfied.
H178135 dated Nov. 22, 2011; H179141 dated Nov. 21, 2011;
H179142 dated Nov. 21, 2011.

Importer utilizes freight forwarders to assist with a variety of origin related services. The charges for the services are included in the invoice price as part of the price of the merchandise. Importer provided documentation from sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consisted of purchase orders from the importer to the sellers/manufacturers for certain apparel and footwear, commercial invoices (indicating FOB port of export term of sale) and packing lists from the sellers to the importer, waybills issued by freight forwarders, and freight invoices from the freight forwarders to the sellers/manufacturers. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by the freight forwarders may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise: administration fee, bill of lading

charge, bill of lading amendment fee, terminal handling charge, CY monitoring, FCR issuance fee, document fee, customs export declaration fee, container seal fee, log-net fee, and late gate charge.
H219516 dated July 30, 2012.

Importer utilizes a third party logistics provider to assist with a variety of origin related services. The charges for the services are included in the invoice price as part of the price of the merchandise. Importer provided documentation from sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consisted of purchase orders from the importer to the seller for certain decorative articles, commercial invoices (indicating FOB port of export terms of sale) and packing lists from the seller to the importer, waybills issued by carriers, forwarder's cargo receipts, and tax invoices issued by the third party logistics provider. CBP found that the following fees charged by the third party logistics provider may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise: the FCR issuance fee, terminal handling charge, foreign customs clearance fee, carrier bill of lading fee, port security charge, the AMS fee or 10+2 fee, and the carrier agent booking fee. However, the CFS storage charge may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise since the CFS is not located within the port limits. Similarly, the CY fees may not be deducted if the CY is not located within the port limits. The fee for the movement of empty containers to the CFS may also not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise. Additionally, the foreign inland freight charges should be included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise since there is no evidence of through shipment from the factory to the U.S.
H235776 dated Apr. 16, 2013.

direct or indirect payments

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A); 19 CFR 152.102(f); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable; See also chapter on INDIRECT PAYMENTS, supra.

542984 dated Apr. 8, 1983 - See Insurance Costs, product liability insurance payments.

Payments made to the seller for expenses incurred for research and development are part of the price actually paid or payable rather than an addition thereto (as an assist). However, the dutiable amount of the research and development is limited to that paid for products actually exported to the United States.
543324 dated Aug. 8, 1984.

543376 dated Nov. 13, 1984 - See Assists, directly or indirectly.

543426 dated Mar. 15, 1985 - See Indirect Payments, part of the price actually paid or payable as an indirect payment.

543584 dated Aug. 30, 1985 - See Assists, engineering, development, artwork, design work necessary for the production.

543574 dated Mar. 24, 1986; overrules 543293 dated Jan. 15, 1985 - See Indirect Payments, compensation for assists as indirect payments.

543771 dated July 11, 1986 - See Indirect Payments, reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt.

543772 dated July 11, 1986 - See Indirect Payments, reduction in purchase price for settlement of a debt.

543882 dated Mar. 13, 1987; aff'd by 554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989 - See Indirect Payments, compensation for assists as indirect payments.

In situations where the buyer pays the seller to provide a mold necessary for the seller to produce the imported merchandise, the buyer is not supplying the seller with the actual mold. The additional amount paid by the buyer to the seller for producing the mold is properly part of the price actually paid or payable and dutiable under transaction value.
543983 dated Dec. 2, 1987.

544381 dated Nov. 25, 1991 - See Assists, payment to seller.

544694 dated Feb. 14, 1995 - See Foreign Trade Zones, design and development costs.

The importer purchases consumer electric products, including color televisions and chassis, from its parent company in Japan. The importer is also a domestic manufacturer of color televisions. The importer has entered into a "Design and Other Services Agreement" with the parent company seller. Under the terms of the agreement, the parent company agrees to perform certain functions affecting the importer's production of the color televisions. The agreement allows the importer the option to receive consulting and/or training services from the seller. The agreement further provides that the seller may provide such services directly to a third party (related to both seller and importer) from which the importer also purchases completed color televisions. The importer agrees to reimburse the parent company for the costs and expenses incurred in rendering the services, including those provided by the third party related seller. The payments made by the importer to the parent for these services are indirect payments to the third party related seller and are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise purchased from the third party related seller.
545848 dated Sep. 1, 1995.

Notwithstanding the fact that the payments in question are referred to by the parties as "license fees," they are actually part of the total payment for the imported merchandise. The alleged license fees paid by the importer are not paid to the licensor. Instead, they

are paid either to the buying agent or the licensees. The seller's invoices refer specifically to the fact that license fees are to be paid by the importer. The payment of the fees is related to the imported merchandise, and the fees are based upon the importer's purchase price for the imported merchandise. These fees paid to a party related to the seller constitute indirect payments to the seller.
545194 dated Sep. 13, 1995; aff'd by 546513 dated Feb. 11, 1998 and 547134 dated July 27, 1999.

The importer purchases merchandise from its related party in Japan. The importer pays the seller for the merchandise. In addition, the foreign seller receives additional payments from the ultimate U.S. purchaser, through the importer. The payments are described as the following: tooling costs; price adjustments when sales do not reach a specified volume; and currency rate adjustments. The payments made by the ultimate purchaser in the United States, through the importer, to the foreign manufacturer are part of the price actually paid or payable as indirect payments.
546007 dated Sep. 21, 1995.

The contract price between a seller and U.S. buyer includes certain fees that are included in the price and become a part of the total payment for the imported merchandise. The buyer and seller agreed that the buyer would pay a portion of the contract price to a third party. It is our conclusion that these payments are indirect payments to the seller and are paid for the benefit of the seller, and as such, are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The fact that the buyer did not pay the fees directly to the seller is immaterial. They were indirect payments for the benefit of the seller.
548298 dated July 25, 2003.

At issue was whether certain escrow reimbursement payments by U.S. wholesalers or distributors to the foreign manufacturer are part of the price actually paid or payable of imported cigarettes. The ruling assumed: 1) that transaction value is properly determined based on the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. importer to the manufacturer in the sale between these parties; 2) that the U.S. importer is under no obligation by contract or otherwise to reimburse the manufacturer for any escrow payments; and 3) that none of the parties involved in the transaction described (i.e., the manufacturer, the importer and the U.S. wholesalers and distributors) are related pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(g). The payments are not part of the price actually paid or payable because they are not direct or indirect payments made by the buyer to, or for the benefit of the seller. "Although the payments are made or to be made to the seller, they are clearly not direct payments made or to be made by the buyer. Rather, the payments are to be made by unrelated wholesalers or distributors to whom the buyer will sell the imported cigarettes." The payments are not indirect payments by the buyer because "they are not settlement by the buyer of a debt owed by the seller and they are not a settlement of a debt owed by the buyer to the seller. The buyer is under no obligation to make these payments to the seller by contract or otherwise. Moreover, the buyer has no relationship to the wholesaler or distributor, the parties that are obligated to and will make these payments to the seller. Finally, the payments are not made through the buyer."
W563503 dated May 26, 2006.

A foreign tobacco manufacturer sells cigarettes to its U.S. subsidiary, who sells the cigarettes to unrelated wholesalers and distributors in the United States. The wholesalers and distributors sometimes sell cigarettes in states that are parties to the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (MSA). Under the MSA and state escrow statutes, the foreign manufacturer is required to make deposits to an escrow account for the purposes of satisfying future judgments and settlements that the states may obtain against the manufacturer. Under the contemplated transactions, the wholesalers and distributors of cigarettes to MSA states will reimburse the foreign manufacturer any escrow expenses it incurs. The reimbursement payments are not a settlement by the buyer, the U.S. subsidiary, of a debt owed by the foreign manufacturer, nor are they a settlement of a debt owed by the U.S. subsidiary to the foreign manufacturer. The wholesalers and distributors will make the payments directly to the foreign manufacturer, and the U.S. subsidiary will not have any involvement in the transactions. Based on the specific facts of this case, the reimbursement payments are not direct or indirect payments made by the buyer to or for the benefit of the seller, and thus not part of the price actually paid or payable.
563522 dated Sep. 11, 2006.

discounts

19 CFR 152.103(a)(1), Statement of Administrative Action (deferred quantity discounts); see also chapter on DISCOUNTS, supra.

542559 dated Aug. 18, 1981 - See Discounts, price actually paid or payable.

542741 dated Mar. 30, 1982 - See Discounts, quantity discounts.

543302 dated Nov. 1, 1984 - See Discounts, price actually paid or payable.

543662 dated Jan. 7, 1986 - See Discounts, quantity discounts.

544371 dated June 11, 1990 - See Discounts, price actually paid or payable..

547210 dated Mar. 25, 1999 - See Discounts, renegotiation of price.

In this case, the related foreign supplier grants various discounts based on established criteria from a price list. A *bona fide* sale occurs between the importer and the foreign supplier, in that the importer assumes title and risk of loss for the imported merchandise from the foreign supplier's factory and the importer is not functioning as a selling agent. The discounted price constitutes the price actually paid or payable. The importer and related foreign supplier transact business as if they are unrelated. The same discounts are given to both related buyers and unrelated buyers. Transaction value is acceptable as a means of appraisement.
547019 dated Mar. 31, 2000.

The importer imports footwear from several suppliers in Taiwan and Hong Kong. Each of the sellers agrees prior to shipment that goods purchased by the importer are subject to a 2% discount on the seller's price as a "damage allowance." The 2% discount offered by the sellers to the importer is unconditional and no specified purchasing obligations are placed on the importer in connection with this discount. Importer issues a letter of credit to the foreign supplier at the time of order placement. This letter of credit states that a 2% discount on the seller's price applies. The commercial invoices issued by the suppliers for the subject merchandise reflect the total price of the goods, the amount of the discount, and the discounted (net) price. The importer only pays the discounted or net price. The discounted prices, agreed to prior to importation, provided unconditionally by the seller to the importer, and reflected on commercial invoices, constitute the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H133044 dated Mar. 9, 2011.

The importer purchased various spare parts from a related entity. According to the importer, the declared value did not take into account a 40% discount granted for related-party sales. The importer could not reduce the entered value of its goods by 40% and obtain a refund of the duties paid because it did not show that its relationship with the related seller did not affect the price actually paid or payable.
H236744 dated Dec. 12, 2013.

The Importer is a wholly owned subsidiary of a parent company, located overseas. The parent company established another wholly-owned subsidiary, Global Buying Company ("GBC") and transferred all of its purchasing functions and personnel to the new subsidiary company. GBC purchases the merchandise from unrelated suppliers and sells the merchandise to the related Importer, located in the United States. The unrelated suppliers manufacture the specified number of merchandise ordered by GBC exclusively for sale to GBC in the United States. The unrelated suppliers offer GBC a certain percentage discount if payment is made within 20 days from the date of shipment. The unrelated suppliers ship the merchandise directly to GBC's warehouses in the United States. GBC retains both title and risk until the merchandise is shipped from GBC's distribution centers to the importer's stores in the United States. CBP found that the Importer was the ultimate purchaser, and with the additional financial interest conveyed through the distribution agreement between the Importer and the related GBC, had the right to make entry as the IOR. CBP also determined that the available evidence indicated that the sales between unrelated foreign suppliers and GBC are *bona fide* sales for export to the United States. Finally, CBP stated that provided that the condition upon which the discount is based it met prior to importation, the certain percentage early payment discount met CBP's established criteria for price adjustments and could be used to determine the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H065028 dated Jan. 8, 2014.

inspection charges

Fees incurred in hiring an on-site inspection agent to verify quantities of components and assembled garments returning to the United Sates are not paid to or for the benefit of the

seller, but, rather, the fees are paid to an independent company acting as the buyer's agent. These inspection fees are not part of the price actually paid or payable, nor do they constitute assists.
543365 dated Nov. 1, 1984.

An inspection fee is not included in the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise. Therefore, no statutory authority exists to include such amount in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544681 dated July 29, 1991.

547006 dated Apr. 28, 1998 - See Assists, inspection services.

The importer purchases down/feathers from various suppliers in China. It hires a company to inspect the product prior to each shipment from China. The purpose of the inspections is to validate that the down/feathers meets the importer's requirements. The suppliers, the inspection service, and the importer are unrelated. The inspection fees that the importer pays to the inspection service does not inure to the benefit of the suppliers or to parties related to the suppliers. Consequently, the payments made for inspection services are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
W563469 dated Mar. 21, 2006.

insufficient information to determine the price actually paid or payable

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1); 19 CFR 152.103(c); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, Paragraph 3

Lump-sum payments from the buyer to the seller which cannot be linked to individual invoices or importations will not suffice to establish the price actually paid or payable for merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States.
543698 dated June 11, 1986.

The price actually paid or payable from the buyer to the seller in this case is not ascertainable from the contract. Even though the contract purportedly contains all of the terms, the importer later revealed that a $200,000 cash advance is provided to the seller. In the absence of specific information pertaining to the cash advance and any other amounts exchanged between the parties, Customs is not able to confirm the total payment made for the imported merchandise. Therefore, no authority exists to appraise the merchandise pursuant to the transaction value method.
545032 dated Dec. 14, 1993.

545622 dated Apr. 28, 1994; revokes 544812 dated Mar. 3, 1994 - See Formulas in Determining the Price Actually Paid or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

As provided for in 19 CFR 152.103(c), additions to the price actually paid or payable will

be made only if there is sufficient information to establish the accuracy of the additions and to the extent to which they are not included in the price. In this case, there is insufficient information to establish the accuracy of the proposed 10% addition. Therefore, the addition to the price actually paid or payable is not proper.
544987 dated July 18, 1994.

The seller provides the importer with technical information needed to create a beet sugar molasses processing plant, as well as chromatographic separation resin (CSR) for use in the process of desugarization of beet sugar molasses. The contract sets forth one price, with no itemization, and for payment in four installments. An invoice accompanies the entry of the CSR, however the invoice is made for customs purposes only. The importer is purchasing a complete system under a single contract price. There is no purchase order specifically for the CSR, as payment is made by means of progress payments based upon a specified percentage of the entire contract price, and no one payment is specifically for the CSR. The price actually paid or payable for the CSR is not quantifiable; therefore, the imported merchandise cannot be appraised on the basis of transaction value.
545505 dated Aug. 9, 1994.

An importer enters into a contract with an unrelated shelter operation to produce window cable assemblies. The shelter provides the building space, utilities, personnel, transportation, and other production-related costs. The importer provides materials and machinery along with two employees. Pursuant to the shelter contract, the shelter bills the importer for its labor, shelter service, and purchases made on behalf of the importer. Although the transaction between the parties represents a sale for exportation to the United States, insufficient information is available concerning the total payment and, therefore, the price actually paid or payable is not ascertainable. Transaction value is not applicable as a means of appraisement.
546161 dated May 7, 1996.

546231 dated Feb. 10, 1997 - <u>See</u> Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

Transaction value may not be used as a method of appraisement because there is insufficient information to ascertain the price actually paid or payable. Although it appears as though an assist is being provided, there is insufficient information available to accurately value the assist. Accordingly, it is necessary to proceed sequentially through the valuation statute to properly appraise the imported merchandise, beginning with the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.
547168 dated Apr. 12, 1999.

H212283 dated June 19, 2014 – <u>See</u>, Packing Costs, addition to price actually paid or payable.

Though the total payment made from an importer to an exporter, including payments that represent something other than the per se value of a good, may be used to determine the

transaction value, there must not be an absence of specific information pertaining to the transactions that account for the total payment. In this case, because the total payments included a pre-payment transaction with an absence of specific information pertaining to that particular transaction, the total payment for the imported good could not be confirmed and appraisement under transaction value was not appropriate.
H255619 dated Jan. 16, 2015.

interest charges

See chapter on INTEREST, supra.

invoice price

The transaction value of doorskins ordered in quarter-inch sizes, but shipped in half-sizes, is their actual invoice price.
542613 dated Nov. 11, 1981 (TAA No. 42).

In this case, the best evidence available as to the price actually paid or payable is the actual invoice price. There is no evidence that a lesser amount was actually paid due to the shortfall in the quantity of merchandise delivered. The transaction value is properly represented by the total invoice price for the imported merchandise.
543428 dated Apr. 26, 1985.

The seller of imported merchandise unilaterally raised the price of twenty robot sets, and invoices reflecting these increased prices were submitted. The importer refused to agree to the increased prices and the seller subsequently cancelled the increase in price and corrected the invoices. The price reflected on the corrected invoices reflects the proper transaction value with respect to the merchandise. The corrected price on the invoices was agreed to prior to exportation of the goods and this amount was actually paid to the seller.
543526 dated Sep. 17, 1985; modified by 543664 dated Oct. 21, 1987.

The invoice price submitted at the time of entry represents the proper price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value. The importer submitted a second invoice, dated after entry, which indicates a lower price. However, the appraising officer correctly appraised the imported merchandise based upon the original invoice price.
545716 dated Jan. 31, 1995.

The U.S. company purchases and imports products from its affiliate in Japan. The Japanese government levies a tax on Japanese goods sold for consumption in Japan. However, when articles are sold in Japan for consumption abroad, one may pay the consumption tax and apply for a refund, by presenting export documentation, because the articles are exempt from the tax. The documentation submitted indicates that the consumption tax is not included in either the invoice price or the entered value. The importer was not charged for and did not pay the consumption tax at any time. Therefore, based on the documentation presented, the refundable consumption tax is not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
547056 dated Feb. 8, 1999.

Jewelry was appraised under the transaction value method based on prices set forth in an invoice submitted by the importer. The evidence submitted is insufficient to support the finding that the price actually paid or payable is properly represented by the first invoice submitted to Customs. The evidence is also insufficient to prove that the amount reflected in the fourth invoice is not the price actually paid or payable for the subject merchandise. Thus, Customs fixed the final appraisement in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1500 and determined that the last invoice submitted reflected the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and, therefore, was the proper basis for the determination of transaction value.
547368 dated June 28, 2000.

Protestant attempted to correct the initial value declared at the time of entry, claiming that an incorrect invoice was provided by its related party foreign supplier and that this reflected an intercompany sale. While the intercompany invoice did list the buyer as the U.S. affiliate, the merchandise was designated for shipment to the Protestant in the U.S., and the shipping date on the intercompany invoice was consistent with the entry date of the merchandise. The "corrected" invoice had a shipping date later than the date of entry. Accordingly, based on the totality of the evidence, the total payment was best reflected by the original invoice.
H110855 dated Dec. 8, 2011.

The importer (the Hong Kong vendor's selling agent) valued the imported merchandise US $3 per piece based on invoices issued by the Hong Kong vendor to its Hong Kong selling agent/the importer, the terms of which were FOB Hong Kong. However, the shipping documents listed the selling agent as the consignee and the place of delivery as Columbus, Ohio. The selling agent issued invoices for the imported merchandise to the DDP Buyer's parent at US $8.50 per piece, LDP Columbus. The DDP Buyer's parent paid the selling agent for the imported merchandise. There was no evidence that the selling agent ever purchased the merchandise or that it acted other than as an agent. The purchase orders and shipping documents indicated that the Hong Kong vendor retained a financial stake in the goods until they reached the U.S. buyer's warehouse in Ohio, and that the agent merely acted as consignee and IOR. Consequently, it was not appropriate to appraise the merchandise on the basis of the invoices issued by the Hong Kong vendor to its Hong Kong selling agent/the importer.
H137455 dated Feb. 16, 2012.

payments to a third party

Payments made by the buyer to an independent tester of merchandise are not made to, or for benefit of, the seller. These payments are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
542946 dated Jan. 27, 1983.

543365 dated Nov. 1, 1984 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, inspection charges.

543569 dated July 16, 1985 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, warehousing charges.

Payments are made to an unrelated Hong Kong company for consultation services in locating quota holding companies. The payments are not made to the seller of the imported goods. The payments are made pursuant to an arrangement which is separate and apart from the transactions vis-a-vis the manufacturers of the imported goods. These payments are not to be added to the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value.
544143 dated July 5, 1988.

Payments made by the importer to individuals in the Philippines for services rendered in providing bonds and safeguarding fabric and raw materials constitute payments to third parties and, therefore, such payments are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
544423 dated June 3, 1991.

544758 dated Feb. 21, 1992 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, additional payments made by the buyer to the seller; total payment.

The importer has hired employees in India, all of whom are engaged in activities that are normally associated with a buying agent, yet no written agreement exists. The employees work exclusively for the importer, and they neither manufacture nor buy and sell merchandise independently. Because the payments made to these employees are not payments made to the seller or a party related to the seller, they are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
544684 dated July 31, 1992.

547635 dated Nov. 7, 2001 - See Quota Charges, payments to unrelated third parties.

548298 dated July 25, 2003 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect.

The importer contracts with an unrelated third party located in the U.S. to provide carton shipping labels and manage label data for shipments moving directly from a foreign factory to a customer's distribution center in the U.S. The labels and data management service make the receiving process in the U.S. more efficient and less likely to have variances or errors. The charges paid for the labels and data management services

described above are not part of the price actually paid or payable because they are not paid by the buyer to or for the benefit of the seller of the imported merchandise. A separate analysis is necessary to determine whether they would be *an addition* to the price actually paid or payable as packing costs.
548690 dated Apr. 4, 2006.

payments unrelated to the imported merchandise

Payments from the buyer to the seller relating to the imported merchandise are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable, while payments unrelated to the imported merchandise are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
542703 dated Aug. 25, 1982 (TAA No. 50); 543387 dated Sep. 7, 1984.

Payments made on a periodic basis from the buyer to the seller as compensation for delivery and inspection of fabric are made pursuant to a service agreement not directly related to the imported merchandise. These payments are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
542831 dated Sep. 21, 1982 (TAA No. 52).

A separate fee paid to a related party seller for the following services is not part of the price actually paid or payable because the fee is unrelated to the manufacture of the imported merchandise: management services, accounting, finance, planning, and clerical activities.
543512 dated Apr. 9, 1985.

A separate agreement entered into between the buyer and seller provides for the buyer to compensate the seller for services rendered in connection with the purchase of fabric. These services include checking production, scheduling delivery, and conducting inspections. The amounts due under the service agreement are paid on a periodic basis rather than against particular shipments of merchandise. These payments to the seller pursuant to the service agreement are not part of the transaction value of the imported goods because they are not directly related to the imported merchandise.
543551 dated Aug. 27, 1985.

The importer enters into a service agreement with its related party seller. The agreement provides the importer with information relating to the steel trade, including market reports, forecasts, and steel trade statistics. In return for these services, the importer agrees to pay $.10 per metric ton of steel purchased by the importer from unrelated companies. Although the importer purchases steel from its parent company, the parent is not the seller in any of the transactions that are the basis for determining the amount of the payments under the service agreement. The payments to the parent company pursuant to the service agreement are unrelated to the purchase of steel by the importer from the related parent. The payments are not dutiable as part of transaction value.
543768 dated July 23, 1986.

544143 dated July 5, 1988 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, payments to a third

party.

W548547 dated Mar. 7, 2006 - See Assists, management services, salaries, infra.

post-importation services

543059 dated May 5, 1983 (TAA No. 62) – See Post-Importation Charges, post-importation services.

544332 dated Nov. 19, 1990 - See Transportation Costs, post-importation transportation.

546697 dated Aug. 26, 1999 - See Post-Importation Charges, construction, erection, assembly, or maintenance charges.

price renegotiation

542933 dated Oct. 13, 1982 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, price renegotiations.

543014 dated Feb. 15, 1983 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, price renegotiations.

543277 dated Apr. 30, 1984 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, price renegotiations.

543457 dated Apr. 9, 1985 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, price renegotiations.

.

The buyer and seller tentatively agree to a price for the goods, prior to exportation of the merchandise to the United States. Also prior to the actual exportation of the merchandise, the parties then negotiated and agreed to a final price. However, the invoices were not changed to reflect the new price until two months later. The importer has established that the negotiated lower prices had been agreed to prior to the exportation of the merchandise and that this price represents the price actually paid or payable.

544645 dated July 16, 1991.

544620 dated Dec. 23, 1991 - See Conditions or Consideration for which a Value Cannot be Determined, transaction value inapplicable.

544646 dated Dec. 23, 1991 - See Transportation Costs, international freight deduction.

544628 dated Mar. 11, 1992 - See Discounts, renegotiation of price.

544911 dated Apr. 6, 1993 - See Transportation Costs, international freight

deduction.

When the price of imported merchandise is renegotiated prior to the exportation of merchandise, and the delivery terms are changed from FOB to C&F, and the freight charges are included in the C&F renegotiated invoice price, the price actually paid or payable is determined by the C&F price, less the international freight charges. In this case, however, the actual transaction appears to have occurred on a FOB basis, notwithstanding the attempted change of delivery terms on the purchase orders because the buyer paid for the freight costs.
545257 dated July 6, 1994.

545628 dated July 29, 1994 - See Invoicing Requirements, inconsistent documents presented at time of entry.

545532 dated Sep. 14, 1994 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, post-importation refund.

The importer claims that there was a reduction in the price of the imported merchandise at issue. However, the documentation provided does not establish that there was a reduction in the selling price of the merchandise before it was imported into the United States. The "adjusted invoice," dated after entry of the merchandise does not discredit the price shown on the invoice dated before entry of the merchandise. The alleged price reduction was properly disregarded in determining transaction value.
546097 dated Mar. 7, 1996.

The importer and seller renegotiated the price of imported merchandise due to a late delivery. However, the price renegotiations occurred after the merchandise was exported and after it was imported into the United States. The price renegotiations, which arose from the late delivery of the merchandise, are disregarded in determining transaction value.
546311 dated Sep. 19, 1996.

547178 dated Jan. 13, 1999 - See Discounts, renegotiation of price.

The retroactive price increase, agreed to between the unrelated parties after the importation of the merchandise into the United States, does not affect the transaction value. The price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise is represented by the original invoiced amount. Those prices were the prices in effect when the merchandise was sold for exportation to the United States. Thus, the importer's retroactive price increase was not agreed to prior to exportation and the contract was not contingent upon the duty refund. The price increase is not part of the price actually paid or payable for the previously imported merchandise.
547273 dated Apr. 22, 1999.

There is no documentation to indicate that a price adjustment of $200,000 was agreed to prior to the sale for exportation of the merchandise. Therefore, the $200,000 paid by the importer to the seller is a retroactive price adjustment that is not part of the transaction value of the merchandise.
547027 dated Sep. 17, 1999.

The importer purchases automotive components from foreign suppliers and assembles the components into chassis assemblies in its foreign trade subzone. It then transfers the assemblies to its customer's subzone, for incorporation into finished vehicles. The customer designates some of the foreign suppliers, and negotiates the prices of the components with those suppliers. Once prices have been negotiated with a supplier, the customer issues a purchase order for the components to the importer, and the importer then issues a purchase order to the supplier. Both purchase orders reflect the price negotiated by the importer's customer. The customer pays the importer for the components and for the assembly when the zone-to-zone transfer occurs. On occasion, the purchase order price for the components increases from the price that was in effect when the components were admitted to the importer's subzone. This variance is due to a price adjustment that went into effect after the components were exported to the United States. All shipments of components from the customer's designated suppliers are subject to price adjustments within one year of the original purchase order for each part. The price increases are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported components.
H086775 dated Mar. 12, 2010.

The importer imports consumer products from a variety of countries. The majority of shipments are transported via ocean carrier and the terms of sale are FOB, port of export. However, when the vendor has failed to meet a deadline and this will result in delayed and/or late delivery of merchandise, the vendor has the option of shipping the goods via air at its own expense. Importer asked whether it can deduct these air freight charges from its vendors' invoices when they are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise, even when the freight costs exceed the value of the invoice price. The purchase orders between importer and its vendors include a late delivery clause, which did not contain a price reduction clause. CBP found that the insertion of a price reduction clause into the late delivery clause in the purchase orders for the merchandise would serve as evidence that the transacting parties actually contemplated and effected a reduction to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise. However, in the absence of such a clause, an adjustment to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise for the actual costs of international air as opposed to ocean freight would be inappropriate. Since the late delivery clause makes no reference to a reduction in the price actually paid or payable, CBP held that in the absence of evidence indicating that importer and its vendors intend to effect an adjustment to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise prior to exportation in the event of a late delivery, an adjustment to the transaction value is not warranted.
H167196 dated Jan. 20, 2012.

proceeds of a subsequent resale

See chapter on PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE, infra.

selling commissions

See chapter on SELLING COMMISSIONS, infra.

testing costs

At the importer's option, steel units are tested to ensure that the design is accurate and that the structure is capable of carrying specified loads. The importer pays the exporter for testing costs separately from the payments for the steel units. The testing cost payment is not an assist; however, the testing cost payments are included as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise, regardless of the fact that the costs are invoiced separately.
542187 dated Nov. 7, 1980 (TAA No. 11); 543645 dated Feb. 17, 1987 - See Assists, testing costs.

542774 dated June 14, 1982 - See Assists, testing costs.
.
542946 dated Jan. 27, 1983 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, payments to a third party.

If an amount for testing merchandise is included in the price actually paid or payable, there is no authority to deduct the cost from the transaction value of the imported product, regardless of whether the expense is invoiced separately.
544035 dated Nov. 23, 1987.

544315 dated May 30, 1989 - See Assists, equipment.

544508 dated June 19, 1990 - See Assists, equipment.

The importer sources apparel and accessories worldwide from unrelated vendors and manufacturers. For quality assurance purposes, it has its fabrics tested prior
to production. It uses an unrelated, third-party testing company to perform these tests before the factories have acquired the fabrics. The importer's buying agent sources the fabric and arranges for the testing. The importer pays the testing fees directly to the testing company, regardless of whether or not the fabric is ultimately purchased and used in the manufacture of the imported merchandise. The importer does not own the fabric at the time of the testing and does not provide it to the factories as assists. The testing fees are not being made by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller, and are not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported garments. The fabric testing also does not qualify as production related design or development of the imported articles.
W563480 dated June 9, 2006.

Product compliance test payments made by the importer to the seller are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. On the other hand, the product compliance test payments made to the test vendors by the importer are not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H256223 dated Aug. 20, 2014.

time of payment

The fact that payment for an imported item is made by a check which is post-dated and therefore not negotiable until sometime after importation does not preclude the finding of a transaction value. There exists a price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
542622 dated Dec. 30, 1981.

Although payment for merchandise is delayed for up to a year after importation, a price actually paid or payable exists for the merchandise and transaction value is applicable in appraising the merchandise.
542804 dated July 12, 1982.

The price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise consists of the sum of two payments for the imported merchandise. The first payment is paid directly to the foreign seller. The second payment is subsequently deposited into a U.S. bank in an account established by the foreign seller.
543630 dated Oct. 8, 1985.

543446 dated Apr. 2, 1986; overrules 543446 dated Aug. 12, 1985 (same ruling number) and 543698 dated June 11, 1986 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

user fee

Where the overall transaction price between the buyer and foreign seller for imported merchandise includes the user fee (ad valorem fee), the fee is not considered to be part of the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, the fee is not dutiable as part of transaction value.
543842 dated Nov. 10, 1986; 544372 dated June 7, 1990.

In a situation in which the overall purchase price for imported merchandise includes the $5 customs fee payable upon the arrival of a commercial truck (e.g., a CIF U.S. delivered price), the fee does not form part of the price actually paid or payable.
544125 dated Aug. 11, 1988.

U.S. retail price

The importer purchases wearing apparel from a related seller. The imported merchandise bears a retail price tag specifying an amount greater than the invoice price to the importer.

The U.S. retail price as shown on the price tag attached to the imported merchandise is not relevant in determining the price actually paid or payable.
545737 dated Aug. 11, 1994.

U.S.-sourced merchandise

Pursuant to an agreement between a Canadian seller and U.S. buyer, the buyer agrees to pay one lump sum to cover all materials and services necessary for a project, including on-site installation services. The seller provides both Canadian and U.S. materials and provides services in Canada and the United States. As long as this "mark-up" is identified separately and is reasonably allocated, the seller's "mark- up," or essentially its profit on the U.S.-sourced goods and services, should be deducted from the price actually paid or payable by the buyer.
545869 dated Mar. 31, 1995.

warehousing charges

Payments made to the seller of the imported merchandise for warehousing and storage charges are part of the price actually paid or payable.
543501 dated May 2, 1985.

Warehousing charges paid separately to a third party that is unrelated to the seller are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
543569 dated July 16, 1985.

If an amount for warehousing expenses is included in the price actually paid or payable by the buyer, there is no authority to deduct the expense from the transaction value of the imported goods.
543622 dated June 23, 1986.

The importer pays a fee to the seller to store merchandise in a warehouse in the country of exportation prior to importation into the United States. The importer has not met its burden under the Generra presumption that the payments by the importer to the seller for warehouse services are completely unrelated to the goods and excludable from the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, the charges are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise. In addition, the payments are not eligible for treatment as charges for services incident to international transport.
547534 dated Jan. 19, 2001.

PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1) provides for the following with respect to proceeds of a subsequent resale:

The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to . . . the proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise that accrue, directly or indirectly, to the seller.
The price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise shall be increased by the amounts attributable to the items (and no others) described in paragraphs (A) through (E) [proceeds of a subsequent resale - paragraph (C)] only to the extent that each amount (i) is not otherwise included within the price actually paid or payable; and (ii) is based on sufficient information. If sufficient information is not available, for any reason, with respect to any amount referred to in the preceding sentence, the transaction value of the imported merchandise shall be treated, for purposes of this section, as one that cannot be determined. (emphasis added)

In addition, the TAA states:

The transaction value of imported merchandise . . . shall be the appraised value of that merchandise for the purposes of this Act only if - . . . (iii) no part of the proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise by the buyer will accrue directly or indirectly to the seller, unless an appropriate adjustment therefor can be made under paragraph (1)(E) . . . [referring to the above-cited provision]
19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A)(iii)

The Customs regulations equivalent to these statutory provisions are 19 CFR 152.103 (b) and (c) and 19 CFR 152.103(j)(1)(iii), respectively.

In 19 CFR 152.103(g), the regulations further state:

Proceeds of a subsequent resale. Additions to the price actually paid or payable will be made for the value of any part of the proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise that accrues directly or indirectly to the seller. Dividends or other payments from the buyer to the seller that do not relate directly to the imported merchandise will not be added to the price actually paid or payable. Whether any addition would be made will depend on the facts of the particular case.

An example is cited which states:

Example. A buyer contracts to import a new product. Not knowing whether the product ultimately will sell in the United States, the buyer agrees to pay the seller initially $1 per unit with an additional $1 per unit to be paid upon the sale of each unit in the United States.

Assuming the resale price in the United States can be determined in a reasonable period of time, the transaction value of each unit would be $2. Otherwise, the transaction value could not be determined for want of sufficient information.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 1, paragraph 1(c) parallels 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A)(iii).

Article 8, paragraph 1(d) provides for the addition to the price actually paid or payable: "the value of any part of the proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal or use of the imported goods that accrues directly or indirectly to the seller."

CCC Technical Committee Case Study 2.2 provides the following examples with respect to proceeds of a subsequent resale:

General facts of transaction
Corporation C of country X owns a number of subsidiaries in different countries, all of which operate in accordance with corporate policies established by C. Some of these subsidiaries are manufacturing enterprises, others are wholesalers and still others are service oriented enterprises.
Importer I in the country of importation Y, a subsidiary of C is a wholesaler of men's, women's, and children's garments; he buys men's garments from manufacturer M, another subsidiary of corporation C also located in country X, and women's and children's garments from unrelated manufacturers of third countries as well as from local manufacturers.

Situation 1
In accordance with C's corporate policy concerning sales between subsidiaries, goods are sold at a price negotiated between the subsidiaries. However, at the end of the year, importer I will pay to manufacturer M 5% of the total annual resales of the men's garments which he buys from him during that year as a further payment for the goods.

In this case, the payment in question is a proceed of a subsequent resale of the imported goods and accrues directly to the seller and the amount is to be added to the price paid or payable as an adjustment under the provisions of Article
8.1(d).

Situation 2
It has been established that importer I pays to service company A, another subsidiary of corporation C, 1% of his gross profit realized over the annual total sales of men's, women's and children's garments purchased from all sources. Importer I produces evidence that this payment is not related to the resale, use or disposal of the imported goods but it is a payment made in accordance with corporate policy to reimburse A for low interest loans and other financial services A provides for all the subsidiaries of

corporation C.

Service company A is related to the seller of the imported goods and thus the payment could be considered as an indirect payment to the seller. It is, however, payment for a financial service which is unrelated to the imported goods. Therefore, the payment would not be considered as proceeds in the meaning of Article 8.1(d).

Situation 3
It has been established that at the end of the financial year, importer I remits to corporation C 75% of his net profit realized over that year.

In this case the remittance by I to corporation C cannot be considered as proceeds since it represents a flow of dividends or other payments from the buyer to the seller which do not relate to the imported goods. Therefore, in accordance with the Interpretative Note to Article 1, (price paid or payable) it is not a part of the Customs value.

Headquarters Rulings:

addition to the price actually paid or payable

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E); 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1)(v); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 1(d)

The amounts required to be paid by the importer to the supplier out of the importer's net profits on the resale of vodka are proper additions to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise as proceeds of a subsequent resale that accrue directly to the seller of the merchandise.
542729 dated Mar. 29, 1982.

The price actually paid or payable of the merchandise is known at the time of exportation to the United States, i.e., the base price agreed upon by the parties. If the price of the product is increased subsequent to importation due to a change in the resale price in the United States, then the amount remitted becomes the proceed of a subsequent resale and the amount is added to the price actually paid or payable. Transaction value is the proper means of appraisement.
542746 dated Mar. 30, 1982.

Where the final price paid by a buyer to a seller is dependent on the buyer's resale price in the United States, the transaction value for the merchandise is the base price, plus any amount ultimately accruing to the seller as a result of changes in the buyer's resale price. The fact that merchandise is transformed in the United States subsequent to its importation does not affect a determination that proceeds from the resale of the imported merchandise accrue to the seller.
542701 dated Apr. 28, 1982 (TAA No. 47).

Proceeds received by the importer in excess of an agreed upon resale price (due to

currency fluctuations) and remitted to the foreign seller are to be added to the price actually paid or payable to arrive at a transaction value.
542879 dated Nov. 3, 1982.

A percentage of the resale price of imported goods sold in the United States which is remitted to the seller is included in transaction value as the proceeds of a subsequent resale.
542900 dated Dec. 9, 1982 (TAA No. 56); modified by 544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991.

Merchandise is produced in Austria and sold to an East German company. The East German company then sells the merchandise to the U.S. importer, as well as other foreign buyers. The importer remits proceeds of a resale in the United States to the Austrian manufacturer. The proceeds of this subsequent resale which accrue to the Austrian manufacturer rather than the East German seller are not added to the price actually paid or payable. In order for proceeds of a subsequent resale to be added to the price actually paid or payable, they must be paid to the actual seller referred to in section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.
543399 dated Apr. 11, 1985.

Pursuant to a profit sharing plan between the related party buyer and seller, the parties share the profits on the resale of the imported product. These payments are dutiable as proceeds of a subsequent resale, which accrue to the seller and are included in transaction value of the imported merchandise.
554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989.

An addition to the price actually paid or payable for proceeds of a subsequent resale, disposal or use should be based on the imported merchandise and should not include proceeds attributable to domestic components or ingredients. In this case, the amount of the payment made by the buyer is calculated with respect to the resale of a finished product that includes U.S. components. Since the payment is based partially on the imported merchandise, and partially on other factors, i.e., mixing the imported merchandise with U.S. ingredients such that the former is no longer separately identifiable, the payment at issue does not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.
545307 dated Feb. 3, 1995.

The importer is an exclusive distributor of certain products in the United States. This right is granted in an exclusive distributorship agreement between the importer and seller. The importer pays the seller a royalty computed on the basis of its sales of the merchandise at wholesale, adjusted for returns. The royalty is not dutiable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA because the royalty payment is not a condition of sale. However, the payments are dutiable as proceeds of a subsequent resale and are to be included within the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545504 dated May 4, 1995.

An agreement requires that a royalty is to be paid based on a percentage of the net sales

price of all products manufactured and sold by the licensee using trademarks/trade names and technical data, as well as an additional percentage based on the net sales of trademarked products sold to trademarked retailers. Where the licensor and seller are unrelated, the payment is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable as a proceed of a subsequent resale pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(E) since, under the facts presented, the payments are not made to the seller of the imported merchandise. If, however, the licensor and the seller are the same legal person, or if the seller is related to the licensor, then the payment constitutes a proceed of a subsequent resale, disposal or use within the meaning of section 402(b)(1)(E). The result is the same if the seller is related to the licensor unless the buyer/importer establishes that no portion of the proceed accrues directly or indirectly to the seller.
545361 dated July 20, 1995.

An importer purchases a bagged magnifying glass from the foreign seller. The magnifying glass is incorporated into a game. The only imported part for the game is the magnifying glass and all other parts of the game are U.S.-made. Royalty payments are made to the seller for the right to use a trademark on the finished game. The only imported component of the game, the magnifying glass, is combined with parts made in the U.S. to produce the complete game. The royalties are based on the sales in the U.S. of the entire finished game, not on sales of the imported magnifying glass. The licensing fees paid to the seller are not based on the resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise, but on sales of a different article, the complete game, which is overwhelmingly composed of domestic components. Accordingly, the royalty payments are not dutiable as proceeds of a subsequent resale pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(E).
545824 dated Aug. 28, 1995.

The imported merchandise is used to manufacture a finished product, i.e., photomultiplier tubes, and the royalty payments at issue are based on the net sales price of the tubes. Because the payments at issue are based partially on the imported merchandise and partially on other factors, it is inappropriate to make an addition to the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.
545419 dated Nov. 30, 1995.

The importer pays a license fee to a party who is neither the seller of the imported merchandise nor related to the seller. The payments are not dutiable as royalties pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. The licensor owns and licenses the trademark used by the importer, but does not produce or sell the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the license fee payments are not dutiable as proceeds of a subsequent resale under section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA because they do not accrue directly or indirectly to the seller of the imported merchandise.
546229 dated May 31, 1996.

A royalty payment becomes due upon the resale of the imported product. The amount of the royalty payment is based on the net-sales value, which is defined as the gross sales to third parties. The proceeds of the subsequent resale apply to the imported product, and the royalty payments directly relate to the imported product. These payments are

statutory additions to the price actually paid or payable as proceeds of a subsequent resale pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.
546034 dated May 6, 1997.

The importer makes payments to the seller for patents used in domestically producing the active ingredient of an imported pharmaceutical product. The royalty payments that accrue to the seller are directly based on the resale of the imported merchandise in the United States. The agreement provides that the licensee shall pay a royalty equivalent to a specified percentage of all annual net sales. The royalty payments are determined solely based on sales of the imported product which is not further processed in the United States after importation. The royalty payments made by the importer to its related party seller should be added to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA in order to properly determine the transaction value of the merchandise. (While the analysis of dutiability could be made pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(d), this ruling focused on section 402(b)(1)(e) regarding proceeds.)
545662 dated Feb. 20, 1998.

546787 dated Jan. 11, 1999 - See Royalty Payments, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

547710 dated Dec. 16, 2001 - See Royalty Payments, price actually paid or payable.

Royalty payments may be dutiable as proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the subject merchandise. However, Customs has held that payments based on the resale of a finished product made in part from the imported merchandise are not dutiable as proceeds. Based on the evidence presented, Customs could not determine whether the payments at issue were based on the sale of the imported merchandise. Many of the payments appear to be based on the sale of “licensed products,” i.e., finished products that may or may not contain the imported merchandise or may be the imported merchandise itself. Accordingly, unless or until the importer can explain which products are imported and whether or in what instances they are the same products subject to the submitted agreements, Customs presumes that the payments at issue are dutiable, pursuant to section 402(e) of the TAA, proceeds of a subsequent sale.
547662 dated Sep. 20, 2002; modified by 548305 dated Aug. 11, 2003.

Escrow reimbursement payments by U.S. wholesalers or distributors to the foreign manufacturer of imported cigarettes do not constitute proceeds of a subsequent resale under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E). The ruling assumed: 1) that transaction value is properly determined based on the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. importer to the manufacturer in the sale between these parties; 2) that the U.S. importer is under no obligation by contract or otherwise to reimburse the manufacturer for any escrow payments; and 3) that none of the parties involved in the transaction described (i.e., the manufacturer, the importer and the U.S. wholesalers and distributors) are related pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(g). The payments do not fall within the provisions of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E) because the connection between the imported merchandise and the distributor's or wholesaler's obligation to reimburse the manufacturer for the escrow

payment is too remote to be considered proceeds of a subsequent resale of the imported merchandise. Some of the factors considered were that neither the importer/buyer nor a party related to the importer/buyer was obligated to reimburse the seller for the escrow payment, it was not the resale of the imported merchandise that triggered the reimbursement payment, and the escrow obligation could arise long after importation based on facts unrelated to the importation.
W563503 dated May 26, 2006.

A foreign tobacco manufacturer sells cigarettes to its U.S. subsidiary, who sells the cigarettes to unrelated wholesalers and distributors in the United States. The wholesalers and distributors sometimes sell cigarettes in states that are parties to the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (MSA). Under the MSA and state escrow statutes, the foreign manufacturer is required to make deposits to an escrow account for the purposes of satisfying future judgments and settlements that the states may obtain against the manufacturer. Under the contemplated transactions, the wholesalers and distributors of cigarettes to MSA states will reimburse the foreign manufacturer any escrow expenses it incurs. The connection between the imported merchandise and the obligation of the unrelated wholesalers and distributors to reimburse the foreign manufacturer is too remote to be considered proceeds of a subsequent resale of the imported merchandise within the context of section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.
563522 dated Sep. 11, 2006.

The importer's proposed methodology was rejected because it was not a written formula agreed to by the parties and was not the actual practice of the parties. However, CBP determined that the provisional payment was a base payment with the additional payments after sale in the U.S. to be proceeds of a subsequent sale. Therefore, transaction value could serve as the basis of appraisement. Extensions of liquidation could be requested to allow for the addition of the proceeds prior to liquidation. Reconciliation was suggested as a program that would work well for the importer and CBP in the case at hand.
H025216 dated Aug. 16, 2010.

transaction value, sufficient information

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A)(iii); 19 CFR 152.103(j)(1)(iii); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 1, paragraph 1(c)

542729 dated Mar. 29, 1982 - <u>See</u> Proceeds of a Subsequent Resale, addition to the price actually paid or payable.

Transaction value is not precluded as a basis of appraisement merely because the amount of the subsequent proceeds to be paid to the seller is not quantifiable until sometime after importation.
542701 dated Apr. 28, 1982 (TAA No. 47).

Transaction value does not exist where sufficient information is unavailable to determine

within a reasonable period and with reasonable accuracy the extent of proceeds due the seller.
542928 dated Jan. 21, 1983 (TAA No. 57).

An addition to the price actually paid or payable for proceeds of a subsequent resale which accrue to the seller must be based upon sufficient information. If such information is unavailable, then transaction value is eliminated as a means of appraisement.
543281 dated Aug. 9, 1984.

Patagonia purchased and imported various garments from an unrelated manufacturer located in India. This manufacturer was certified by Fair Trade USA as a Fair Trade Certified Manufacturing Facility. Patagonia decided to market a selection of ten different women's sportswear items purchased from its unrelated manufacturer as Fair Trade Certified. In order to do so, Patagonia entered into a License Agreement with Fair Trade USA to use Fair Trade USA certification trademarks on the sportswear sold in the U.S. market. Patagonia, as the licensed brand holder, is obligated to pay Fair Trade USA a base license fee. In exchange for this fee, Fair Trade USA granted Patagonia a worldwide, non-exclusive, non-transferable license to display Fair Trade USA's certification trademarks. In addition, Patagonia is also obligated to pay a community development premium to the Fair Trade Committee, an account controlled by a committee of factory production workers, working for the manufacturer or the seller of the imported merchandise. This Fair Trade Committee, not the manufacturer, has the exclusive control over the use of the Fair Trade account, and the funds are used for the benefit of all factory production workers. The manufacturer has an obligation to report to Fair Trade USA how the premiums are utilized. CBP found that the community development premiums, paid by Patagonia are not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and should not be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise as proceeds of subsequent resale under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E). Additionally, CBP determined that the base license fee paid by Patagonia to Fair Trade USA, an unrelated third party licensor, should not be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise as royalties under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D).
H262685 dated Mar. 23, 2015.

PROHIBITED APPRAISED VALUES

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)(2) states:

Imported merchandise may not be appraised, for the purposes of this Act, on the basis of -
(A) the selling price in the United States of merchandise produced in the United States;
(B) a system that provides for the appraisement of imported merchandise at the higher of two alternative values;
(C) the price of merchandise in the domestic market of the country of exportation;
(D) a cost of production, other than a value determined under subsection (e) for merchandise that is identical merchandise or similar merchandise to the merchandise being appraised;
(E) the price of merchandise for export to a country other than the United States;
(F) minimum values for appraisement; or
(G) arbitrary or fictitious values.
This paragraph shall not apply with respect to the ascertainment, determination, or estimation of foreign market value or United States price under title VII.

This statutory language is repeated in 19 CFR 152.108, which is entitled "Unacceptable bases of appraisement."

GATT Valuation Agreement:

The prohibited methods of appraisement listed in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)(2) quoted above, is found in Article 7, paragraph 2.

Headquarters Rulings:

two or more values

542717 dated Apr. 2, 1982 - See Transaction Value of Identical or Similar Merchandise, two or more values.

The merchandise imported is a complete set of gun parts absent a frame. The imported merchandise is appraised pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA, and price information in a gun publication about a similar caliber machine gun is used. This method of appraisement does not meet the standards under section 402(f) and is inconsistent with the provision in the TAA that precludes the use of arbitrary and fictitious values.
544746 dated Nov. 12, 1991.

The merchandise was appraised pursuant to section 402(f) at an adjusted transaction value by using a factor of 1.20 times the entered value in order to recover the difference for undeclared fabric. However, the method in which the merchandise was appraised is

precluded, as it was based upon what amounts to fictitious fabric calculations. The determination of the fabric amounts used in the production of the imported merchandise was based on nominal conversion factors, and not on the amount of fabric actually used in the production of the merchandise. Appraisement on the basis of arbitrary or fictitious values is specifically precluded under section 402(f)(2)(G).
223727 dated Apr. 5, 1993.

QUOTA CHARGES

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A) defines the "price actually paid or payable" as follows:

The term "price actually paid or payable" means the total payment (whether direct or indirect,) made, or to be made, for imported merchandise by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller. (emphasis added)

The corresponding Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.102(f).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable, is similar to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A).

Judicial Precedent:

Generra Sportswear Co. v. United States, 905 F.2d 377 (Fed. Cir. 1990),

The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit was presented with the issue of whether quota charges were properly included in the transaction value of imported merchandise.

The importer purchased cotton knit blouses from the seller in Hong Kong at a price of $6.00 each. The seller agreed to obtain type A transfer quota at $0.95 per unit. The importer paid the seller an amount for the shirts, exclusive of quota. The seller then billed the importer's buying agent for the quota charges under a separate invoice and the importer's buying agent paid for this amount. The Customs Service appraised the merchandise at $6.95 per unit by combining the amounts stated on the two invoices.

The importer filed a protest, which was subsequently denied by Customs. The importer filed suit in the Court of International Trade challenging the denial of the protest. The court held the payments to be non-dutiable and ordered the Customs Service to refund excess duties collected. The United States subsequently filed an appeal with the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which reversed the lower court's decision.

The Court determined that because the statutory language does not specifically address quota payments, the appraisal by the Customs Service was based upon a permissible construction of the statute. The Court stated that it is reasonable to conclude that the quota charges are properly part of the "total payment . . . made,
or to be made, for imported merchandise by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller." The court further stated:

As long as the quota payment was made to the seller in exchange for merchandise sold for export to the United States, the payment properly may be included in transaction value, even if the payment represents something other than the per se value of the goods. The focus of transaction value is the actual transaction between the buyer and seller; if quota payments were transferred by the buyer to the seller, they are part of transaction value.

In addition, the Court stated that it is irrelevant that the buyer did not pay for the quota charges directly to the seller; its buying agent made the payment on behalf of the buyer.

Murjani Int'l Ltd. v. United States, 17 Ct. Int'l Trade 822 (1993), amended, 17 Ct. Int'l Trade 1035 (1993).

The importer claimed that Customs improperly included quota charges in the dutiable value of imported merchandise because it never paid the seller for quota charges. The Court rejected this claim and indicated that the importer did not provide sufficient evidence to prove that the seller was not paid for quota as part of the value of the invoices. In addition, the evidence was insufficient to prove that the quota payments were paid to a party other than the seller. The quota charges were held to be part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.

Headquarters Rulings:

free-quota price manipulations; T.D. 86-56

See also, chapter on INVOICING REQUIREMENTS, supra.

543358 dated Sep. 13, 1984; overruled by 544856 dated Dec. 13, 1991 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, free-quota price manipulations.

543611 dated Sep. 6, 1985; overruled by T.D. 86-56 dated Feb. 20, 1986 – See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, formula used in determining transaction value.

543694 dated Mar. 20, 1986 (citing T.D. 86-56); 543659 dated Mar. 12, 1986 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, free-quota price manipulations.

payments for quota made directly to the seller

See 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A); 19 CFR 152.102(f); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable

Quota payments made by the buyer to the foreign seller are included in the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise. Thus, even if the seller is prepaying expenses on behalf of the buyer, those expenses that are then reimbursed by the buyer to the seller will be treated as being part of the price actually paid or payable.
542169 dated Sep. 18, 1980 (TAA No. 6); 542150 dated Jan. 6, 1981 (TAA No. 14);

542573 dated Nov. 6, 1981; 542798 dated Feb. 10, 1983; 543382 dated Nov. 14, 1984; 543715 dated June 13, 1986; 543913 dated Feb. 22, 1988; 544110 dated Apr. 26, 1990; 544472 dated July 30, 1990; 544388 dated July 13, 1990.

Payments for quota made by the buyer, through its agent, to the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable.
542558 dated Nov. 10, 1981.

Payments are made for obtaining additional quota from the seller in order to comply with the correct quota category. This secondary quota payment is made after the goods are imported into the United States. In this case, the payments for the purchase of the original quota were included in the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States. The payments made to obtain the correct visa category are made *subsequent* to the sale for exportation of the imported merchandise. Therefore, these payments are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
544220 dated Jan. 22, 1990.

Quota payments made to the agent of the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable. The fact that the payments are made to the seller's agent, rather than directly to the seller, does not change the dutiable status of the payments. This is due to the fact that an agent, by definition, acts on behalf of the principal.
544345 dated July 30, 1990.

In cases where quota payments are paid to the seller or a party related to the seller, the amount of the payments is part of the total payment to the seller and is included in the transaction value of the merchandise.
544585 dated Jan. 29, 1991; 544221 dated June 3, 1991.

The payments for quota made by the importer to its purported agent, which on the basis of the evidence submitted is actually the seller of the merchandise, are included as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. These payments are therefore dutiable.
544610 dated Dec. 23, 1991.

The documentation submitted in this case, specifically, the visaed invoice, indicates that the cost of quota was included in the price of the imported merchandise when it was sold for exportation to the United States.
545927 dated Jan. 30, 1996.

The importer has not provided adequate documentation supporting its position that the quota payments are made to a third party that is unrelated to the seller. The quota charges are either paid directly to the seller of the imported merchandise, through the buying agent, or the quota charges are remitted to a party related to the seller. Either way, the quota charges are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported sweaters.
546343 dated May 22, 1996.

546871 dated Feb. 17, 1999 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

Because the sale for export for purposes of determining transaction value is that between the middleman and the importer, then the quota payments that are made by the importer to the middleman, i.e., the actual seller, are part of the price actually paid or payable.
547054 dated Aug. 6, 1999 - See also Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

There is insufficient evidence to establish that quota payments were made to an "unrelated" third party and that such payments did not "inure to the benefit of the seller." Therefore, the quota payments at issue should be included as part of the price actually paid or payable.
548148 dated Aug. 12, 2002.

payments to unrelated third parties

Quota payments made by the buyer to an unrelated third party or directly to the quota holder, who is unrelated to either the buyer or the seller, are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
542169 dated Sep. 18, 1980 (TAA No. 6); 542803 dated Dec. 30, 1982; 543382 dated Nov. 14, 1984; 543540 dated June 12, 1985; 543500 dated Apr. 9, 1985; 543616 dated Oct. 1, 1985.

Where the buyer pays quota charges to an exporter who is unrelated to the foreign seller, and where such charges are not remitted by the exporter to the seller, in whole or in part, such charges are not part of the dutiable value of the imported merchandise.
542442 dated June 11, 1981 (TAA No. 30).

Quota charges paid by the importer to its buying agent are not part of the price actually paid or payable as long as these payments are not remitted in any way, directly or indirectly, by the buying agent to the seller of the goods.
543655 dated Dec. 13, 1985.

Sufficient evidence has been submitted to indicate that the payments for quota made by the buyer do not inure to the benefit of the seller of the imported merchandise. The payments for quota are properly excluded from the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544016 dated June 22, 1988; aff'd by 544245 dated Apr. 5, 1989, and July 31, 1989.

Quota payments made by the buyer to an agent are not part of the price actually paid or payable for imported apparel provided that evidence submitted at the time of importation indicates that the payments do not inure to the benefit of the seller.
544866 dated Sep. 29, 1993.

The importer enters into an arrangement for the purchase of quota with an unrelated third party quota broker. The quota broker invoices the importer for the cost of the quota, and the importer remits the full payment for the quota to the broker. Payments are made directly to the quota broker via wire transfer. The importer makes no payment to the seller for the cost of the quota, and the quota broker does not remit any portion of the payments to the seller. The quota charges at issue are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547140 dated Sep. 21, 1998.

Based upon the documentation submitted by the importer, it is apparent that the importer acquired quota from a third party unrelated to the seller. Therefore, the quota payment at issue should not be considered part of the price actually paid or payable.
546461 dated Dec. 21, 1998.

Based on the information provided, the quota payments were made by the buyer to third parties unrelated to the seller of the imported merchandise. Therefore, the quota payments are not included in the transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.

546804 dated May 4, 1999.

Based on the evidence submitted, the payment for quota was made by the buyer's agent to a third party unrelated to the seller of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the quota payment at issue is not included in the transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable. In this case, the transaction value of the imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise as per the wire transfer, plus amounts in respect of any additions to the price actually paid or payable, including an amount for the assist.
546701 dated Dec. 2, 1999.

Sufficient evidence has been submitted to indicate that the payments for quota are made from the importer to a party unrelated to the seller and that each negotiates at arm's length. These quota payments do not benefit the seller of the imported merchandise. The payments for quota should not be included as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
547696 dated May 18, 2001.

In this case, the payment for quota charges is part of the price paid by the importer to the middleman. However, the middleman does not pay quota charges to the factory. Once received from the importer, the middleman pays the quota charges to an unrelated third party quota broker. Based on the fact the importer cannot obtain the contract between the middleman and the factory as well as the price, transaction value cannot be based on the sale between the middleman and the factory. Thus, transaction value is based on the transaction between the middleman and importer with the quota payments included in the price actually paid or payable.
547635 dated Nov. 7, 2001.

As long as the appraising officer at the applicable port of entry is satisfied that there is sufficient documentation to indicate that the quota payments do not inure to the benefit of the seller, the quota payments that are paid to either the buying agent or the quota broker would not be included as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H010509 dated June 19, 2007.

quota holder acting as "straw" seller

The manufacturer of the imported merchandise is the true seller of the goods. However, to satisfy the foreign government, the documents make it appear that the quota holder buys the merchandise and resells it to the U.S. importer. The quota holder never takes title to the merchandise but, rather, the transaction merely passes through the quota holder so that it can sell the quota. In this case, the quota holder is a third party to the sales transaction and the quota charges paid are not part of the price actually paid or payable.
543294 dated May 15, 1984; <u>overruled</u> <u>by</u> 544859 dated Dec. 13, 1991.

Counsel argues that the documents submitted render a certain party as the seller of merchandise, in order to satisfy Hong Kong third party shipper's regulations. In appraising merchandise, Customs must rely on the accuracy of the information contained in documents, such as invoices and contracts. Customs cannot find that documentation submitted does not accurately depict the transaction. Based upon the transaction documents, the seller of the imported merchandise is also receiving the quota payments. Therefore, the payments are part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546409 dated July 9, 1997.

The third party shipper purchased merchandise from the manufacturer and then resold the merchandise to the importer for exportation to the United States. The third party shipper was engaged in a sale for exportation of the imported merchandise and, for appraisement purposes, the third party shipper was the actual seller of the imported merchandise. Therefore, due to the fact that the third party shipper was the seller of the imported merchandise (and it received the quota payments), the payments were part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546683 dated Aug. 13, 1997.

Based on the documentation presented, the third party quota holder/shipper in Hong Kong is considered the seller/exporter of the imported merchandise. Therefore, the quota payments remitted to the seller/quota holder are part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise and must be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547055 dated June 3, 1999; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 547531 dated May 5, 2000.

Based on the evidence submitted, the payments for quota are to be considered part of the price paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation by the quota

holders. The third party quota holders in Hong Kong are the actual sellers of the merchandise for purposes of determining transaction value.
547531 dated May 5, 2000; <u>aff'g</u> 547055 dated June 3, 1999.

REBATES SUBSEQUENT TO IMPORTATION

INTRODUCTION

"Any rebate of, or other decrease in, the price actually paid or payable that is made or otherwise effected between the buyer and seller after the date of importation of the merchandise into the United States shall be disregarded in determining the transaction value under paragraph (1)." 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(B).

The equivalent regulation with respect to rebates is found in 19 CFR 152.103(a)(4).

Judicial Precedent:

Allied Int'l v. United States, 16 Ct. Int'l Trade 545 (1992).

In determining transaction value, Customs properly disregarded the importer's purchase bonus, which was contingent on certain quantity deliveries and payment of the purchase price in a pre-importation agreement with the seller. The Court indicated that absent any proof that the contingencies had actually occurred prior to the date of the entry, the bonus should be disregarded in the determination of transaction value.

Esprit de Corp v. United States, 17 Ct. Int'l Trade 195 (1993).

The U.S. buyer contracted to purchase shoes from the seller. The sale provided for FOB Hong Kong terms, and the buyer was responsible for costs of shipping and insurance. Specified dates for shipment were agreed to between the parties. Prior to the initial shipping date, the seller informed the buyer that the shipping date requirements would not be met. In order to meet delivery commitments in the United States, the parties agreed to ship the merchandise by air, rather than by sea. The seller agreed to reimburse the buyer for the cost differential between sea and air shipment. The seller reimbursed the buyer based upon the reconciliation of costs at the end of the season.

The merchandise was appraised at the invoiced unit values and no allowance was made for the freight differential reimbursement. The court agreed with Customs and indicated that the evidence does not support a finding that the shipping was a part of the price actually paid or payable or that price reductions were made. In addition, any rebate made after the date of importation must be disregarded in determining the transaction value.

Century Importers, Inc., v. United States, 22 Ct. Int'l Trade 821 (1998).

The issue before the Court of International Trade was whether the importer had established that a deduction from the invoice price should have been made for the amount of duties paid in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise. Century Importer, a subsidiary of the buyer, Miller Brewing Company, imported beer from a related seller, Molson Brewing Company. At the time of the importations, the normal duty rates were replaced by a 50% rate of duty. Century paid the duties and was later reimbursed by Molson, subsequent to importation. Customs appraised the beer using transaction

value based on the invoice price because there was no evidence that the invoice price included the applicable duties. The CIT held in favor of Century deciding that the claimed deduction for the applicable duties was in fact warranted. The court concluded that there was an error in the preparation of the entry papers so that the duty-paid nature of the transaction was not indicated at the time of entry. The court indicated that there is nothing in the statutes or regulations that indicates that the failure to identify the "duty paid" status of a sale at the time of entry is an error which may never be corrected. In addition, a repayment of identified duties is not a "rebate of price" within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4) which excludes rebates or other price reductions in the determination of transaction value.

Century Importers, Inc., v. United States, 205 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000), vacating and rev'g 22 Ct. Int'l Trade 821 (1998).

The Court in this case reversed the decision of the Court of International Trade in holding that Customs should have allowed a deduction for duties paid by the importer and subsequently reimbursed by the seller, after importation. Century Importer, a subsidiary of the buyer, Miller Brewing Company, imported beer from a related seller, Molson Brewing Company. At the time of importation, the normal duty rates were replaced by a 50% rate of duty. Century paid the duties and was later reimbursed by Molson, subsequent to importation. Century claimed that in calculating the duties on the imported beer, Customs should have deducted the reimbursed duties from the invoice price. The Court applied the relevant statutory formula, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(3) that excludes customs duties from the transaction value if identified separately to Customs. The record indicates that the parties did not identify these duties separately, and therefore, Customs has no authorization to deduct these duties from the price calculation. The Court further stated that because Molson reimbursed the duties after the date of importation, that the post-importation action was in fact a rebate that, pursuant to section 1401a(b)(4)(B), is disregarded in the determination of transaction value.

Headquarters Rulings:

discounts

See, chapter on DISCOUNTS, supra.

Rebates or deferred quantity discounts, given by the foreign seller to the importer are not considered in determining the transaction value of imported merchandise.
543662 dated Jan. 7, 1986.

formula used in determining transaction value

19 CFR 152.103(a)(1); see also, chapter on FORMULAS IN DETERMINING PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE, supra.

542671 dated Mar. 15, 1982 - See Formulas in Determining the Price Actually Paid

or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

In situations in which the price actually paid or payable is determined pursuant to a formula, a firm price need not be known or ascertainable at the time of importation, although it is necessary for the formula to be fixed at that time so that a final sales price can be determined at a later time on the basis of some future even over which neither the seller nor the buyer has any control.
542701 dated Apr. 28, 1982 (TAA No. 47).

543189 dated Oct. 19, 1983 - See Formulas in Determining the Price Actually Paid or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

543285 dated Mar. 20, 1984 - See Formulas in Determining the Price Actually Paid or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

543352 dated Mar. 30, 1984- See Formulas in Determining the Price Actually Paid or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

543089 dated June 20, 1984 See Currency Conversion, formulas used in determining the price actually paid or payable.

543917 dated Aug. 27, 1987- See Formulas in Determining the Price Actually Paid or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

The amount owed to the foreign seller for magazines is calculated pursuant to a prearranged agreement between the buyer and seller taking into account the unit price, the quantity of the shipment, as well as other factors. The buyer has a right to return any unused magazines. An invoice is not provided to the buyer until reconciliation, during which time the amount of merchandise shipped and returned is taken into account. This method of calculating the price of the imported merchandise is not a formula that determines the price actually paid or payable. The price actually paid or payable is decreased after the date of importation and the transaction value may not be reduced to take into account this reduced amount.
543940 dated Nov. 4, 1987.

An agreement entered into between the buyer and seller prior to exportation of the merchandise includes the purchase price of a mold, the price of the goods, and the method by which the mold is repurchased by the seller. This agreement does not constitute a formula pursuant to section 152.103(a)(1) of the Customs regulations.
543983 dated Dec. 2, 1987.

544317 dated Apr. 24, 1990 - See Formulas In Determining the Price Actually Paid or Payable, pre-determined formula agreed to between parties.

The importer receives a refund of one half of a mold purchase price if a minimum quantity of merchandise is ordered. The entire mold cost is refundable if 300,000 pieces are

ordered. The arrangement contained in the mold purchase orders between the importer and manufacturer does not constitute a formula under 19 CFR 152.103(a)(1). The full amount of the mold cost, disregarding the subsequent refund, is part of the price actually paid or payable.
544364 dated Oct. 9, 1990.

A contract is submitted to Customs, however, the seller does not appear as a party in the document and the seller did not sign the document. Also, two preliminary invoices and two final invoices are submitted. The final invoices indicate a lower price than the preliminary invoices and allegedly represent an average price as shown in Metals Week Journal. Language on the final invoices states that these invoices cancel and replace the preliminary invoices. In this case, a base price is agreed upon and there is a subsequent credit of funds payable to the importer as determined by a formula. The payment to the importer after importation of the goods is a rebate or other decrease in the price and is disregarded in determining transaction value. The use of the average price as indicated in the Metals Week Journal is not a formula for determining the price actually paid or payable, but rather, is a formula for determining the rebate owed to the importer.
544944 dated May 26, 1992.

According to an agreement between the buyer and seller, the price of imported marigold meal is based upon the price per gram of xanthophyll contained in the marigold meal. The amount shown on the invoice is a base price. Upon
importation, a laboratory analysis is conducted to determine the xanthophyll content of the marigold meal. Based upon this analysis, a final settlement price is determined in accordance with an established formula. The formula is in effect prior to the date the merchandise is exported to the United States. Accordingly, the post-importation adjustment does not constitute a rebate under section 402(b)(4)(B) of the TAA. The adjustment to the invoice price should be taken into account in determining transaction value.
545289 dated Sep. 29, 1994.

The parties' method for setting prices for the imported merchandise is based on a contract entitled the "supply agreement." The price equals the sum of certain costs incurred by the seller, plus an amount sufficient to reimburse the seller for royalties paid to the manufacturer. The seller is required to pay patent royalties to the manufacturer. The royalties are a fixed percentage of the selling price in the United States. A supplementary agreement between the seller and the manufacturer reduces the amount of the royalty in specified circumstances. The method of payment described is not a formula upon which transaction value can be based. The amount of the royalty paid to the manufacturer is within the control of one of the parties, the seller. The decrease in price attributable to the lower royalty payment to the manufacturer is disregarded in determining transaction value.
545388 dated Oct. 21, 1994.

H018314 dated Mar. 18, 2013 – See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

H256363 dated Jan. 29, 2015 – See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

free-quota price manipulations; T.D. 86-56

In a single shipment transaction, the invoice price for the merchandise exceeds the original, agreed-upon contract price. Although the higher invoice price is paid to the seller, the seller pays a rebate to the importer that consists of the difference between the contract price and invoice price to the importer. The original, agreed-upon price represents the proper transaction value. Because the parties determine the agreed-upon price prior to exportation of the merchandise, there is no rebate effected after the date of importation, within the meaning of section 402 (b)(4)(B).
543358 dated Sep. 13, 1984; overruled by 544856 dated Dec. 13, 1991.

In a situation where an agreement between a buyer and seller to issue a rebate as part of the sale of merchandise is in existence prior to importation, the price actually paid or payable may differ from figures in documents accompanying a shipment. The types of evidence which are acceptable as proof of such rebate transactions are limited to *direct* payments from a seller to an importer. The price actually paid or payable in these transactions is the sum of the funds remitted to the seller by the importer, less rebates to the buyer in the form of checks, letters of credit, etc., drawn on the seller's account, or in the form of a price reduction on other merchandise previously sold to the importer by the seller.
543611 dated Sep. 6, 1985; overruled by T.D. 86-56 dated Feb. 20, 1986.

Where the merchandise is being shipped at a higher price than contracted for between the parties with a subsequent rebate for the difference, the lower valuation will not be accepted with respect to the appraisement of the merchandise. The acceptance of these documents by Customs is inconsistent with the requirement, under the law and regulations, that the invoice set forth the purchase price of the merchandise, and is precluded by the regulations, which call for the rejection of any documents that appear to be erroneous.
543694 dated Mar. 20, 1986 (citing T.D. 86-56 dated Feb. 20, 1986).

post-importation refund

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(B); 19 CFR 152.103(a)(4)

An export deposit refunded to the buyer by the seller subsequent to exportation of the merchandise is not considered in determining the price actually paid or payable.
542676 dated Dec. 7, 1981; 542731 dated Feb. 26, 1982; 542911 dated Sep. 16, 1982; 542917 dated Sep. 17, 1982; 542876 dated Aug. 6, 1982; 542983 dated Dec. 29, 1982; 543004 dated Mar. 16, 1983; 543236 dated Sep. 12, 1984; 544066 dated Dec. 15, 1987.

543246 dated Jan. 9, 1984 - See Transportation Costs, international freight

deduction.

With regard to merchandise for which an amount is paid, which includes a value added tax, and a refund is received subsequent to the date that the merchandise is imported, the transaction value is the price actually paid, inclusive of the value added tax.
543435 dated Jan. 15, 1985.

As a result of late delivery of imported merchandise, the importer receives a 10% decrease in the purchase price. This refund is disregarded in determining transaction value because the rebate is effected after the date of importation of the merchandise.
543537 dated Feb. 14, 1986.

544615 dated Sep. 11, 1991; modified by 544820 dated Oct. 18, 1991 - See Post-Importation Charges, price actually paid or payable.

The importer advances a stated amount to the seller. The amount is held by the manufacturer as security for the cost of a mold to produce imported merchandise. It is agreed between the parties that the mold charges are fully refundable if a certain number of pieces are ordered. The importer's payment, characterized as a refundable mold deposit, is part of the price actually paid or payable. The existence of an arrangement between the importer and manufacturer to refund the importer's mold deposit, upon the order and purchase of a requisite number of units, does not constitute a permissible formula under transaction value. The post-importation refund of the mold deposit from the manufacturer to the importer shall not be taken into account in determining the transaction value of the subject merchandise.
544867 dated Dec. 15, 1993.

The importer claims that the invoice submitted at the time of entry indicated a "provisional" price and that the price actually paid or payable was lower than that shown on the entry documentation. No documentation has been provided that supports the contention that a rebate of, or other decrease in, the price actually paid or payable was effected before the merchandise was imported into the United States. Accordingly, the decrease in the price alleged by the importer should be disregarded in determining the transaction value.
545510 dated Jan. 7, 1994.

The importer purchased caviar from a Russian seller and entered the merchandise in June 1992. In December 1992, the parties entered into a settlement agreement which provides that in consideration of the payment terms in the settlement agreement, the parties agreed to discharge each other from any and all obligations arising from the contract for the purchase of the caviar. The terms in the settlement agreement created a lower sales price than that originally stated on the invoice. The terms outlined in the settlement agreement, to the extent that they represent a decrease in price that occurs subsequent to the importation of the merchandise, may not form the basis of transaction value.
545532 dated Sep. 14, 1994.

547273 dated Apr. 22, 1999 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, price renegotiation.

547027 dated Sep. 17, 1999 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, price renegotiation.

548093 dated Apr. 26, 2002; aff'd by 548184 dated Nov. 5, 2002 - See Defective Merchandise, allowance in price.

Related parties entered the value of the imported goods using estimated, instead of actual prices. The importer states that the price that it actually paid the related party seller was less than the value on the commercial invoice. The importer did
not explain why the price adjustment was made, such as by the application of a formula. The decrease in price is disregarded in determining the transaction value of the imported goods.
H092575 dated July 2, 2010.

Original and revised entered values were based on a purchase/marketing agreement. The agreement required the importer to prepay for the goods, at a rate that will fluctuate with the market. The final value was to be determined after the goods were sold and the contract with the supplier was approved. However, the agreement and supplier's contract were entered into after the goods were entered. Post importation price decreases were not made pursuant to a valid formula that was in existence at the time of importation. Accordingly, the price decrease was to be disregarded in determining transaction value of the imported merchandise.
H110615 dated July 2, 2010.

H204329 dated Aug. 18, 2014 – See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

The importer is an exclusive distributor of motor vehicles purchased from the seller/manufacturer (parent company) for re-sale in the U.S. market. The importer made post-importation adjustments, referred to and booked as "APA support" payments in Cost of Goods Sold pursuant to a bilateral APA subject to Headquarters Ruling Letter ("HRL") H029658 dated December 8, 2009. The importer argued that these payments were part of the transaction value formula set forth in the importer's APA approved as the basis of appraisement in H029658 (claiming duty refunds). CBP determined that the importer could claim these post-importation adjustments because these adjustments directly related to the value of the imported merchandise and the importer satisfied the five factors specified in HRL W548314 dated May 16, 2012.
H186055 dated Jan. 15, 2015 (relates to H029658 and H125118).

H238027 dated Feb. 19, 2015 – See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

price actually paid or payable

545121 dated Jan. 31, 1994 - See Transportation Costs, international freight deduction.

price renegotiations

To the extent that they represent price renegotiations that occur subsequent to the importation of the goods, late penalty payments are not part of transaction value of the imported merchandise.
542275 dated June 11, 1981 (TAA No. 31).

No documentation was submitted to substantiate the claim that any of the invoiced 6,102 packages indicated on the entry invoice were not received. The buyer claimed that only 6,100 packages were received. The post-importation price adjustment is disregarded in determining the price actually paid or payable.
542959 dated Nov. 24, 1981.

Retroactive price adjustments between related parties agreed to after importation of merchandise does not affect the transaction value of the goods, provided that it is determined that the parties' relationship does not influence the price charged.
542797 dated May 19, 1982 (TAA No. 48).

A contract for sale of seasonal goods contains a clause obligating the vendor to reduce the cost of the merchandise by an amount equal to the difference between straight ocean shipment and ocean/air shipment for failure to meet delivery schedules. This price reduction is effected prior to shipment of the goods and is invoiced as such. The price actually paid or payable is the invoiced unit price that reflects the reductions due to late delivery.
542933 dated Oct. 13, 1982.

543014 dated Feb. 15, 1983 - See Defective Merchandise, price renegotiation.

The Statement of Administrative Action provides that where it is discovered subsequent to importation that the merchandise being appraised is defective, an allowance will be made. If the defect is discovered within the statutory protest period, and the protesting party submits evidence that the price was lowered due to a defect, an allowance should be taken into account.
543061 dated May 4, 1983.

Refunds made or effected after the date merchandise was imported may not be used to reduce the transaction value of the merchandise.
543246 dated Jan. 9, 1984.

An export deposit refunded to the buyer by the seller and which is received by the buyer *prior* to the date of exportation of the merchandise is not part of the price actually paid or

payable.
543277 dated Apr. 30, 1984.

Due to a drastic change in the exchange rate between the dollar and the German mark, the seller has received windfall profits and has agreed to lower its price to the related party buyer. Assuming that the lower price that the parties have negotiated is acceptable, i.e., due to the relationship between the parties, the lower price is the transaction value. However, any rebate or decrease in the price actually paid or payable effected *after* the date of importation is disregarded in determining transaction value.
543457 dated Apr. 9, 1985.

543609 dated Oct. 7, 1985 - See Defective Merchandise, price renegotiation.

543537 dated Feb. 14, 1986 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, post-importation refund.

The importer ordered sweatshirts from a manufacturer in December for a spring season delivery. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the shipment was delayed. Seven months after the scheduled delivery, the goods arrived and the importer and seller arranged for the importer to receive a partial rebate of the purchase price due to the delay in shipment. This rebate in the price cannot be considered in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
544262 dated June 27, 1989.

The importer purchases ceiling fans that are manufactured in Hong Kong. Subsequent to their importation into the United States, the seller allows the buyer to debit their account in an amount consistent with a reduced unit cost. This reduction in price is not considered in determining the transaction value of the ceiling fans.
544453 dated Mar. 8, 1990.

544645 dated July 16, 1991 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, price renegotiation.

The corrected invoiced amounts do not represent post-importation price adjustments or rebates within the meaning of section 402(b)(4)(B) of the TAA. The documentation reveals that the change in the invoiced values represents a clerical error that was subsequently corrected. The documentation presented includes a revised invoice, a letter from the seller explaining the nature of the error, and a credit note.
546141 dated Apr. 16, 1996.

547273 dated Apr. 22, 1999 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, price renegotiation.

547027 dated Sep. 17, 1999 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, price renegotiation.

RECONCILIATION

The importer makes remittances to its related party seller pursuant to a corporate transfer pricing policy. A portion of its remittance relates to purely domestic purchases unrelated to the imported merchandise. An additional portion relates to foreign purchases from unrelated sellers. As such, the remittances reflect income that is unrelated to the purchase of imported merchandise. Accordingly, subject to acceptable documentation prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, only the amount attributable to the purchase of imported merchandise needs to be reported for purposes of reconciliation since it is that portion that is subject to duties and fees.

548386 dated Nov. 26, 2003.

RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A) through (C) states:

(2)(A) The transaction value of imported merchandise determined under paragraph (1) shall be the appraised value of that merchandise for the purposes of this Act only if - . . .

(iv) the buyer and seller are not related, or the buyer and seller are related but the transaction value is acceptable, for purposes of this subsection, under subparagraph (B).

(B) The transaction value between a related buyer and seller is acceptable for the purposes of this subsection if an examination of the circumstances of the sale of the imported merchandise indicates that the relationship between such buyer and seller did not influence the price actually paid or payable; or if the transaction value of the imported merchandise closely approximates -

(i) the transaction value of identical merchandise, or of similar merchandise, in sales to unrelated buyers in the United States;

(ii) the deductive value or computed value for identical merchandise or similar merchandise; or but only if each value referred to in clause (i) or (ii) that is used for comparison relates to merchandise that was exported to the United States at or about the same time as the imported merchandise.

(C) In applying the values used for comparison purposes under subparagraph (B), there shall be taken into account differences with respect to the sales involved (if such differences are based on sufficient information whether supplied by the buyer or otherwise available to the customs officer concerned) in -

(i) commercial levels;

(ii) quantity levels;

(iii) the costs, commissions, values, fees, and proceeds described in paragraph (1); and

(iv) the costs incurred by the seller in sales in which he and the buyer are not related that are not incurred by the seller in sales in which he and the buyer are related.

In 19 U.S.C. 1401a(g)(1), related parties are defined as follows:

For purposes of this section, the persons specified in any of the following subparagraphs shall be treated as persons who are related:

(A) Members of the same family, including brothers and sisters (whether by whole or half bloods), spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendants.

(B) Any officer or director of an organization and such organization.

(C) An officer or director of an organization and an officer or director of another organization, if each such individual is also an officer or director in the other organization.

(D) Partners.

(E) Employer and employee.

(F) Any person directly or indirectly owning, controlling, or holding with power to vote, five percent or more of the outstanding voting stock or shares of any organization and such organization.
(G) Two or more persons directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control with, any person.

The corresponding Customs regulations regarding related parties are found in 19 CFR 152.103(j)(2) and 19 CFR 152.102(g), respectively.

In addition, 19 CFR 152.103(l) and (m), along with various interpretative notes and examples, elaborates as follows:

Related buyer and seller –
(1) Validation of transaction. The port director shall not disregard a transaction value solely because the buyer and seller are related. There will be related person transactions in which validation of the transaction value, using the procedures contained in [section] 152.103(j)(2), may not be necessary.

(i) Interpretative note 1. Customs may have previously examined the relationship or may already have sufficient detailed information concerning the buyer and seller to be satisfied that the relationship did not influence the price actually paid or payable. In such case, if Customs has no doubts about the acceptability of the price, the price will be accepted without requesting further information from the importer. If Customs does have doubts about the acceptability of the price and is unable to accept the transaction value without further inquiry, the importer will be given an opportunity to supply such further detailed information as may be necessary to enable Customs to examine the circumstances of the sale. In this context, Customs will examine relevant aspects of the transaction, including the way in which the buyer and seller organize their commercial relations and the way in which the price in question was arrived at in order to determine whether the relationship influenced the price.
(ii) Interpretative note 2. If it is shown that the buyer and seller, although related, buy from and sell to each other as if they were not related, this will demonstrate that the price has not been influenced by the relationship, and the transaction value will be accepted. If the price has been settled in a manner consistent with the normal pricing practices of the industry in question, or with the way the seller settles prices for sales to buyers who are not related to him, this will demonstrate that the price has not been influenced by the relationship.
(iii) Interpretative note 3. If it is shown that the price is adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit which is equivalent to the firm's overall profit realized over a representative period of time (e.g., on an annual basis), in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind, this would demonstrate that the price has not been influenced.

Example. A foreign seller sells merchandise to a related U.S. importer. The foreign seller does not sell identical merchandise or similar merchandise to any unrelated parties. The transaction between the foreign seller and the U.S. importer is determined by Customs to be unaffected by the relationship. How should the merchandise be appraised?

Transaction value based on the price actually paid or payable. A transaction value between a related buyer and seller is acceptable if the relationship did not affect the price actually paid or payable. This is so even if similar merchandise is being sold at a higher price, which includes a higher percentage for profit and general expenses.

(2) Test values.

(i) The importer or the buyer may demonstrate that the transaction value in a related person transaction is acceptable by showing that the value "closely approximates" any one of the test values provided in [section] 152.103(j)(2)(i). The factors that will be examined to determine if the transaction value closely approximates a test value include:

(A) The nature of the imported merchandise and the industry,

(B) The season in which the merchandise is imported,

(C) Whether the difference in value is commercially significant,

(D) Whether the difference in value is attributable to internal transport costs in the country of exportation.

(ii) Because these factors may vary, Customs will not be able to apply a uniform standard, such as a fixed percentage, in each case. A small difference in value in a case involving one type of imported merchandise may be unacceptable, although a large difference in a case involving another type may be acceptable, in determining if the transaction value closely approximates any of the test values. Customs will be consistent in determining if one value "closely approximates" another value. The same approach will be taken if Customs considers a transaction value that is higher than any of the enumerated test values as will be taken if the transaction value is lower than any of the test values.

Example. In applying any of the test values, if the transaction value in the sale under consideration is rejected because 95 does not closely approximate 100, then a transaction value for the sale of the same merchandise at 105 occurring at or about the same time likewise would have to be rejected. Similarly, if 103 were considered to closely approximate 100, a transaction value of 97 likewise would closely approximate 100.

(iii) If one of the test values provided in [section] 152.103(j)(2)(i) has been found to appropriate, the port director shall not seek to determine if the relationship between the buyer and seller influenced the price. If the port director already has sufficient information to be satisfied, without further detailed inquiries, that one of the test values is appropriate, he shall not inquire the importer to demonstrate that the test value is appropriate.

(m) Rejection of transaction value. When Customs has grounds for rejecting the transaction value declared by an importer and that rejection increases the duty liability, the port director shall inform the importer of the grounds for rejection. The importer will be afforded 20 days to respond in writing to the port director if in disagreement. This procedure will not affect or replace the administrative ruling procedures contained in Part 177 of this chapter, or any other Customs procedures.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 1, paragraph 2(a) states:

In determining whether the transaction value is acceptable for the purposes of paragraph 1, the fact that the buyer and seller are related within the meaning of Article 15 shall not itself be ground for regarding the transaction value as unacceptable. In such case the circumstances surrounding the sale shall be examined and the transaction value shall be accepted provided that the relationship did not influence the price. If, in the light of information provided by the importer or otherwise, the customs administration has grounds for considering that the relationship influenced the price, it shall communicate its grounds to the importer and he shall be given a reasonable opportunity to respond. If the importer so requests, the communication of the grounds shall be in writing.

Article 1, Paragraph 2(b) provides for the test values corresponding to the test values provided in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B). In addition, paragraph 2(c) states:

The tests set forth in paragraph 2(b) are to be used at the initiative of the importer and only for comparison purposes. Substitute values may not be established under the provisions of paragraph 2(b).
Article 15, paragraph 4, lists those deemed to be related for purposes of the Agreement (similar to those listed in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(g)(1)). Article 15, paragraph 5, states:

Persons who are associated in business with one another in that one is the sole agent, sole distributor or sole concessionaire, however described, of the other shall be deemed to be related for the purposes of this Agreement if they fall within the criteria of paragraph 4 of this Article.

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Paragraphs 2 and 2(b), correspond with the interpretative notes and examples regarding related parties in the Customs regulations. See 19 CFR 152.103(l), cited in this chapter.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 7.1 discusses the Acceptability of Test Values under Article 1.2(b)(i) of the Agreement, and states:

1. Can a price below prevailing market prices for identical or similar goods be used as a test value for the purposes of Article 1.2(b)(i) of the Agreement [transaction value in sales to unrelated buyer of identical or similar goods for export to the same country of exportation]?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following opinion:
When a price between unrelated parties has satisfied the conditions prescribed in Article 1 [transaction value] and, with any necessary adjustments in accordance with the provisions of Article 8 [additions to the price actually paid or payable], has been accepted by customs as a transaction value, that value can be used as a test value. That is not of course the case where a price is still subject of an enquiry or where the final determination by Customs value otherwise remains provisional (see Article 13 of the Agreement).

CCC Technical Committee Commentary 10.1 discusses and cites examples of situations

involving questions of adjustments for different commercial levels and quantities with respect to test values.

Headquarters Notices:

Transfer Pricing; Related Party Transactions, Vol. 27, No. 4, Cust. B & Dec., January 27, 1993; 58 Fed. Reg. 5445 (January 21, 1993).

This notice informs the public of the Customs valuation laws concerning the appraisement of transactions between related parties. The notice provides for the following: the definition of related parties, tests for determining the acceptability of transaction value for related party transactions, and Customs right to question transfer prices and importers' obligations to provide information to Customs.

Judicial Precedent:

La Perla Fashions, Inc., v. United States, 22 Ct. Int'l Trade 393 (1998), aff'd, 185 F.3d 885 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (decision affirmed without opinion).

In this three-tiered transaction, La Perla imported merchandise from its parent company, Gruppo La Perla (GLP), in Italy, and resold the merchandise to retailers in the United States. The merchandise was appraised by Customs based on the price paid by the U.S. customers to La Perla. The Court held that the transfer price between GLP and La Perla was affected by the relationship between the parties. The Court determined that Customs correctly appraised the merchandise based on the sales between the importer, La Perla, and its U.S. customers.

Headquarters Rulings:

control

The importer has no ownership interest in the distributors. The relationship between the importer and its unrelated distributors is governed by a distributorship agreement, the provisions of which suggest a substantial degree of influence or control over the distributors. By virtue of the "control" that the importer exercises pursuant to the distributorship agreements, and by virtue of the market control the importer realizes as the exclusive importer of certain vehicles, the importer is in fact related to the distributors. Consequently, sales between the importer and the distributors cannot be used as the basis of deductive value. Instead, the deductive value of the imported vehicles must be calculated with reference to the unit price at which distributors sell them to unrelated parties.
545481 dated Sep. 14, 1994.

544815 dated May 8, 1997 - <u>See</u> Royalty Payments and License Fees, price actually paid or payable.

definition of related parties

19 U.S.C. 1401a(g)(1); 19 CFR 152.102(g); GATT Valuation Code, Article 15, paragraphs 4, 5

The president of an exporting company is a participant in a seven-member governing committee that controls the importer. Because each of the seven members of the governing committee has an equal vote, the president of the exporting company does not exercise the requisite degree of control required in order to determine that the parties are related within the meaning of section 402(g)(1).
543425 dated Sep. 28, 1984.

Section 402(g) of the TAA provides that any person directly or indirectly owning, controlling, or holding with power to vote, five percent or more of the outstanding voting stock or shares of any organization and such organization shall be considered related for purposes of appraisement. The statute does not provide that persons otherwise meeting these criteria are unrelated by virtue of the existence between the parties of an agreement whereby capital contributions are eventually repatriated. Accordingly, the manufacturer, the importer, and the reseller, are all related parties by reason of their participation in, and ownership of, a joint venture.
545621 dated Sep. 19, 1994.

The importer and the supplier are related due to the fact that the same person sits on the board of directors of both the supplier and importer. These parties are related pursuant to section 402(g)(1)(C) of the TAA. However, when a person is on the board of directors of the importer and is only an employee of the supplier, then the parties are not related pursuant to section 402(g)(1) of the TAA.
546583 dated Dec. 2, 1997.

The importer is a company under common control with a foreign corporation. The foreign corporation's parent company owns 51% of the foreign corporation. In turn, the parent company is owned by two separate companies, with one owning 51% and the other owning 49%. These two companies are each owned, approximately 20% and 70%, respectively, by the importer. As such, the foreign corporation and the importer are both indirectly controlled by two separate companies and are related within the meaning of section 402(g) of the TAA.
547662 dated Sep. 20, 2002; <u>modified</u> by 548305 dated Aug. 11, 2003.

examination of the circumstances of the sale

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B); 19 CFR 152.103(j) (2); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 1, paragraph 2(a) and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, paragraph 2

The transaction value of imported merchandise sold between related parties may be based upon "posted prices" which reflect the normal pricing practices of the industry in question.
542261 dated Mar. 11, 1981 (TAA No. 19).

In a related party situation, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is acceptable if an examination of the circumstances of sale indicates that the relationship between the buyer and seller did not influence the price actually paid or payable, or if such value closely approximates one of the test values.
542310 dated May 22, 1981.

542797 dated May 19, 1982 (TAA No. 48) – See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, price renegotiations.

Transaction value does not exist in a related party transaction where there is no basis upon which to ascertain whether the relationship influenced the price or that the price satisfies a test value. In the absence of a transaction or deductive value, computed value is to be used in appraising the merchandise.
542792 dated Mar. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 61); aff'd by 543144 dated Nov. 17, 1983.

In the instant case, the circumstances of the sale indicate that the relationship between the parties influences the price actually paid or payable and the price does not meet any of the statutory test values. Accordingly, the invoice price cannot represent transaction value.
543378 dated Nov. 20, 1984.

Information submitted regarding the manner in which the related parties conduct their transaction is conclusory in nature. No material has been submitted from which Customs will make a positive determination that the parties deal with one another as if they are unrelated. Therefore, no conclusion may be made as to the acceptability of transaction value.
543272 dated Apr. 26, 1985.

Documentary evidence has been submitted to establish that the parties, although related, buy and sell as if they are not related. The importer negotiates prices with the related party seller, rejects the prices if dissatisfied, and may purchase from other suppliers. The importer's sales divisions determine their U.S. resale prices and make their own management decisions. Transaction value is applicable in appraising the merchandise.
543519 dated Sep. 5, 1985; aff'd by 554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989.

Customs will examine relevant aspects of the transaction between related parties. This includes the ways in which the parties organize their commercial relations and arrive at the price in question. Customs determines whether the relationship influenced the price in light of those considerations.
543568 dated May 30, 1986.

The determination that the price actually paid or payable is not influenced by the relationship between a related buyer and seller is made on a case-by-case basis.
543806 dated Mar. 12, 1987.

Evidence is available to indicate that the manufacturer/seller sells to unrelated purchasers in the United States at the same price at which the manufacturer sells to its related party buyer. It appears, from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the sale between the related parties, that the relationship does not influence the price and that transaction value is a valid means of appraisement.
543984 dated Feb. 22, 1988.

It appears from the facts and circumstances surrounding the sale of the imported merchandise that the relationship between the parties does not influence the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, transaction value is applicable in appraising the merchandise.
544061 dated May 27, 1988.

At the time of entry, the price actually paid or payable between the related parties was submitted to Customs by the importer and that price was accepted by Customs. Transaction value was accepted as a means of appraisement and, therefore, the determination that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price was made. There is no basis for rejecting transaction value and proceeding through the remaining bases of appraisement.
544189 dated Aug. 11, 1988; 544547 dated Aug. 30, 1990.

The importer has not submitted any documentation to establish either that the relationship between the two parties did not influence the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise or that certain deductions taken were not the result of such a relationship between the parties in question.
544759 dated Dec. 13, 1991.

The prices paid by unrelated purchasers and the importer to the foreign seller for identical merchandise appear to be the same, leading to the conclusion that the parties buy from and sell to each other as if they are not related, thereby demonstrating that the price for the merchandise has not been influenced by the relationship.
544809 dated June 1, 1994.

No information has been submitted to support a finding that the transfer price between the related parties was acceptable under the circumstances of sale approach. In particular, there is neither any information concerning normal industry pricing practices, nor any detail about the way in which the seller deals with unrelated buyers. Finally, the seller has not shown that its price was adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit equal to its overall profit realized over a representative period of time in sales of parts of the same class or kind. Transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement.
545369 dated July 25, 1994.

The importer has not submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the transfer prices between the related parties were settled in a manner that is consistent either with the normal pricing practices of the construction industry or with the manner in which the seller sets prices with unrelated buyers. Accordingly, the importer has not met its burden of showing that the circumstances of the related party sale support the use of transaction value in appraising the merchandise.
544686 dated Aug. 31, 1994; aff'd. by 545813 dated Sep. 11, 1996.

The circumstances of sale information submitted by the importer is insufficient to establish that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise. The value of the merchandise should be determined in accordance with the remaining methods of appraisement applied in sequential order.
545669 dated Nov. 17, 1994.

The buyer failed to prove that the price was not influenced by the relationship between the parties. Also, the price between the buyer and seller does not approximate available test values. Transaction value is eliminated as a basis of appraisement.
545638 dated Feb. 13, 1995.

The importer purchased carpets from its related-party parent in Belgium. The invoices between the parties indicated a sixty-day payment period. However, the importer did not pay its related seller for the merchandise for an average of 465 days after the invoice date. Interest was not charged and the importer did not incur late charges. Subsequent shipments were not delayed due to the untimely payments. The importer was timely in paying debts owed to unrelated parties. A review of the circumstances of sale indicates that the transfer price between the parties was insufficient to recover all costs plus a profit equivalent to the overall profit of the seller. The related seller's profit and general expenses, in unrelated sales of identical or similar rugs, were higher than the profit the seller claimed on sales to the importer. Transaction value was properly rejected as a means of appraisement.
545960 dated Aug. 16, 1995.

The buyer of the imported merchandise is a subsidiary of the foreign seller. The foreign seller is the related buyer's only foreign vendor. Using the same price list, the foreign seller sells its merchandise to the related buyer, unrelated U.S. distributors and unrelated U.S. retailers. The related buyer receives a higher trade discount than do the unrelated U.S. distributors. However, the trade discounts to both the related buyer and unrelated U.S. distributors are based on the volume of their purchases from the foreign seller. In addition, the larger trade discount given to the related buyer is due to the increased warehousing costs incurred by stocking a larger and more extensive line of the foreign seller's products than that which is maintained by the unrelated U.S. distributors. The related buyer also markets and advertises the foreign seller's merchandise in the United States. When the related buyer's purchases are adjusted for volume, the trade discounts are not significantly different from that between the related buyer and the unrelated

distributors. Thus, it does not appear that the relationship affects the price of the merchandise; the parties buy and sell from each other as if they are unrelated. Therefore, the circumstances of sale indicate that transaction value is an acceptable method of appraisement.
546285 dated June 7, 1996.

The importer is a wholly owned subsidiary of the foreign seller. The importer has produced sufficient evidence to indicate that the seller settles prices with the importer in the same fashion that it settles prices with unrelated buyers because, to the extent reasonably allocable, the same costs are reflected in both prices and the same return is anticipated. The transfer price is sufficient to recover all costs plus a profit that exceeds the seller's overall profit based upon the company's financial statements. Transaction value is an acceptable method of appraising the imported merchandise.
546211 dated June 10, 1996.

The U.S. importer is related to the foreign seller in Canada. The related party seller has provided information regarding sales in its home market of Canada, including total sales in Canadian dollars, total costs incurred on a yearly basis, and "net return" on sales of like merchandise to the importer. Evidence from foreign sales does not satisfy the circumstance of sale test. In addition, the evidence submitted is inadequate to show that the price of the imported merchandise is sufficient to recover all costs plus a profit equivalent to the firm's overall profit realized over a representative period of time. It has not been demonstrated that the parties buy and sell from one another as if they are unrelated, nor has the importer proved that the transaction value closely approximates a previously accepted Customs value. Transaction value is not applicable in appraising the merchandise.
545800 dated June 28, 1996.

Based on the evidence submitted, the circumstances of sale between the related parties are insufficient proof that the price actually paid or payable was not influenced by the relationship between the parties. It does not appear as if the price between the parties was determined in a manner consistent with the way the price was determined between the seller and unrelated U.S. buyers. Accordingly, transaction value is not applicable in appraising the imported merchandise.
545878 dated July 31, 1996.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to demonstrate that the relationship between the buyer and seller did not influence the price actually paid or payable, such that the related party transfer price constitutes an acceptable transaction value. The appropriate basis of appraisement should be determined by proceeding sequentially through the alternative methods of appraisement set forth in the TAA.
545813 dated Sep. 11, 1996; <u>aff'g</u> 544686 dated Aug. 31, 1994.

The importer has not provided any evidentiary support for the assertion that the relationship between the parties does not influence the price actually paid or payable. The information available indicates that the parties do not buy and seller from one another

as if they are unrelated. In addition to making payments on the invoice value of the imported merchandise, the importers makes additional payments for advertising, promotional and design costs, accounting services, and financing services. It appears as if the price is influenced by the relationship between the parties; and, thus, transaction value is not available as a means of appraisement.
546430 dated Jan. 6, 1997.

An importer purchases frozen vegetables and mushrooms in jars from its wholly owned Mexican subsidiaries. The invoices submitted for appraisement purposes reflect transfer, or estimated, prices based on an "export invoice pricing policy." The importer effects payments via lump sum monthly transfers in response to the exporter's request for funds, without regard to specific entries. An aggregate average price, as opposed to an entry specific price, is derived from the prices set by the Mexican exporters, wherein the prices fluctuate based on actual costs and shipping volume. This method of pricing does not represent a formula nor does it result in a fixed price for the merchandise. In addition, evidence has not been provided concerning the circumstances of sale between the related parties that would indicate that their relationship did not influence the price actually paid or payable. Transaction value is not applicable in this case.
546231 dated Feb. 10, 1997.

The importer failed to establish that the price of the imported merchandise was not influenced by its relationship with its related party seller. The importer submitted inadequate evidence regarding the circumstances of sale. The financial information furnished is insufficient to establish that the price the seller charged the importer was adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit equivalent to the firm's overall profit realized over a representative period of time in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. Transaction value based upon this related party sale is unacceptable.
546449 dated Jan. 6, 1998.

546552 dated Jan. 13, 1998 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

In order to establish that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price actually paid or payable, the importer provided two sets of invoices for two different products. The invoices show that the buyer paid its related party the same price for each product before and after the parties became related. However, the mere fact that the prices remain unchanged before and after the parties became related is not prima facie evidence that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price, i.e., market conditions change over time and the prices of products must be kept current. The fact that the prices remained unchanged even though the parties became related must be examined along with other evidence regarding the circumstances of sale in order to determine whether transaction value is in fact applicable in appraising the imported merchandise.
546561 dated Mar. 16, 1998.

The importer indicates that the price paid by the related party buyer for the imported merchandise reflects a list price, including a discount for wholesaler expenses, which is

consistent with the foreign parent's sales to other related and unrelated purchasers in third countries. The Statement of Administrative Action, Customs Regulations (19 CFR 152.103(j)(2), provides that a price will not be considered to have been influenced if it is shown that the price is profit realized over a representative period of time in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. The importer has provided no such comparison of profit. On the contrary, the submitted evidence indicates that the subsidiary buyer did not enjoy any net profit. We cannot find that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price actually paid or payable such that transaction value is the appropriate method of appraisement.
546072 dated May 21, 1998.

Based on the evidence submitted, Customs concludes that an examination of the circumstances of sale indicates that the relationship of the parties did not influence the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the sale between the importer and its related company may be used as the basis for transaction value. The transaction value of the imported merchandise must also include the material assists, packing costs, and any other applicable additions.
546873 dated Mar. 24, 1999.

The buyer and seller of the imported merchandise are related. The circumstances of sale between the parties indicate that the relationship between the parties influences the price. Specifically, the evidence does not demonstrate that the price is determined in a manner consistent either with industry practice or with the way the seller deals with unrelated buyers. The Statement of Administrative Action provides that the price will not be considered to have been influenced if it is shown that the price is adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit that is equivalent to the firm's overall profit realized over a representative period of time in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. There is insufficient information regarding the circumstances of sale, and the circumstances of sale test has not been met; therefore, it cannot be determined whether the trade discounted prices could form the basis of transaction value. Consequently, the imported merchandise should not be appraised under transaction value.
546865 dated Aug. 6, 1999.

In this case, the price is determined using the prices on three invoices, i.e., the cut, make, and trim (CMT), the material purchase recovery (MPR), and the appropriate costs on the warehousing and expense allocations (WEA). Also, the total price paid by the buyer to the related seller is adequate to ensure the recovery of all costs plus a profit. Thus, the evidence presented indicates that the relationship between the parties does not influence the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, based on the evidence available, the transaction value between the related parties is represented by the sum total of the three invoices as identified above.
547108 dated Mar. 28, 2000.

All of the importer's imported products are covered by an APA for its related party transactions. An APA is a prospective agreement between a taxpayer and the IRS regarding the correct transfer pricing methodologies under tax law to be applied to

transactions between related parties. Based on the review of the information and the information provided to the IRS, the importer has demonstrated that the price has not been influenced by the relationship for purposes of the circumstances of sale test. Thus, transaction value is the proper basis of appraisement for the related party transactions.
546979 dated Aug. 30, 2000.

547806 dated Jan. 31, 2001 - <u>See</u> Buying Commissions, *bona fide* buying commissions.

The U.S. importer purchased stainless steel bars from a related party, and under market conditions. The joint venture agreement between the two parties requires that the "related" party status not confer a benefit to either entity. The test values method and the circumstances of sale approach both indicate that the relationship between the parties did not influence the sale. The transfer price between the importer and the related party manufacturer is an acceptable basis of appraisement under transaction value.
548024 dated Mar. 5, 2002.

The importer and certain vendors are related parties. Whether the price between the importer and its related vendors is acceptable as a basis for transaction value depends upon the circumstances of the sale. Information submitted by the importer did not satisfy the importer's burden to demonstrate that the relationship between the parties did not affect the price between the parties. The merchandise cannot be appraised under the transaction value method of appraisement.
548087 dated Apr. 5, 2002.

The circumstances of sale test requires not only that there be consistency in the importer's price levels with related and unrelated parties, but also that comparable methodologies for pricing are followed. It is inadequate to merely allege that related and unrelated party prices are similar because the exporter may have employed dissimilar methodologies that resulted in similar prices. In addition, in the absence of previously accepted test values, Customs cannot evaluate whether sales between related parties were conducted at arm's length under the test values method.
547982 dated May 20, 2002.

An importer proves that sales between related parties are conducted at arm's length when the importer provides sufficient information to satisfy the circumstances of sale test. The circumstances of sale test requires the importer to demonstrate that the sale between the related parties is not influenced by their relationship. The importer may demonstrate this by establishing that the seller determines the price in a consistent manner with both related and unrelated parties. For comparison purposes, sales by the Italian seller to an unrelated UK distributor are acceptable when the seller does not sell directly to unrelated parties in the United States. The fact that absolute price levels are different does not preclude a determination that the seller's pricing methodology was consistent, provided the difference in pricing is explained by reasons other than a relationship between the parties. The discrepancy in the commercial conditions between the United States and the United Kingdom is an acceptable explanation for differences in the absolute price.

Additionally, the related party price was high enough to ensure that the seller recovered all costs and the requisite amount of profit.

548098 dated May 20, 2002.

The transactions between the middleman and the manufacturer constitute *bona fide* sales of vehicles clearly destined for exportation to the U.S. Even so, these transactions could not be used as a basis for appraisement under transaction value. The importer's evidence is insufficient to show that the sales were conducted at arm's length. Under the circumstances of sale test, the related status of the parties will not preclude appraisement under transaction value if the importer can demonstrate that the price between the middleman and the manufacturer was settled in a manner consistent with normal pricing practices of the industry. In order to establish normal pricing in the industry, objective evidence is needed regarding how prices are set in the industry in question. The company to industry comparison provided by the importer fails to clearly conform to a sufficiently objective standard. Prominent flaws in the importer's report included the following: (1) the industry in question was not clearly limited to manufacturers of vehicles comparable to the manufacturer; (2) the methodology for determining the transfer price between the middleman and the manufacturer was not included; (3) the middleman's full cost mark up was not a basis of comparison; and (4) the profit level indicator comparisons should were not based on product sold.

547672 dated May 21, 2002.

The transactions appear to be analogous to shelter operations, which involve a U.S. corporation that is established for the sole purpose of facilitating assembly operations for third party clients in the United States. Accordingly, the use of transaction value is appropriate so long as the relationship between the importer and the supplier did not influence the price. Absent any comment from the port, we assume that the pricing component, i.e., the amount of profit earned by the importer, is consistent with industry practices. Therefore, the price between the importer and the supplier was not influenced by the relationship between the parties. The importer acted as a buyer of the imported merchandise rather than as a selling agent for its related party assembler/manufacturer. Consequently, the transaction value for the sale between the importer and the supplier is the appropriate method of valuation.

547729 dated Sep. 20, 2002.

The importer has met its burden of proof in regard to the arm's length nature of its transactions with its related party suppliers. The supplier's profit figures are comparable to other companies selling like products to the importer and the sales documentation and terms used in the importer's transactions mirror those of unaffiliated transactions. It is our conclusion that the circumstances of the sales between the importer and its related suppliers demonstrate that the prices are acceptable for use as the price actually paid or payable for appraisement purposes.

548305 dated Aug. 11, 2003; reconsideration of 547662 dated Sep. 20, 2002, (additional information presented).

The relationship between the related parties does not influence the price actually paid or

payable based upon the circumstances of sale test. The parties have demonstrated that the circumstances of sale indicate that while related, the parties buy and sell from one another as if they were unrelated. This conclusion is based, in part, upon a review of information contained in the company's bilateral APA. An APA constitutes a prospective agreement between a taxpayer and the IRS (and in the case of bilateral APAs, foreign tax authorities) regarding the correct transfer pricing methodologies under tax law to be applied in transactions between related parties. Although CBP's approach to related party transactions differs from the IRS approach, in some cases, especially where the APA is bilateral, some of the information in the APA may be relevant for purposes of applying the circumstances of sale test.

548233 dated Nov. 7, 2003.

A U.S. manufacturer, a wholly-owned subsidiary of a U.S. parent, is in turn wholly owned by a foreign manufacturer. The U.S. manufacturer obtains parts from the foreign manufacturer. The U.S. manufacturer is also related to another manufacturing company located in the U.S. The U.S. manufacturer receives technical support from the related U.S. manufacturing company. This support includes procurement support. CBP determined that the related U.S. manufacturer is a buying agent of the U.S. manufacturer, and the sourcing fees paid to the affiliate constituted a buying commission which was not added to the price actually paid or payable. The U.S. manufacturer pays foreign and domestic R&D for the right to produce merchandise bearing the trademark of the foreign manufacturer. As the U.S. manufacturer incurred the obligation to pay the royalty regardless of the quantity of the imported merchandise, the royalty was deemed not to be related to the imported merchandise. To cover costs, the U.S. parent loans operating capital to the U.S. manufacturer. The U.S. manufacturer has an agreement with the foreign manufacturer for technical guidance in the form of technical documents and experts. The foreign manufacturer grants a license to the U.S. manufacturer to assemble the merchandise, in consideration of which, the U.S. manufacturer pays a royalty equal to a percentage of the value added in the U.S. of all finished goods sold by the U.S. manufacturer. The U.S. manufacturer also had an agreement with the foreign manufacturer regarding the supply of parts, the purchase price of which are to be negotiated by the foreign manufacturer and the U.S. manufacturer. CBP determined there were *bona fide* sales between the foreign manufacturer and the U.S. manufacturer. The terms of sale were FOB and the U.S. manufacturer paid for the merchandise by making payments to the U.S. parent, which subsequently netted the payments against the U.S. manufacturer's debt obligations to the foreign manufacturer. These payments were considered indirect payments for the benefit of the foreign manufacturer. The firm's overall cost of production was used by the functional divisions of the firm to negotiate and establish the overall cost structure of a particular finished good, and the price to be paid by the U.S. manufacturer was established by the time of importation. The amount paid by the U.S. manufacturer to the foreign manufacturer for R&D related to the imported merchandise was fully captured in the transfer price based on the costing process. A FOB ratio was used to ensure that the foreign manufacturer recovers all costs plus a representative profit on sales to the U.S. manufacturer. CBP determined that the costing process and FOB ratio were designed to capture all of the manufacturer's direct and indirect costs and that the amount for profit was comparable to the foreign manufacturer's

profit on sales of the same class or kind. The Foreign Manufacturer's invoice indicates both a FOB unit price and a total CIF price that itemizes the costs of ocean freight and insurance. Based on the invoice and other documents CBP found that the terms of sale are FOB and that the CIF price is provided to separately identify expenses related to the international transportation of the merchandise. Regarding the treatment of ocean freight, it appears that the amount remitted by the U.S. Manufacturer to the Foreign Manufacturer includes an amount for international freight based on the CIF price. This amount may be deducted from the total payment provided that the importer is able to substantiate the claimed freight charge is the actual amount paid to the shipping company.
W563326 dated Nov. 3, 2006.

Related party seller sells generic drugs to the U.S. buyer at a price less than the prices for branded drugs in order to be competitive with other generic manufacturers. CBP had been satisfied that the relationship between the seller and the buyer did not influence the price actually paid or payable of the branded drugs. Absent evidence to the contrary, it may be appropriate to appraise the generic drugs under transaction value and for CBP to continue to recognize that the relationship did not influence the price of the generic drugs.
H062635 dated Nov. 30, 2009.

The importer/buyer is a U.S. Corporation, which acts as an exclusive distributor of motor vehicles imported from the Seller/Manufacturer, the parent company, for re-sale in the U.S. market. The importer also acts as the exclusive distributor for parts, accessories, and service tools imported from the affiliate of the parent company. The importer provided a detailed description of its sales process and price negotiations. The importer supplied CBP with a bilateral APA that was approved by the IRS and the foreign tax authorities, and it covered all of its imported items for 5 years. In its APA, the importer selected the Comparable Profits Method ("CPM") as the best method for evaluating its related party, or controlled, transactions. Pursuant to the CPM, an arm's length price range was selected by comparing the profitability of the importer (or "tested party") to that of a set of unrelated companies that performed similar functions and assumed similar risks as the importer. However, none of the 21 selected companies were automobile distributors or manufacturers because pricing data for sales from such companies to unrelated distributors did not exist. The importer stated that it did not make compensating adjustments pursuant to its APA because of the rigorous price negotiations. Although CBP did not allow the importer to rely solely on the bilateral APA transfer pricing agreement, CBP held that the Importer had showed that the sales price was not influenced by the relationship for the purposes of circumstances of sale test, based on the totality of the circumstances considered, and, as a result, transaction value was the proper method of appraisement for the related-party import transaction.
H029658 dated Dec. 8, 2009.

CBP determined that transaction value is the appropriate method of appraisement in respect to import sales of medical products between the foreign seller/manufacturer and its related importer. The price charged by the foreign seller/manufacturer was based on the resale price method ("RPM"), pursuant to Section 482 of the IRS Code. The

transactions were not subject to an APA. All the external comparable companies in the transfer pricing analysis distributed goods of the same class or kind, and they were direct competitors of the importer. Additionally, although the importer's gross profit margin was higher than the margins realized by an affiliated company in comparable sales to unrelated third parties, CBP found the margins to be comparable because the differences in prices were due to additional marketing and distribution activities performed by the importer in respect to the related party transactions. Therefore, CBP determined that since all comparable companies sell merchandise of the same class or kind, the transfer pricing study supports a finding that the importer's price was settled in a manner consistent with the normal
pricing practices of the industry.
H037375 dated Dec. 11, 2009.

CBP determined that transaction value is the appropriate method of customs valuation in respect to import sale of specialized textile fabrics between the foreign seller/manufacturer and its related distributor in the United States. The transfer prices for imported finished goods were based on a "customer price minus" formula, and "works in progress goods" were based on a "cost to produce plus" formula. Multiple transfer pricing studies were presented to CBP, which independently tested both the seller/manufacturer and the distributor. The Comparable Profits Method ("CPM") was used in the distributor's transfer pricing studies, while the foreign seller's/manufacturer's studies used the Transactional Net Margin Method ("TNMM"). The transactions were not subject to an APA. Transfer pricing studies provided to CBP, which evaluated the manufacturing activities of the Canadian subsidiary (manufacturer), contained comparable companies that sold merchandise of the same class or kind as the merchandise being imported. Even though the transfer pricing studies were not approved by the IRS and were based on TNMM method, CBP considered these transfer pricing studies to substantiate the conclusions drawn from the Segmented Income Statement of the foreign seller/manufacturer with respect to the "work in progress goods". The importer satisfied the all costs plus a profit test in the case of finished goods sales because the net profit margin of the foreign seller's/manufacturer's sales to unrelated third parties was similar (or higher) to the net profit margin of manufacturer's sale to the related prices.
H032883 dated Mar. 31, 2010.

Importer sought to obtain downward adjustments under transaction value using reconciliation in transactions between related parties. Importer failed to meet the circumstances of the sale test citing only to an APA as the basis for meeting the test. The transactions did not fall within the understanding of a formula, and contrary to the argument advocated by the importer, section 1059A of the IRS code did not require that the value of the goods be the same for customs and tax purposes. The importer's claim for treatment failed as the period of downward adjustments did not the regulatory 2-year requirement.
H022287 dated Dec. 30, 2010.

This case involved apparel that the importer wanted to enter using the first sale. The factories and the middleman are related parties. The importer wanted to use the "all costs

plus a profit" method to show that the price was equivalent to an arm's length transaction but did not provide the profit of the parent corporation. CBP did not accept a comparison between the profit of the factory and the profit of related factories to demonstrate that the all costs plus a profit test was met.
H106603 dated July 25, 2011.

The importer, middleman and factory are all related parties. The importer submitted a transfer pricing study but the study did not include companies that were direct competitors, the study did not cover the relevant time period, and the study was not reviewed by the IRS. A one-page follow-up that covered the relevant time period gave no supporting documentation, used a new methodology, and mainly looked at new companies. The follow-up did not indicate how the new companies were chosen or much information about the new companies. The importer did not satisfy the normal pricing practices of the industry test. The importer then argued that it satisfied the all costs plus a profit test. The profit of the parent corporation was not provided. The importer made a comparison between the overall profits of the related Factory C and the profits of Factory C in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. CBP did not accept this comparison to demonstrate that the sale was at arm's length.
H088815 dated Sep. 28, 2011.

Internal advice decision rejecting a first sale claim between two related parties – the manufacturer and the middleman. The decision questioned the claim that the sale between the parties was ex-factory based on the parties' actions and apparent noted errors in the documents regarding method of payment. However, setting aside the apparent conflicts, the decision considered whether the sale would be acceptable per 19 USC 1401a(b)(2)(B). The two methods by which counsel sought to argue the parties met the circumstances of the sale test were found deficient. In one, related parties whose transactions were the subject of other protests were used as an example to show that the prices reflected the normal pricing practices in the country of export at the time. Insufficient information was presented to show that the comparison related parties met the circumstances of the sale test. The other argument submitted was that because unrelated subcontractors were willing to accept the same price paid to the related manufacturer, the related parties at issue arrived at prices in a manner not influenced by their relationship. Because CBP cannot view the subcontractors' prices out of context of the entire transaction, this argument was unpersuasive.
H097035 dated Nov. 15, 2011.

Reconsideration of prior internal advice decision, H097035, rejecting a first sale claim between related parties. CBP upheld the prior decision addressing only the additional arguments presented by counsel, including why this office concluded the sales between the related parties were FOB, and not ex-factory. The decision addressed the rulings cited by counsel and why they did not support the argument that CBP erred in finding that the related parties failed to meet the all costs plus a profit test. Finally, the decision explained why the unrelated subcontractors' prices could not be viewed out of context of the entire transaction which involved the related parties.
H215658 dated June 11, 2012.

The importer established that there was a sale for export to the United States between the middleman and its related manufacturer in regard to the Cut, Make, and Trim (CMT) services performed by manufacturer on behalf of the middleman. Furthermore, the accompanying documents demonstrated that the merchandise was clearly destined to the United States at the time of the sale between manufacturer and the middleman. Although the middleman and manufacturer were related, it was determined that the price that the middleman paid to manufacturer for the CMT services was not influenced by the relationship between these parties. To support the circumstances of sale test, the importer presented evidence to indicate that the price that the manufacturer charged its related middleman was adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit that was equivalent to the firm's overall profit realized over a representative period of time in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind. The financial information that importer submitted were certified financial statements for the relevant year prepared by third party auditing firms. The financial audits of the manufacturer and its parent company indicated that the operating profit realized by the manufacturer on the subject transaction was higher than the profit realized by parent company for the year in which the transaction occurred. The evidence also showed that the related parties engaged in active negotiations with each other. It is also showed that the middleman could receive quotes for the assembly services from a number of different manufacturers, and it always had the option to eliminate a manufacturer from consideration if its instructions were not followed. Therefore, the evidence supported that the appraisement of the imported merchandise should be based on the "first sale" prices paid by the middleman, to its related manufacturer. In determining the final transaction value for the imported merchandise, an addition should have been made to the price paid by the middleman for the values of the fabric and other materials used in producing the goods that were supplied to the manufacturer free of charge as assists.
H208055 dated Oct. 12, 2012.

The importer is a U.S. based company that imports and purchases contact lenses from a foreign related manufacturer and declares import values based on transaction value. The importer purchases finished goods from a related party and makes quarterly transfer pricing adjustments based on the Comparable Profits Method ("CPM"), supported by a transfer pricing study. From 2005 to 2006, the importer made downward price adjustments for nearly all quarters and filed for refunds through the Reconciliation program. Applying the 5-factor test, specified in HRL W548314 dated May 16, 2012, CBP found that post-importation adjustments (both upward and downward), to the extent they occur, may be taken into account in determining the transaction value under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b). The importer provided numerous financial and accounting records to support the claimed adjustments, a detailed description of the profit allocation to individual products, as well as various documentation to show that the written transfer pricing policy was in effect prior to importation, and records to illustrate that the adjustments were indeed reported to the IRS. This decision serves as example of the types of documentation CBP is looking for in order for the 5-factor test to be met. Finally, the importer demonstrated that the prices, as adjusted, met the circumstances of the sale test necessary to demonstrate that transaction value is acceptable in a related party

transaction. CBP determined that related party prices were similar to sales made to an unrelated party in another country, and that the operating profits of the manufacturer exceeded the operating profits of the parent company.
H018314 dated Mar. 18, 2013.

Protest involving a Chinese manufacturer, a middleman, and a U.S. buyer. The protestant middleman claimed first sale and claimed not to be related to the manufacturer. Thus, protestant claimed the presumption of the sale being arm's length. CBP rejected the arm's length presumption because the protestant middleman had the same address and telephone number in China as the manufacturer. Moreover, in protests involving the middleman's related party (another middleman), the sole director of the manufacturer signed documents and was identified as an employee of the middleman's sister company. The financial information submitted to support a claim that the transactions met the all cost plus a profit method appeared to be inconsistent with the gross margin of the transaction at issue leading to questions regarding the selling, general and administrative expenses of the companies involved and whether these costs were beyond the norm for companies engaged in similar activities. CBP found the submitted financial information inadequate to conclude the manufacturer and the middleman operated at arm's length.
H161677 dated July 11, 2013.

An importer sought to appraise imported engine spare parts under transaction value based on a discounted price it had paid to a related party. In support, the importer submitted a letter between the related parties, stating their relationship and that the price paid by the importer is based on a discount from the published spare parts price list. The importer also submitted another letter indicating that the reason for the discount was so that the importer and other affiliates, which were unrelated to the importer, could obtain a reasonable profit margin for their sale of the parts. This was not sufficient information to establish transaction value as the importer did not provide CBP with a list of affiliates that allegedly received the same discount, nor did the importer demonstrate that any of these unrelated companies actually received the same discount.
H236744 dated Dec. 12, 2013.

The importer is a U.S. corporation, related to the manufacturer/seller. Manufacturer/seller is a global manufacturer of food processing equipment, and the importer markets and sells the manufacturer/seller's product lines. All but three of the manufacturer/seller's worldwide distributors are unrelated parties. The importer provided a detailed description of how the company sets its prices, both to related and unrelated distributors. The importer also supplied CBP its Marketing Contract, negotiated prior to the importation of merchandise, together with its amendments. Further, the importer provided CBP with a transfer pricing study that covered all of its imported items for one year. In its transfer pricing study, the importer selected a "modified" Resale Price Method ("RPM") as the best method for evaluating its related party, or controlled, transactions. The transfer pricing study selected the importer as the tested party and used the operating margin as its Profit Level Indicator. Upon review of the documentation submitted by the importer, CBP determined that transaction between the Importer and the related manufacturer/seller constituted *bona fide* sales for export. Additionally, CBP found that the importer may take

into account downward and upward post-importation adjustments, to the extent necessary, to the provisional values of the imported merchandise declared to CBP, provided that the importer maintains and provides upon request accounting details from its books and/or financial statements to support the claimed adjustments. The importer was strongly encouraged to use Reconciliation to report the changes made pursuant to its transfer pricing policy. Finally, in order to use transaction value method of appraisement, the Importer was able to show that the related party prices (adjusted in accordance with the Importer's transfer pricing study) were settled in a manner consistent with the way the seller settles prices in sales to unrelated buyers.
H024857 dated Jan. 7, 2014.

The importer purchases flash memory devices and products incorporating flash memory devices from its related party supplier for distribution in the U.S. The importer supplied CBP with a detailed description of the structure and flow of the transactions with the supplier, two transfer pricing studies conducted in compliance with Section 482 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC), as well as a supplemental economic analysis for each tax year prepared. The Comparable Profits Method (CPM) was identified in the transfer pricing studies as the best method for evaluating the intercompany tangible transactions between the importer and the supplier. The importer was chosen as the tested party. The profit level indicator selected was the operating margin calculated as operating profit divided by net sales. CBP found that even though none of the information provided strictly fell under the three illustrative examples under 19 C.F.R. §152.103(l)(1)(i)-(iii), the sales price was not considered influenced by the relationship for purposes of the circumstances of the sale test, based on the totality of the information considered and the review and examination of all relevant aspects of the transaction, including the way in which the importer and the supplier organized their commercial relations and the way in which the price in question was arrived at.
H176775 dated Mar. 6, 2014.

Company A is an importer, marketer, and distributor of various pharmaceutical products. Company A purchased the imported pharmaceutical products from its related foreign supplier. The complex bilateral APA covered all transactions between the parties, both tangible and intangible, as well as services. The APA addressed the arm's-length nature of prices charged or received in aggregate between the related parties with respect to covered transactions. In this case, Company A made (1) transfer of funds; (2) booked adjustments in COGS; and, (3) revised supply agreements to account for adjustments. CBP found that the customs value of the imported merchandise was affected every time the related parties reduce or increase their profitability pursuant to the APAs or transfer pricing studies, which covered the imported goods, resulting in payments, transfer of funds, or credit/debit transactions between the related parties. Although, in certain circumstances, compensating (post-importation) adjustments might not relate to the imported goods, this was not the case here. Considering all of the facts and documents, CBP determined that the adjustments in this case must be reported to CBP since they directly relate to the imported goods.
H204329 dated Aug. 18, 2014.

The merchandise at issue is chlorothalonil, the active ingredient in some fungicides, imported in powder form. Sipcam, the importer, processes chlorothalonil into a finished fungicide in the U.S. Depending on the level of purity of chlorothalonil, the finished product is sold in the U.S. or in Canada. The importer purchases chlorothalonil from its Italian parent company, Oxon Italia ("Oxon"), which purchases the chemical from a Chinese manufacturer, Jiangyin Suli Chemical Co., Ltd. ("Sulichem"). Sulichem supplies two (2) grades of chlorothalonil at issue in this case (Product 1 and Product 2). The Importer entered the products based on the price which it paid to the foreign seller, Oxon; however, the importer later claimed that the products should have been valued based on the price paid by Oxon to the Chinese manufacturer, Sulichem. CBP found that there was a *bona fide* sale for export between Oxon and Sulichem. With respect to the circumstances of the sale analysis, for Product 1, purchased by Oxon, company provided emails between the parties, arguing that there was evidence of negotiations and that the price was determined based on an arm's-length transaction. CBP was unable to determine whether the price at which Product 1 was sold to Oxon was consistent with the way in which the seller determined prices for unrelated buyers or sold to unrelated buyers, since provided emails did not show how the price was arrived at between the parties (the emails merely showed that the seller was unwilling to grant a discount to the buyer). The company also argued that the all costs plus a profit example was satisfied, but since the seller's profit was not equal to or higher than the parent company's overall profit over a presentative period of time, CBP found that the all costs plus a profit test was not met for Product 1. Similarly, the company failed to meet the test values with respect to Product 1, and CBP found that Product 1 should be appraised using the fallback method. Concerning Product 2, the company satisfied circumstances of the sale test by providing sufficient evidence showing that the price at which the manufacturer sold to its related seller, Oxon, was consistent with the price at which the manufacturer sold to unrelated buyers; thus, transaction value was proper method of appraisement.
H224598 dated Dec. 30, 2014.

The importer purchases equipment, machinery and components from related and unrelated parties for use in building manufacturing process equipment for customers. To show that the importer met the circumstances of the sale and that the prices, or discounts on prices, reflected the normal pricing practices of the industry, the importer submitted numerous examples of negotiations between it and related and unrelated parties for the purchase of goods. The importer also submitted examples of related party sales to it and to unrelated parties where comparable discounts were given on the price of goods. CBP was satisfied that the related parties dealt with one another as if not related and that the prices were settled in a manner consistent with the normal pricing practices of the industry. Therefore, transaction value was an acceptable method of appraisement for the goods imported by the importer from related parties. As to the royalty fee paid by the importer to a related party, other than the seller, CBP found it not dutiable as the importation of the merchandise did not trigger the royalty fee Rather, the sale of the manufacturing processing systems incorporating the imported merchandise, and upon which the trademark would be displayed, triggered the obligation to pay the royalty. CBP found the royalty was not intrinsically related to the sale of goods for export or as a condition of sale.

H160935 dated Feb. 11, 2015.

The importer is a supplier of components and subassemblies which are used in the manufacture and assembly of various construction equipment machines produced primarily at the U.S. facilities of its parent company. The importer provided a number of transfer pricing documents prepared for tax purposes including the U.S. parent company's global tax policy letter, the U.S. parent company's Intercompany Pricing Practice Letter, two transfer pricing studies, and an excerpt from a U.S. importing tax study. CBP found that the transfer pricing studies submitted by the importer did not by themselves provide CBP with the information necessary to conclude that the relationship between the importer and the seller did not influence the price for the imported merchandise. The comparable companies identified in the transfer pricing study did not necessarily operate in the construction equipment industry and did not manufacture products of the same class or kind as the seller and there was no indication that the comparable companies were direct competitors of either the seller or the importer. Further, the transfer pricing documents submitted were either incomplete or insufficient. Thus, based on the totality of the information considered, CBP found that the information presented did not support acceptability of using transaction value to appraise the imported merchandise. CBP also held that the all costs plus a profit test was not satisfied since no information was submitted concerning the U.S. parent company's operating profit; comparable companies did not sell merchandise of the same class or kind; and, the importer did not breakdown the seller's profit margins by sales of merchandise of the same class or kind.

H233328 dated Apr, 1, 2015.

The importer is a maker and importer of electronic throttle controls, pneumatic controls and electronic sensors for heavy-duty trucks, buses, off-road equipment and military applications. In addition, it designs and manufactures a line of adjustable foot pedals and arm rests, as well as a line of joysticks. The Importer sells its products directly to large, heavy truck, transit bus and off-road original equipment manufacturers ("OEMs") worldwide, and through a network of independent distributors and representatives, which sell controls and sensors to smaller OEMs and replacement parts to truck and bus owners. The importer purchases the imported products from its related party in China. According to the information submitted, although transfer prices are set yearly, if the seller's standard costs change significantly within the year, the buyer/importer, reviews and updates transfer prices accordingly for subsequent shipments. In addition, each month the importer analyzes and updates material costs using the suppliers' latest purchase prices, and each quarter it analyzes cost-plus margins and, if needed to keep arm's-length pricing, adjusts transfer prices more frequently than once a year. CBP determined that in this case prices of previously imported goods are not being adjusted. The only price adjustments being made are for goods yet to be imported into the United States, and the adjusted prices are being reported to CBP when the goods are entered. Accordingly, the question of whether the declared price, which may differ from the contracted transfer price, is derived from an objective formula does not arise, and HQ W548314 is not applicable. Moreover, CBP found that because the sellers' operating profits were higher than the profits of the parent company in sales of merchandise of the

same class or kind over a representative period of time, the importer satisfied the circumstances of the sale test, and transaction value is an acceptable method of appraisement. CBP determined that even though adjustable foot pedals, arm rests, and joysticks are not similar or identical to the imported electronic throttle controls, pneumatic controls and electronic sensors, CBP considered these items to be merchandise of the same class or kind, as defined in 19 CFR §152.102(h). The importer operates within its parent company's industrial controls segment, designing, manufacturing, and selling all of its products for specialty vehicles, such as heavy trucks, transit buses, off-road equipment and military applications. Therefore, the importer operates within the driver control subsystem industry, and all of its manufactured, designed, and sold products, even though not identical or similar, belong to this industry sector.
H236154 dated Apr. 8, 2015.

Biesse America is an importer of machinery and systems for working materials like wood, glass, stone, aluminum, and solid surfaces. Biesse America purchases the imported parts and finished machinery from its parent company, Biesse SpA, located in Italy. According to Biesse America, Biesse SpA sets its prices for parts based on a wholesale price list, applicable to all sales of parts at the wholesale level. With respect to the importation of finished machines, these machines are produced according to end-user specifications, which are generally unique. Biesse SpA provides discounts based on volume, investment in spare parts inventory, the commitment made by the intermediary to its product, and the level of product support provided to the end user, including the technical ability to service the machines. CBP determined that transaction value was not the appropriate method of appraisement for sales between Biesse America and its parent company. With respect to the valuation of finished machines, there were no global price lists or any type of contracts provided between Biesse SpA and its related and unrelated distributors to support the company's assertion that Biesse SpA charged all of its unrelated distributors and the related parties the same price, including the same discount. Additionally, there were no examples of documents submitted to show negotiations between Biesse SpA and related and unrelated parties for the purchase of the imported machines. Similarly, with respect to the imported parts, there was insufficient information to show that the related party prices were settled in a manner consistent with the way the seller settled prices in sales to unrelated buyers. Moreover, to support its argument that the price of the imported merchandise was not influenced by the relationship of the parties, Biesse America provided Biesse SpA's operating profit for the sale of merchandise to the U.S. and Biesse SpA's operating profit for sales to the rest of the world. Biesse SpA is both the parent company of Biesse America and the seller of the imported merchandise; however, Biesse SpA's overall operating profit margin was not provided for review. Therefore, CBP was unable to compare the operating profit margin for Biesse SpA's sales to the U.S. to the operating profit margin of Biesse SpA's global sales, including the United States. The imported merchandise had to be appraised in accordance with the remaining methods of valuation, applied in sequential order. 19 U.S.C. 1401a(a). Specifically, given Biesse of America's resale of the imported merchandise in the United States, the deductive method of appraisement was found to be applicable.
H223036 dated July 24, 2015.

The seller earned a higher percentage in profit on its sales of its vacuum pumps to the buyer in the United States then it did on its total sales of all the vacuum pumps it sold during the applicable period under review. In deciding whether the all costs plus a profit test has been satisfied, CBP must consider whether the overall profits that are used as a comparison were calculated from sales of merchandise which were of the same class or kind, as the merchandise that the seller sold to buyer in the United States in the importations under review. Although the sales to the U.S. buyer did not include all the varieties of the different pump models that the seller sold at that time, it nevertheless included the two basic types of pumps that it sold, i.e., pumps for the dairy industry and the industrial waste vacuum pumps. All the pumps that the seller sold both to the related U.S. buyer and to its customers in other countries shared a number of common characteristics. They were intended to perform the same function of pumping fluids. They were produced in the same factory, had the same basic design, and operated using the same basic mechanical principles of vacuum pumps. The chief difference in the dairy pumps from the industrial pumps was that they were smaller in size and had less power. CBP concluded that the pumps that the seller sold to related U.S. buyer were of the same class or kind as the pumps that it sold to all its other customers, and was satisfied that the seller earned profits in its sales to the related U.S. buyer which were greater than its overall profits in sales of the same class or kind of merchandise realized over a representative period of time. CBP concluded that the price that the seller charged the U.S. buyer for the imported vacuum pumps compensates the seller for all its costs to produce the imported merchandise plus a sufficient amount of profit to satisfy the circumstances of the sale test as set forth in 19 C.F.R. §152.103(l)(1)(iii).
H235527 dated Aug. 4, 2015.

The U.S. company purchased watches from its parent company in Switzerland. The company submitted its bilateral APA to CBP, and CBP participated in the opening conference for the APA renewal. CBP obtained all submissions and information the company provided to IRS. Under the bilateral APA, the Comparable Profits Method ("CPM") was utilized as the best method, with Operating Margin as PLI, and the tested party was the U.S. company. Products sold by comparable companies used in the APA analysis were not of the same class or kind as the imported merchandise. The company claimed that the totality of the information presented and a review of the examination of all relevant aspects of the transactions demonstrated that the price was not influenced by the relationship. The company submitted information regarding its own profitability versus that of its competitors, and a study of the Swiss watch industry prepared by Ernst and Young, LLC. This study included both a qualitative and quantitative verification. The company also submitted a range of information as to how it does business, from its bilateral APA to the way it establishes prices with its parent company in Switzerland. CBP found that even though the bilateral APA by itself was not sufficient to show price acceptability, the underlying facts and conclusions and especially the underlying documentation furnished to the IRS and provided to CBP, contained relevant information in examining the circumstances of the sale. Based on the totality of the evidence, CBP determined that transaction value was the appropriate method of appraisement. Finally,

CBP reviewed the totality of information regarding importer's post-importation adjustments and concluded that as long as the importer maintains and provides accounting details from its books and/or financial statements to support adjustments upon making a claim and describes the method of allocation of such adjustments, the importer may claim post-importation adjustments to value.
H238027 dated Feb. 19, 2015.

In the related party transactions under review, the sellers earned a greater profit in their sales of the imported product to their related company in the U.S. than the parent company made in its sales of goods of the same class or kind during the applicable years in which those sales occurred. Because the sellers' operating profits were higher than the profits of the parent company, the all costs plus a profit test was satisfied, and the companies satisfied the circumstances of the sale test. Accordingly, transaction value is an acceptable method of appraisement. Future importations of the applicable articles should be monitored periodically to ensure that the companies continue to earn a profit which is equivalent or greater than the profit earned by the parent company in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind during a representative period of time.
H238990 dated Apr. 7, 2014.

The U.S. importer/buyer, located in North Carolina distributed pesticides herbicides, and fungicides in the U.S., which it purchased from its related suppliers. The U.S. importer/buyer was also a U.S.-based subsidiary of its parent company, located in Israel. The company's determination of the transaction value was driven by its transfer pricing study, prepared by KPMG, LLP for tax purposes. This global transfer pricing study, as applied to the U.S. importer/buyer, stipulated that the company operated on a guaranteed local margin concept. The U.S. importer/buyer provided its parent company's global transfer pricing study, the U.S. importer/buyer's fiscal years 2012 and 2011 economic analysis, 2010 transfer pricing update, and the parent company's transfer pricing policy for 2012. Apart from identifying the parent company's competitors in the crop protection industry, there was no quantitative or qualitative information provided with respect to the U.S. importer/buyer's direct competitors in the U.S. Regarding the parent company's global transfer pricing study, the Transactional Net Margins Method ("TNMM") was selected as the most appropriate method to test the arm's length nature of the tested transactions for tax purposes. For the U.S. importer/buyer's operations in North America, the Comparable Profits Method ("CPM") was selected as the best method. None of the importer/buyer's transfer pricing studies (or updates) identified comparable companies based on product comparability for customs purposes. In fact, most of the comparable companies identified distributed pharmaceutical and medical products and do not belong to the crop protection industry. The issues were whether transaction value was the proper method of appraisement for transactions between the U.S. importer/buyer and its related suppliers and whether post-importation adjustments to the value of the merchandise, resulting from the U.S. importer/buyer's reconciliation of profit in accordance with its transfer pricing policies, should be taken into account for purposes of determining customs value. CBP determined that transaction value was not the appropriate method of appraisement for sales between the U.S. importer/buyer and the related suppliers. The

deductive value method of appraisement, using the amount of profit and general expenses originally reported to CBP, should be used to value the imported merchandise.
H254700 dated Nov. 25, 2015.

The importer is a U.S. Corporation, which acts as an exclusive distributor of motor vehicles, motorcycles, and parts imported from the Seller, for re-sale in the U.S. market to unrelated dealers. The importer provided a detailed description of its sales process and price negotiations. The importer supplied CBP with a bilateral APA that was approved by the IRS and the foreign tax authorities, and it covered all of its imported items for 5 years. The importer also submitted the application for a renewal APA. The Comparable Profits Method ("CPM") was identified in the APA as the best method for evaluating the importer's related party or controlled transactions. Pursuant to the CPM, an arm's length price range was selected by comparing the operating margin of the importer (or "tested party") to that of a set of unrelated companies that performed similar functions and assumed similar risks as the importer. However, none of the 12 selected companies were distributors of products of the same class or kind as the importer since comparable companies which import and sell motor vehicles did not exist. Although CBP did not allow the importer to rely solely on the bilateral APA transfer pricing agreement, CBP held that the importer had showed that the sales price was not influenced by the relationship for purposes of the circumstances of sale test, based on the totality of the circumstances considered, and, as a result, transaction value was the proper method of appraisement for the related-party import transaction. CBP also held that the importer may take into account downward and upward post-importation adjustments to the provisional values of the imported merchandise declared to CBP.
H256363 dated Jan. 29, 2015.

The Importer/Buyer requested a ruling seeking approval of the proper basis of appraisement of natural and biodegradable additives, purchased from foreign related manufacturers. The Importer/Buyer belongs to the food additive industry. To substantiate its argument that the related party price was not influenced by the relationship of the parties, the Importer/Buyer submitted the following information to CBP: (1) detailed description of how the related parties set their prices; (2) three unilateral APAs, comparing the operating profit margin of the Importer/Buyer to the operating profit margins of comparable distribution companies that sell non-durable goods; and, (3) a sample of one product sold to the unrelated party in a mature market, comparable to the United States. CBP determined that the acceptability of transaction value based on the related party sale was not demonstrated because: (1) comparing the prices for one product imported in 2013 was not enough to show how the company settled prices to unrelated buyers for other product lines, imported since 2006, even if CBP accepted the argument that the majority of the company's sales outside of the United States were to that market and prices between markets were comparable; (2) the Importer/Buyer failed to present evidence that its pricing methodology was typically used in the food additive industry and the APAs in question utilized comparable companies that did not belong to the Importer/Buyer's industry; thus, the Importer/Buyer failed to meet the normal pricing practices and the all costs plus a profit illustrative examples; and, (3) the Importer/Buyer failed to present independent evidence to illustrate that other factors might be relevant in

CBP's examination of transactions in question. Therefore, CBP found that deductive value method was applicable.
H260036 dated Feb. 24, 2015.

rejection of transaction value

In this case, the evidence indicates that the relationship between the parties influenced the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise, and the transaction value of the imported merchandise did not closely approximate a test value. The merchandise cannot be appraised pursuant to transaction value but must instead be appraised based upon the transaction value of identical merchandise.
544713 dated Dec. 2, 1992; aff'd by 545274 dated Mar. 9, 1995.

In an examination of the circumstances of the related party sale, Customs is unable to determine that the relationship did not influence the price actually paid or payable. No evidence has been submitted to indicate that the price is settled in a manner consistent either with the normal pricing practice in the industry or with how the seller sells to unrelated parties. Customs is also unable to determine if the price "closely approximates" that of certain test values. There is no transaction value of identical or similar merchandise and there has not been a previously accepted computed or deductive value of identical or similar merchandise appraised by Customs and which could be used in the instant case. Under the circumstances, transaction value is not an appropriate method of appraisement for the imported merchandise.
544812 dated Mar. 3, 1994; revoked by 545622 dated Apr. 28, 1994 (finding transaction value inapplicable where Customs is unable to determine the price actually paid or payable).

There is no authority for the position that in order for a transfer price between related parties to form the basis of transaction value, the transfer price must include a price element associated with the resale of the merchandise, after importation. Rejecting the use of transaction value on this basis is improper.
545929 dated Jan. 30, 1998.

Insufficient evidence is available to appraise the imported merchandise pursuant to transaction value of identical or similar merchandise set forth in section 402(c) of the TAA, the deductive value set forth in 402(d), or the computed value set forth in 402(e). As such information is available, appraisement should proceed pursuant to the hierarchy established in 402(b). Based on the evidence presented, appraisement should be based on the related party's invoice price to the importer, as a reasonably adjusted transaction value pursuant to 402(f) of the TAA. To appraise the merchandise at the price list is an arbitrary value and, as such, it is precluded from serving as the basis of appraisement under section 402(f) of the TAA.
546953 dated May 5, 1999.

The importer retains a 16.5% commission and remits the balance to its related company. Even if the transactions between the related parties were deemed to be *bona fide* sales,

no evidence has been submitted to indicate that the parties dealt with one another on an arm's length basis. No evidence was submitted to show that the parties dealt with each other as though they were unrelated. Based on the information submitted, the subject merchandise may not be appraised under transaction value based on the related party price between the importer and the related party. Instead, transaction value should be based on the price actually paid or payable between the importer and its U.S. customers.
547790 dated Sep. 10, 2001.

The sales price between the importer and its related company is not an acceptable basis for transaction value, even though the importer has proven the existence of a *bona fide* sale. The importer's submission lacks the objective evidence detailing the normal pricing practice in the industry in question, assuming such a practice even exists for the designer industry. As such, the importer has not established an acceptable related party price merely by establishing that the price was settled in a manner consistent with normal pricing practices in the industry.
548095 dated Sep. 19, 2002.

An agreement between two related parties provides for the importation of components for sale in the United States. The price agreed to is described as "at least the normal manufacturing cost for the imported material and . . . a voluntary royalty to . . . for the use of copyrighted materials." Based upon the agreement between the parties, we cannot conclude that the relationship between the parties will not affect the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, transaction value is not an acceptable means of appraisement.
548291 dated May 28, 2003.

The buyer and seller are related parties. Although the transactions are *bona fide* sales wherein the merchandise is clearly destined for the U.S., there is insufficient information to establish that the price between the parties is not influenced by the relationship. No information regarding the manufacturer's pricing practices in sales to unrelated parties or the normal pricing practices of the industry has been provided. There is also no information regarding the manufacturer's cost and overall profit levels. Also, no information has been submitted to demonstrate whether the related party price closely approximates previously accepted test values.
548239 dated June 5, 2003.

The buyer/importer and the seller are related parties. The buyer/importer submitted a transfer pricing study to CBP, which compares the profitability of the buyer/importer to that of other functionally equivalent companies in an effort to establish that the transfer prices between the seller and the buyer/importer are consistent with the arm's length standards of the IRS Code, section 482. The tested party in the submitted transfer pricing study is the buyer/importer. The transfer pricing methodology is based on the Comparable Profits Method ("CPM") and the comparable companies were chosen based on "functions performed, markets served, and risks borne." The transfer pricing study submitted to CBP has not been reviewed or approved by the IRS. The existence of a transfer pricing study does not, by itself, obviate the need for CBP to examine the circumstances of sale in order to determine whether a related party price is acceptable.

Further, information provided to CBP in a transfer pricing study may be relevant to the application of the circumstances of the sale test, but the weight to be given that information will vary depending on the details set forth in the study. Based on the arguments and information presented, CBP held that the circumstances of the sale information submitted by the importer is insufficient for CBP to conclude that the relationship between the buyer/importer and the seller did not affect the price paid or payable, thus, the use of transaction value was not acceptable.
548482 dated July 23, 2004.

The importer, a party related to the seller, made various lump sum payments to the seller, but was unable to show by invoices or otherwise how the payments were linked to particular quantities of merchandise. Determination of a price actually paid or payable was impossible, so that transaction value could not be used for appraisement.
W563485 dated Sep. 10, 2007.

The Importer sold coloring products similar to the subject merchandise to unrelated parties in the U.S., and submitted invoices for two sales of coloring products to unrelated U.S. buyers to show that its prices charged to the related Buyer were "comparable and consistent" with the Seller's prices in sales to unrelated U.S. buyers. To satisfy the circumstances of sale test, the Seller stated that the price was adequate to ensure the recovery of the Seller's costs plus a reasonable profit to enable the Buyer to recoup its acquisition costs and earn a profit on sales to unrelated U.S. customers. This information did not demonstrate the acceptability of the related party transaction under the all costs plus a profit analysis as the Seller only provided information on the sale of three types of coloring product for two sales to unrelated parties in the U.S. and did not show the Seller's overall profit. Because the sales to the unrelated U.S. buyers occurred more than one year before the subject transaction, the Seller's profit in the unrelated sales was not earned during a time period that was representative of the period of the subject transaction. The sales to the unrelated buyers involved sales of coloring products of different colors than those sold to the related party, and the difference in price is significant for the related and unrelated party sales. Therefore, the products may not be appraised under the transaction value method and must be appraised in accordance with the remaining methods of valuation value.
H017761 dated Sep. 27, 2007.

The sales of automobiles from a foreign manufacturing subsidiary of a U.S. auto company to a U.S. importing distributing company were examined. The U.S. importer requested refunds through the U.S. reconciliation program related to post entry transfer pricing adjustments. The CBP port officials objected to the importer's use of transaction value, and CBP Headquarters determined that the importer failed to demonstrate that it met the circumstances of sale ("COS") test. The importer was not correct in its assertion that transaction value must apply if CBP considers the intercompany pricing program to be a formula, absent satisfaction of the COS test or test values tests. Additionally, the importer failed to show that the pricing in the automobile industry which is essentially "market driven," meaning the consumer determines the actual price they will pay for a vehicle, presents evidence that the prices were settled in accordance with the industry's normal

pricing practices. While CBP acknowledged that the primary activity was in accord with the importer's transfer pricing policy, CBP criticized the importer for not developing and submitting appropriate supporting documentation "If the importer believes that information in the transfer pricing study and/or in some other supporting documentation is relevant to the application of the COS test, the importer should identify that information, explain why it is relevant, and submit the relevant documentation to CBP."
W563467 dated June 22, 2009.

The foreign manufacturer and importer are related. Counsel claimed that the transfer price was based on a pre-arranged formula that was reported to the IRS
but failed to submit a transfer pricing study or any information on how the downward adjustments were calculated. Counsel did not show that the circumstances of the sale test were met. The protest was properly denied.
H008706 dated Jan. 12, 2010.

Where a Canadian seller handles all of the warehousing, purchaser processing, invoicing (including preparation of invoices to U.S. customers), distribution of merchandise, maintaining and supporting the telecommunication infrastructure, and performing virtually all of the administrative services for its related U.S. company, it exercises too much control over its U.S. related company to establish that there was a *bona fide* sale for exportation between these parties. Merely keeping separate bank accounts is not sufficient to show that the related parties are acting at arms length, when the accounts are maintained by the parent company's employees and are under its control. Therefore, the transaction between the related parties may not be used as the basis of appraisement.
H026063 dated Aug. 17, 2010.

The company argued that detailed, narrowly-tailored transfer pricing studies demonstrating that both the related party foreign manufacturers and the company/U.S. importer each earned an arm's length return on their respective activities, and detailed financial data demonstrating that each foreign manufacturer covered its costs and made an appropriate profit on the products exported to the U.S., indicated that the prices were not influenced by the relationship of the parties. CBP rejected the company's transfer pricing studies and determined that transaction value was not the appropriate method of appraisement. Additionally, CBP rejected the use of the same transfer pricing studies by the company in order to claim post-importation adjustments to the price actually paid or payable under the computed value method of appraisement. CBP determined that the company failed to establish that the producers' profit and expenses were inconsistent with those usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind as the imported merchandise. Thus, the company did not demonstrate that the value adjustments were warranted because the company's profit was inconsistent with profits usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind as the imported merchandise. However, CBP found that the company may appraise its merchandise under the computed value method of appraisement on the basis of the producers' amount for profit and general expenses.
H065015 dated Apr. 14, 2011.

The transfer value between a parent company (the importer) and its subsidiary was questioned with respect to three types of products: data products, chemistry products, and mass spectrometers. Whereas the importer's transfer pricing was found to be sufficient with respect to the mass spectrometers, it was not acceptable with respect to the data and chemistry products. Based on the information submitted by the importer, the profit of the chemistry and data products was not found to be equal to that of the parent company, so the importer did not meet the all cost plus profit method of examining transfer pricing. Furthermore, the importer did not submit evidence to show that its prices were settled in a manner consistent with industry practice, and the profits of the chemistry and data products were not comparable to the profits of direct competitors. As a result, the transaction value of the subject data and chemistry products was found to be unacceptable.
H065024 dated July 28, 2011.

The importer is a wholly owned subsidiary of a foreign corporation. The foreign parent designs and manufactures equipment used in tobacco processing and in filter and cigarette manufacturing, and sells machinery and spare parts to subsidiaries, third party customers (factories), and third party distributors worldwide. The importer rebuilds and services cigarette-producing equipment and imports spare parts into the U.S. for distribution to unrelated customers. The importer buys spare parts for its own account at prices set according to the parent's intercompany price guideline, imports parts to stock its own inventory, and fulfills customer orders out of its own U.S. stock. The parent grants the importer a discount on the list price for spare parts which is higher than the average discount given to unrelated multinational cigarette companies. Discounts are reviewed and adjusted yearly so that the importer achieves a profit margin that is on par with the companies identified in a transfer pricing study. This consideration is not extended to distributors that are not related to the parent. Transaction value was not found to be the appropriate method of appraisement of sales between the related parties because the circumstances of the sale test were not satisfied. The transfer pricing study submitted by the importer did not provide CBP with the information necessary to conclude that the relationship between the related buyer and seller did not influence the price. Likewise, the intercompany price guideline was not persuasive evidence that the intercompany price was consistent with pricing between unrelated entities because it did not address how the industry set its prices.
H138203 dated Oct. 11, 2011.

The importer was a reseller of computer server systems and components. One of the importer's key suppliers was an overseas company. The President and CEO of the importing company, and his wife, who was Vice President of Operations and Treasurer for the importer, together owned between 10.5 and 30.7% of the supplier's voting stock over time, including during the audit period. The importer used transaction value as its basis of appraisement for all its imported merchandise, including goods bought from related parties. However, Regulatory Audit found that the importer had not adequately demonstrated that its relationship with the supplier had no influence on the price of their transactions. The importer disputed that it was related to the supplier. The facts indicated

that the importer and the supplier were controlled by or under the common control of the President and CEO of the importing company and his wife. In addition, the terms of the contracts between the parties allowed the importer to influence the prices it was charged by the supplier, which was not free to set its own prices. Consequently, transaction value was not the appropriate method of appraisement for sales between the importer and its related supplier.
H169975 dated Jan. 20, 2012.

H008101 dated Oct. 9, 2012 – See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.

CBP rejected the first sale claim because it determined that although the manufacturer and middleman were stated to be unrelated parties, sufficient information existed to question the relationship of the parties and reject the claim that the transactions should be treated as arm's length. Financial information was submitted to argue that the parties transactions should be acceptable under transaction value based upon the all costs plus a profit test. CBP found inconsistencies in the financial figures which led to questions as to the selling, general and administrative costs of the companies involved and whether they were beyond the norm for companies engaged in similar activities. CBP was not convinced that the submitted financial information provided adequate support that the middleman and manufacturer operated at arm's length. Based on the totality of the circumstances, CBP rejected the use of "first sale" transaction value.
H240423 dated July 31, 2013; H240424 dated July 31, 2014.

H144042 dated Oct. 30, 2013 – See Value if Other Values Cannot be Determined, sequential order.

H236744 dated Dec. 12, 2013 – See Price Actually Paid or Payable, discounts.

The transfer pricing study submitted by counsel, on behalf of the buyer/importer, did not by itself provide CBP with the information necessary to conclude that the relationship between the buyer/importer and the seller did not influence the price charged for the imported merchandise. Furthermore, because there was no indication that the transfer pricing study submitted to CBP by the company has been reviewed by the IRS, CBP is unaware whether the assumptions on which the study is based and the conclusions derived would be acceptable to the IRS. As such, the information presented does not support acceptability of using transaction value to appraise the imported merchandise. Accordingly, an alternative basis of appraisement must be used. The imported merchandise should be appraised using deductive value under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d), provided the technical requirements for appraising the merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d) are met.
H243689 dated Jan. 9, 2014.

The Importer/Buyer purchased and imported certain products from its wholly-owned foreign subsidiaries. The company's counsel argues that (1) the test value method permitted the importer to show that the transaction value under examination was valid

because it closely approximated either the deductive or computed values of similar or identical merchandise and that deductive and computed test values intended to be contemporaneous to show that the relationship did not influence the price, and (2) in applying the all costs plus a profit example, the term "firm's overall profit" means the profit of the selling entity. CBP reaffirmed its position that in determining whether a test value closely approximates an instant transaction value, the test values have to reflect a value previously accepted as a customs value. Additionally, CBP determined that, for purposes of applying the all costs plus a profit analysis, it was necessary to compare the seller's profit to the parent company's overall profit in the sale of the merchandise of the same class or kind. Since it was impossible to break down the company's profit margins by sales of merchandise of the same class or kind, CBP found that transaction value method was not the appropriate method of appraisement between the related parties. The computed value method of appraisement had to be used, provided the Importer/Buyer could produce the necessary/sufficient records and information (if not already provided) to substantiate its prices under the computed value.
H206715 dated Jan. 29, 2015.

H256333 dated Mar. 3, 2015 – <u>See</u> Discounts, price actually paid or payable.

sales to unrelated buyers

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B); 19 CFR 152.103(j) (2); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 1, paragraph 2(b) and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, paragraph 2(b)

If a related buyer in the United States is purchasing merchandise from a foreign seller for approximately the same price that the merchandise is sold to unrelated buyers, this requires a finding that the transaction value is acceptable.
543257 dated Sep. 26, 1984.

The evidence indicates that the relationship between the buyer and seller did in fact influence the price for the merchandise. The price for the merchandise sold by the parent corporation to its subsidiary is 14% lower that the price actually paid or payable by unrelated purchasers. No information regarding any test value is available.
543615 dated Dec. 4, 1985.

In this case, the price is not influenced by the relationship of the parties if, in fact, the price of the imported merchandise closely approximates that paid by sales to unrelated distributors in the United States.
544049 dated Jan. 19, 1988.

Evidence is available to indicate that the manufacturer/seller sells to unrelated purchasers in the United States at the same price at which the manufacturer sells to its related party buyer. It appears from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the sale between the related parties that the relationship does not influence the price and that transaction value is a valid means of appraisement.
543984 dated Feb. 22, 1988.

The related parties in this case have not met their burden of establishing that the price has not been influenced by the relationship between them. The seller admits that it incorporates a 25% profit margin into the price for sales to non-related parties, but excludes the profit margin when it sells to the importer. The parties failed to submit any evidence to indicate that the related party price is consistent with industry practice or that the alleged transaction value closely approximates a test value.
544239 dated Nov. 18, 1988.

A U.S. subsidiary purchases merchandise for its own account from the related party foreign seller. In addition, the U.S. subsidiary acts as an agent in transactions between the foreign seller and unrelated U.S. customers. In comparing the prices in the related and unrelated transactions, the only difference in the price for the two types of sales is the commissions paid to the U.S. subsidiary in the sales between the foreign seller and the unrelated U.S. purchasers. This supports the contention that the relationship does not affect the price actually paid or payable, and transaction value is the appropriate basis of appraisement between the related parties.
545087 dated Dec. 7, 1993.

test values

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B)(i) and (ii); 19 CFR 152.103(j)(2)(i) and (ii); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 1, paragraph 2(b) and (c) and Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, paragraph 2

542310 dated May 22, 1981 - <u>See</u> Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

The transfer price of merchandise purchased from a related party is acceptable as a transaction value where it closely approximates a test value, i.e., the computed value of identical or similar merchandise produced by the same manufacturer.
542580 dated Nov. 4, 1981 (TAA No. 41).

Once a particular importation is appraised on the basis of computed value, that value may then be used as a test value for purposes of determining whether a transaction value exists with respect to merchandise, assuming that the subsequent shipments are exported to the United States "at or about the same time" as the test value shipment.
542580 dated Nov. 4, 1981 (TAA No. 41); 543568 dated May 30, 1986.

Home market prices are specifically excluded as a means of comparison in determining whether the test values referred to in section 402(b)(2)(B) closely approximate the transfer price between the related parties.
542868 dated July 29, 1982.

542792 dated Mar. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 61); <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 543144 dated Nov. 17, 1983 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

For an importer-parent that declares that it sets the prices, transaction value requires a determination that the relationship between the buyer and seller has not influenced the price or that a test value has been met.
543144 dated Nov. 17, 1983; aff'g 542792 dated Mar. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 61).

In considering the nature of the merchandise and industry in question, a difference of even four percent between a transfer price in a related party situation and a computed value which serves as a test value is not a close approximation and, consequently, does not meet the statutory test value. Accordingly, the transfer prices cannot represent transaction value.
543546 dated June 7, 1985.

Test values refer to values that are determined pursuant to actual appraisements of imported merchandise. Thus, a computed value calculation may not serve as a test value unless that calculation represents an actual appraisement of imported merchandise determined pursuant to the definition of computed value set forth in section 402(e).
543568 dated May 30, 1986.

For test value purposes, sales to a related party do not suffice to determine whether the transaction value of the merchandise to be imported closely approximates the value for identical or similar merchandise sold to the related party.
543941 dated Aug. 27, 1987.

Although a related party transaction price will be considered acceptable by a showing that those prices closely approximate certain test values, evidence of comparable sales of similar merchandise to customers outside of the U.S. does not qualify as a test value.
543957 dated Nov. 5, 1987.

The test value method can be used for comparison purposes only if the values relate to merchandise exported to the United States at or about the same time as the imported merchandise. In this particular case, no transaction, deductive, or computed values are available as test values.
544409 dated Nov. 20, 1989.

An examination of the circumstances of sale between the related parties does not validate the use of transaction value. However, in comparing transfer prices of the imported garments to previously accepted computed values, the transfer prices closely approximate the computed value of identical merchandise. Accordingly, transaction value is an acceptable basis on which to appraise the merchandise.
544662 dated Mar. 18, 1994; modified by 545909 dated Nov. 30, 1995.

The term "test values" refers to values determined pursuant to actual appraisements of imported merchandise. There are no previously accepted deductive or computed value appraisements of the merchandise in question. Therefore, the test value method may not

be used to demonstrate the acceptability of the related party transfer price.
545369 dated July 25, 1994; 544686 dated Aug. 31, 1994.

Transaction value is eliminated as a method of appraisement. Based upon the evidence submitted, we cannot find either that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price actually paid or payable, or that the transaction value represented by the price paid by the related party buyer closely approximates the value of the identical merchandise sold to unrelated buyers, such that transaction value is an appropriate method of appraisement.
545274 dated Mar. 9, 1995; aff'g 544713 dated Dec. 2, 1992.

In determining whether a test value closely approximates the transaction value in this case, the test value must reflect a value previously accepted as a customs value. Customs has no authority to utilize values for the same entries of merchandise, based on different valuation methods, as evidence as to whether a test value closely approximates the instant transaction value.
544455 dated Mar. 14, 1995; 545506 dated Nov. 30, 1995.

The term "test values" refers to values previously determined pursuant to actual appraisements of imported merchandise. The evidence submitted reveals that during the same time period when the imported merchandise was being imported, the seller sold identical merchandise to an unrelated third party. The invoiced prices between the seller and the third party were used as the transaction value of the imported merchandise and appear to closely approximate the prices for identical merchandise sold from the seller to its related party buyer. Based on the information presented, Customs is satisfied that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price of the merchandise. Accordingly, the merchandise should be appraised pursuant to transaction value, based upon the price between the related parties.
546319 dated Apr. 18, 1997; modifies 545272 dated Aug. 17, 1995 (additional evidence submitted by importer regarding test values).

548024 dated Mar. 5, 2002 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

547982 dated May 20, 2002 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.
.
The use of transaction value in this related party transaction is not acceptable. No evidence has been submitted concerning "test values" pursuant to 19 CFR § 152.103(j)(2)(i)(A). The documentation provided fails to provide CBP with a basis upon which to conclude that the relationship between the parties did not influence the price.
548503 dated June 3, 2004.

transfer prices

Assuming that a related party transaction may otherwise be eligible for treatment under

transaction value, transfer prices based on standard costs, without subsequent adjustment, represent the transaction value of the merchandise.
542315 dated May 13, 1981(TAA No. 25); 542675 dated July 20, 1982; 543212 dated May 7, 1984.

The transfer price between related parties closely approximates the computed value of the identical merchandise; therefore, a transaction value may be found for the merchandise sold at the transfer price. It is necessary to appraise an initial importation on the basis of computed value in order to establish the test value to be used to support transaction value.
542580 dated Nov. 4, 1981 (TAA No. 41).

Transfer prices between related parties which are based upon estimated costs, to be reconciled with actual costs on a periodic basis, are applicable and proper in appraising merchandise pursuant to transaction value. Evidence indicates that the estimated transfer prices are not influenced by the relationship between the parties.
543079 dated Sep. 20, 1983.

Excess costs (the difference between actual and standard costs, as established in an excess cost account, from the start of production) are amortized over current and future production and reflected in the selling price (transfer price) between the related parties in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The selling price is periodically adjusted, through increases or decreases. This method meets the requirements of the transaction value methodology, and accounts for start-up costs in an acceptable manner.
543153 dated May 1, 1984.

A determination that the related party transactions constitute *bona fide* sales does not mean or imply that the transaction values between the parent and subsidiary are "acceptable" within the meaning of section 402(b)(2)(B) of the TAA. This is an independent determination that must be made with respect to the importations.
543511 dated May 29, 1986.

543708 dated Apr. 21, 1988 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

The transfer price is not accepted as a valid transaction value between the related parties. Because the parties refuse to supply information that would permit appraisement on other bases of valuation, resort to a section 402(f) appraisement must be made in this case.
543850 dated June 20, 1988.

The importer is a subsidiary of the seller and, therefore, the parties are related within the meaning of section 402(g) of the TAA. No evidence has been presented to substantiate that (1) the importer's price is settled in a manner consistent with industry pricing practices; (2) that the price is adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit equal to the firm's overall profit realized in a representative period of time in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind; or (3) that the price closely approximates a test

value. Accordingly, the evidence is insufficient to support the use of transaction value.
545753 dated Mar. 8, 1996.

The producer and the importer are related parties. The importer's position that the transfer price ensures that the producer recovers its costs plus a reasonable profit does not satisfy the costs plus profit factor as articulated in the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA). The SAA merely provides that the price will not be considered to have been influenced if it is shown that the price is adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit that is "equivalent to the firm's overall profit realized over a representative period of time in sales of merchandise of the same class or kind." In addition, although a transfer price established in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles might provide a legitimate transaction value, it must be established that the relationship did not influence the price. Based on the evidence submitted, it has not been demonstrated that the price paid by the related party buyer is acceptable for establishing transaction value.
546166 dated Apr. 5, 1996.

To produce new and/or improved products the importer conducts worldwide basic research and specific development. The research and development work is undertaken overseas and in the United States by corporate technical centers established specifically for that purpose and by various corporate affiliates assigned responsibility for discrete, product-focused development. The importer is capable of segregating the research and development expenses attributed to each affiliate. Thus, the price between the parties represents an acceptable transaction value only where it includes all of the costs attributed to the selling affiliate. Where the price between related parties excludes those costs and an appropriate adjustment is not made to the declared value, we conclude that the relationship between the parties influences the price such that the use of transaction value is unacceptable.
546471 dated Sep. 28, 2001.

The auditors and the port reviewed voluminous amounts of material and both agreed that the related party price was acceptable for determining the transaction value. Counsel for the importer also agreed that transaction vale was appropriate. Accordingly, Customs determined that the transaction value was acceptable for the subject entries. Counsel for the importer then claimed that the related party price was unacceptable for determining transaction value. Customs is not required to question the accountability of the related party price and there is no compelling reason to question the related party price for the purposes of determining the transaction value of the subject merchandise.
548065 dated Sep. 6, 2002; <u>aff'g</u> 547108 dated Mar. 28, 2000.

548386 dated Nov. 26, 2003 - <u>See</u> Reconciliation.

General statements such as claiming that if the sellers cannot or will not offer the goods at a price and quantity sufficient for the buyer's requirements, the buyer is permitted to buy the goods from an unrelated third party, is not proof that the parties deal with each other as though they are not related. Other statements such as about the intent of the

parties to set the prices to reflect market conditions for the goods and that then-current market conditions shall be taken into account, also does not satisfy the circumstances of the sale test. Therefore, transaction value is not an acceptable basis of appraisement. **H053359 dated Jun. 24, 2009.**

Importer submitted its transfer pricing study using the Comparable Profits Method ("CPM"). Gross margin was used as a profit level indicator between tested company and comparable companies. CBP first found a *bona fide* sale took place. CBP also stated that even though the information submitted by the importer to substantiate the circumstances of the sale analysis did not strictly fall under the three illustrative examples, referenced in 19 CFR §152.103(l)((1)(i)-(iii), the price was not influenced based on totality of facts, including industry analysis and the way the price was arrived at. Finally, CBP determined that the importer may take into account downward and upward post-importation adjustments to the provisional values of the imported merchandise declared to CBP, provided that the importer maintains and provides upon request accounting details from its books and/or financial statements to support the claimed adjustments. **H219515 dated Oct. 11, 2012.**

H218916 dated Apr. 29, 2014 – <u>See</u> Consignments, transaction value inapplicable.

REPAIRS

INTRODUCTION

See chapter on DEFECTIVE GOODS, supra.

Headquarters Rulings:

price renegotiations

See chapters on DEFECTIVE GOODS and REBATES SUBSEQUENT TO IMPORTATION, supra.

repairs in the United States

543123 dated Dec. 20, 1983 - See Deductive Value, superdeductive value.

543288 dated Nov. 26, 1984 - See Defective Merchandise, defective parts returned to the U.S.

The importer purchased and imported parts that were manufactured abroad. The parts were then exported out of the United States to a foreign subsidiary. Subsequently, some of the parts would break, thereby necessitating their return to the United States. When the merchandise is returned to the United States for repair, adjustments to the original purchase price in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles are made in order to properly appraise the merchandise.
543637 dated Dec. 2, 1985.

544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989 - See Assists, assist definition.

A related party in the United States imports merchandise from Canada to be repaired at the importer's U.S. repair facility. There is no sale between the parties nor are there any sales of identical or similar merchandise available on which to base a transaction value. The importer does not resell the merchandise in the United States, thereby eliminating deductive value as a means of appraisement. There is insufficient information available to appraise the merchandise pursuant to computed value. The merchandise is properly appraised pursuant to section 402(f) according to 70% of the standard cost of new equipment. This is the inventory value of the goods in the Canadian company's accounting records.
544377 dated Sep. 1, 1989.

547042 dated June 17, 1999 - See Defective Merchandise, allowance in price.

Components imported into the United States for repair or replacement cannot be appraised pursuant to transaction value. There is no sale for exportation to the United States upon which to base a transaction value. The importer has provided information

regarding the cost for the repair parts and depreciation for replacement parts. The method employed by the importer based on cost for repair parts and depreciation for replacement parts is an acceptable method of appraisement based upon 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), Value if Other Values Cannot be Determined.
548211 dated July 2, 2003.

Defective power supplies are returned to the United States for repair or recalibration. For purposes of appraising the defective parts, none of the four
bases of appraisement set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)-(e) could be satisfactorily established. The method of appraisement employed by the importer based on the standard cost of new power supplies adjusted to exclude the cost of repairs or recalibration is a permissible basis of valuation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)(1).
548688 dated Oct. 20, 2005.

To facilitate the repairs of its products sold to customers around the world, Seagate maintains collection points in various countries. After obtaining a return merchandise authorization from Seagate, customers are instructed to send products needing repair to the nearest collection point. The collection point consolidates the returned products and ships them to the nearest distribution center. The distribution center ships the defective products to be tested and repaired to an appropriate repair facility based on the family of the product to be repaired, what region the defective product is from, and what level of repair is required. The repair facilities are not related to Seagate, and are located in Reynosa, Mexico, and Penang Malaysia. The distribution centers also maintain buffer stock of refurbished or repaired products to support customer exchanges. All defective drives that are to be repaired in Reynosa are first imported into the U.S. and sent to the repair provider's for processing before being sent on to Mexico. Once repaired, the repair facilities send the products to the appropriate distribution center within their respective region. Some of the repaired products are returned to customers in the U.S. The defective drives returned to the U.S. for repair may be appraised under the fallback valuation method, in accordance with the methodology proposed by the importer. The imported refurbished disc drives should be appraised using the deductive value method if, after review of all available information, it is apparent that they qualify under this method. If they do not so qualify, they should be appraised under the fallback method, using a modified deductive value, or, alternatively, the method proposed by the importer.
W563557 dated Dec. 26, 2006.

The importer's proposal to appraise used products imported to be repaired based on the original equipment manufacturer price reduced by 43% was not acceptable because the importer did not show that the reduction was based on the actual cost of repairs for the specific products in question.
H007484 dated Apr. 19, 2007.

warranty provisions

542699 dated Mar. 10, 1982 - <u>See</u> Defective Merchandise, warranty provisions.

An article imported under warranty and subsequently found to be defective by the importer is exported for repairs and later re-imported. The duty is assessed upon the value of the repairs or alterations. It is irrelevant that the article is under warranty or that the repairs have been performed at no cost to the importer.
543142 dated May 7, 1984; 543180 dated July 17, 1984.

544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989 - See Assists, assist definition.

544394 dated Oct. 9, 1990; 544368 dated Oct. 9, 1990; 544370 dated Oct. 9, 1990; 544574 dated Nov. 14, 1990 - See Defective Merchandise, warranty provisions.

value of repairs for merchandise damaged in-transit

542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39); modified by 543737 dated July 21, 1986 - See Defective Merchandise, in-transit damage to imported goods.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A) provides for the following:

The transaction value of imported merchandise determined under paragraph (1) shall be the appraised value of that merchandise for the purposes of this Act only if-
(i) there are no restrictions on the disposition or use of the imported merchandise by the buyer other than restrictions that- (I) are imposed or required by law, (II) limit the geographical area in which the merchandise may be resold, or (III) do not substantially affect the value of the merchandise;
(ii) the sale of, or the price actually paid or payable for, the imported merchandise is not subject to a condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined with respect to the imported merchandise;
(iii) no part of the proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise by the buyer will accrue directly or indirectly to the seller, unless an appropriate adjustment therefor can be made under paragraph (1)(E) [addition to price actually paid or payable for proceeds];
(iv) the buyer and seller are not related, or the buyer and seller are related but the transaction value is acceptable, for purposes of this subsection, under subparagraph (B).

(NOTE: With respect to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A)(ii), (iii) and (iv), <u>see</u> chapters on CONDITIONS OR CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH A VALUE CANNOT BE DETERMINED, PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE, and RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS, <u>supra</u>.)

The corresponding Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.103(j)(1), i.e., “Limitations on use of transaction value.”

In addition, 19 CFR 152.103(k), along with an interpretative note, states:

<u>Restrictions and conditions on sale.</u> (1) A restriction placed on the buyer of imported merchandise that does not affect substantially its value will not prevent transaction value from being accepted as the appraised value.
(i) <u>Interpretative note.</u> A seller requires a buyer of automobiles not to sell or exhibit them before a fixed date that represents the beginning of a model year.

<u>GATT Valuation Agreement:</u>

Article 1, paragraph 1(a) through (d) parallels 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A)(i) through (iv).

The language in the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Paragraph 1(a)(iii), is similar to the interpretative note cited in 19 CFR 152.103(k).

In addition, CCC Technical Committee Commentary 12.1 discusses the meaning of the

term "restrictions" in Article 1 of the Agreement. In relevant part, that commentary states:

[A] number of factors may have to be taken into consideration to determine whether the restriction has substantially affected the value or not. These factors include the nature of the restriction, the nature of the imported goods, the nature of the industry and its commercial practices, and whether the effect on the value is commercially significant. Since these factors may vary from case to case, it would not be proper to apply a fixed criterion in this respect. For example, a small effect on the value of a case involving one type of goods may be treated as substantial while a much greater change in the value of goods of another type may not be treated as substantial.
An example [of] restrictions as to the disposition or use of the goods which do not substantially affect the value of the goods is mentioned in the Interpretative Notes to Article 1, i.e., where a seller requires a buyer of automobiles not to sell or exhibit them prior to a fixed date which represents the beginning of a model year. Another such example would be where a manufacturing firm of cosmetics imposes through contractual provisions a requirement on all importers that its product be sold to consumers exclusively through individual sales representatives undertaking house-to-house sales since its whole distribution system and advertising approach is based on this kind of sales effort.
On the other hand, a restriction which could have a substantial effect on the value of the imported goods is one that is not usual in the trade concerned. An example of such a restriction would be the case where a machine is sold at a nominal price on condition that the buyer uses it only for charitable purposes.

CCC Technical Committee Case Study 3.1 provides several examples on the use of restrictions and conditions in Article 1.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

INTRODUCTION

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 11 provides for the following:

1. The legislation of each Party shall provide in regard to a determination of customs value for the right of appeal, without penalty, by the importer or any other person liable for the payment of the duty.

2. An initial right of appeal without penalty may be to an authority within the customs administration or to an independent body, but the legislation of each Party shall provide for the right of appeal without penalty to a judicial authority.

3. Notice of the decision on appeal shall be given to the appellant and the reasons for such decision shall be provided in writing. He shall also be informed of his rights of any further appeal.

The Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 11, states:

1. Article 11 provides the importer with the right to appeal against a valuation determination made by the customs administration for the goods being valued. Appeal may first be to a higher level in the customs administration, but the importer shall have the right in the final instance to appeal to the judiciary.

2. "Without penalty" means that the importer shall not be subject to a fine or threat of fine merely because he chose to exercise his right of appeal. Payment of normal court costs and lawyers' fees shall not be considered a fine.

3. However, nothing in Article 11 shall prevent a Party from requiring full payment of assessed customs duties prior to an appeal.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 17.1 defines the scope and implication of Article 11 and states:

1. Does the phrase "without penalty", which is used in respect of the appeal provisions contained in Article 11, prohibit Customs from requiring the full payment, prior to the appeal, of any penalties imposed as a result of valuation fraud and other forms of contravention of valuation law?

2. The question arises because paragraph 3 of the Interpretative Note to Article 11 refers to full payment, prior to the appeal, of assessed Customs duties but does not address cases involving fines and penalties.
3. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation concluded that paragraph 2 of the Interpretative Note to Article 11 is explicit in its definition of the words "without penalty"

which "means that the importer shall not be subject to a fine or threat of fine merely because he chose to exercise his right of appeal".

4. Furthermore, the importer's right of appeal under this Article is in respect of decisions taken by the customs administration with regard to the determination of Customs value within the provisions of the Agreement.

5. It follows that cases of fraud fall outside the scope of this Article; in such cases, appeal procedures would be governed by national legislation which could provide for prior payment of penalties as well as of the duty.

ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND LICENSE FEES

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1) provides for the following:

The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to - … "any royalty or license fee related to the imported merchandise that the buyer is required to pay, directly or indirectly, as a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise for exportation to the United States ...."

The price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise shall be increased by the amounts attributable to the items (and no others) described in paragraphs (A) through (E) [royalty or license fee - paragraph (D)] only to the extent that each such amount (i) is not otherwise included within the price actually paid or payable; and (ii) is based on sufficient information. If sufficient information is not available, for any reason, with respect to any amount referred to in the preceding sentence, the transaction value of the imported merchandise shall be treated, for purposes of this section, as one that cannot be determined. (emphasis added)

The corresponding Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1) and (2). In addition, 19 CFR 152.103(f) states:

Royalties or license fees. Royalties or license fees for patents covering processes to manufacture the imported merchandise generally will be dutiable. Royalties or license fees paid to third parties for use, in the United States, of copyrights and trademarks related to the imported merchandise generally will be considered selling expenses of the buyer and not dutiable. The dutiable status of royalties or license fees paid by the buyer will be determined in each case and will depend on (1) whether the buyer was required to pay them as a condition of sale of the merchandise for exportation to the United States, and (2) to whom and under what circumstances they were paid. Payments made by the buyer to a third party for the right to distribute or resell the imported merchandise will not be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise if the payments are not a condition of the sale of the merchandise for exportation to the United States.
Example. A foreign producer sold merchandise to an unrelated U.S. importer. The U.S. importer pays a royalty to an unrelated third party for the right to manufacture and sell a product made in part from the imported merchandise. The royalty is based on the selling price of the further-manufactured product in the U.S.

Is the license fee part of the appraised value? No. The license fee is not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise for export to the U.S.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

The equivalent provision in the Agreement regarding the addition to the price actually paid or payable for royalty and license fees is found in Article 8, paragraph l(c).

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 1(c), states:

1. The royalties and license fees referred to in Article 8.1(c) may include, among other things, payments in respect to patents, trademarks and copyrights. However, the charges for the right to reproduce the imported goods in the country of importation shall not be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods in determining customs value.
2. Payments made by the buyer for the right to distribute or resell the imported goods shall not be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods if such payments are not a condition of the sale for export to the country of importation of the imported goods.

Article 8, paragraph 3, allows for the addition to the price actually paid or payable only on the basis of objective and quantifiable data.

As an illustration, the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 8, paragraph 3, provides:

Where objective and quantifiable data do not exist with regard to the additions required to be made under the provisions of Article 8, the transaction value cannot be determined under the provisions of Article 1. As an illustration of this, a royalty is paid on the basis of the price in a sale in the importing country of a litre of a particular product that was imported by the kilogram and made up into a solution after importation. If the royalty is based partially on the imported goods and partially on other factors which have nothing to do with the imported goods (such as when the imported goods are mixed with domestic ingredients and are no longer separately identifiable, or when the royalty cannot be distinguished from special financial arrangements between the buyer and seller), it would be inappropriate to attempt to made an addition for the royalty. However, if the amount of this royalty is based only on the imported goods and can be readily quantified, an addition to the price actually paid or payable can be made.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinions 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 are all examples of whether a royalty or license fee is to be added to the price actually paid or payable.

Headquarters Notices:

General Notice, Dutiability of Royalty Payments, Vol. 27, No. 6, Cust. B. & Dec., February 10, 1993:

Regarding the dutiability of royalty payments, three factors are relevant in assisting in the determination of whether payments are related to the imported merchandise and are a

condition of sale. These factors are: 1) whether the imported merchandise was manufactured under patent; 2) whether the royalty was involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise and; 3) whether the importer could buy the product without paying the fee.

Negative responses to factors one and two and an affirmative response to factors three point to non-dutiability.

Notice to Require Submission of Royalty and Purchase/Supply Agreements in Ruling Requests Regarding Dutiability of Royalty or License Fees, Vol. 29, No. 36 Cust. B. & Dec., Sep. 6, 1995:

In order to obtain a ruling regarding the dutiability of royalty or license fees, any royalty agreement[s] relating to the payment of the royalty or license fees in question and any purchase/supply agreement[s] relating to the sale of the imported merchandise must be furnished. If there are no written agreements, the ruling request should so indicate.

Headquarters Rulings:

direct costs of processing

A royalty fee paid in exchange for engineering and design information constitutes a cost that will be directly incurred in the production of the merchandise under consideration. Therefore, inasmuch as the price will encompass all production costs, including the royalty payment, the royalty payment is deemed to be part of the direct costs of processing operations.
543155 dated Dec. 13, 1983.

price actually paid or payable

There is a rebuttable presumption that all payments made by a buyer to a seller, or a party related to a seller, are part of the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, with regard to payments made by the importer to the related party seller for merchandise purchased from the related party seller, the presumption is that the payments are part of the total payment made for the imported merchandise. The information submitted does not rebut the presumption that the royalty payments are part of the total payment made for the imported merchandise.
545536 dated Sep. 21, 1995.

All payments made by a buyer to a seller are presumed to be part of the price actually paid or payable unless rebutted by evidence which clearly establishes that the payments are completely unrelated to the imported merchandise. This presumption also applies to payments made to a party related to the seller. In this case, the importer pays royalties to the sub-licensor, which is related to the foreign affiliate/sellers of the imported merchandise. The sublicensing agreement specifically addresses payment to the sub-licensor for merchandise purchased from the foreign licensed affiliate/sellers. The

royalties paid represent part of the total payment made to, or for the benefit of, the foreign affiliate/sellers.
545526 dated Nov. 30, 1995.

There is a rebuttable presumption that royalty payments made directly to the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. In this case, the royalty payments made for the know-how and U.S. trademark patent rights, necessary for the company to get FDA approval for the product, enable the company to import the product pursuant to the supply agreement. These payments are directly related to the imported product and are part of the total payment made, or to be made, by the buyer to the seller for the importation of the merchandise.
546038 dated July 19, 1996.

License fees paid by the buyer to the licensor for use of a trademark on the imported merchandise purchased from the seller (a party related to the licensor) are additions to the price actually paid or payable for the imported licensed product (as royalties under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA). The seller and licensor were deemed to be related pursuant to section 402(g)(1)(G) which states that "[t]wo or more persons directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by or under common control with any person" are considered to be related parties.
544815 dated May 8, 1997.

Pursuant to an agreement between the importer and the unrelated seller, the importer paid the seller advance royalties and the seller agreed that the importer would purchase the necessary drug to be shipped to the seller for use in the manufacture of the time release product. The payments made to the seller constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and counsel has not demonstrated that the subject payments are unrelated to the imported merchandise. Therefore, based on the evidence and information provided, the advance payments made by the importer against future royalties, in consideration for the seller's provision of contracted plant capacity, are included within the transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable.
546638 dated Oct. 4, 1999.

Pursuant to license and technical agreements, the licensee pays the licensor/seller a running royalty based on the percentage of the net selling price for each licensed product sold by the licensee. The agreements define net selling price as the price of the licensed products manufactured by the licensee and sold to it customers, excluding actual freight, transportation charges, insurance fees, agent's or distributor's commissions, and other similar charges paid by the licensee in dispatching the licensed products. Also, the payment of the royalties is not related to the sale for exportation of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the amounts do not constitute part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. In addition, the imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. The royalty is not involved in the production or sale of the licensed products. Finally, the importer may purchase the imported product without paying the fee. Based on the evidence and information provided, and assuming that the price between the related parties represents an acceptable transaction value pursuant to

section 402(b)(2)(B), the royalties concerning the licensed products, paid to the licensors/sellers, are not included within the transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable, or as royalties and/or proceeds.
546951 dated Oct. 22, 1999.

Fees paid in accordance with the licensing agreement are part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise in that they are part of the total payment for the merchandise paid by the buyer to the seller. Thus, the license fees paid by licensee to licensor are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise under section 402(b) of the TAA.
546966 dated Nov. 5, 1999.

546367 dated Dec. 1, 1999 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

Pursuant to a non-exclusive license agreement with its parent company, the importer has acquired rights to certain technical information or patents for use in the connection with the manufacture of certain vehicles. In exchange for these rights the importer pays its parent company a royalty of 2.5 percent of the total sales amount of licensed products manufactured and sold by the importer. These royalty payments are in fact based upon the proceeds of the sale of U.S. manufactured vehicles that may or may not contain imported components purchased from the parent company. The amounts paid are not directly based upon the resale, disposal, or use of the imported components themselves. In addition, the payments are not involved in the production or sale of the imported components. The amounts paid by the importer to its related party parent under the non-exclusive license agreement are not included in, or additions to, the price actually paid or payable for imported components purchased from the related party company and used in the production of the vehicles.
547532 dated Nov. 2, 2001.

Under a license agreement, the importer has agreed to pay its subsidiary percentages of its worldwide sales of the licensed products in exchange for the right to manufacture and sell the licensed products worldwide. Assuming transaction value is the appropriate basis of appraisement, royalties paid with respect to the licensed products for the imported raw materials purchased by the importer from its related companies are neither part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported raw materials, nor do they constitute additions thereto under section 402(b)(1)(D)-(E) of the TAA.
547710 dated Dec. 16, 2001.

For the subject merchandise, two license fees were paid to the licensor pursuant to two separate agreements: one by the seller and a second by the importer. The seller/licensor agreement indicated that the licensor grants the seller the exclusive right to use the trademark to manufacture the subject merchandise. The importer/licensor agreement, by contrast, related to marketing the merchandise in the United States. The relationship between the license fees and the merchandise determines whether the license payments by the importer are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable. The importer's

license fee payments were paid directly to the licensor and did not accrue to the benefit of the seller, thus the license payments are not part of the price paid or payable.
547968 dated May 7, 2002.

In this case, based on the evidence presented, Customs could not determine whether there was a linkage of the payment of the royalties to the purchase of the imported goods by the buyer. Unless and until the importer can indicate the goods being imported, provide a sales agreement and invoices, and furnish any other necessary evidence, Customs presumes that the payment of the royalties was a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for exportation to the United States. Thus, the royalty payments are part of the price paid or payable in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547662 dated Sep. 20, 2002; <u>modified</u> by 548305 dated Aug. 11, 2003.

Royalties paid to third parties for the right to use a trademark in the United States will generally not be added to the price paid or payable. In this case, the licensor is related to the importer, but the licensor is not related to the manufacturer. Additionally, the licensor does not buy or sell the merchandise. Accordingly, the royalties paid by the importer to the licensor were not a condition of sale for export to the United States. The royalties paid to the licensor by the importer should not be added to the price paid or payable.
548112 dated Sep. 23, 2002.

A royalty payment made for the right to use the intellectual property in the U.S. is not paid in respect of manufacturing rights. It is not a condition of sale for exportation to the U.S. and is not paid to the seller or a party related to the seller. Consequently, it is not included in transaction value as an addition to the price actually paid or payable. CBP ruled that the imported merchandise (clothing) could be appraised based on the first sale. CBP held that the design work was an assist that had to be included in PAPP. A sourcing fee was paid to an independent contractor and was determined not to be a selling commission and not included in the PAPP. The royalty payment was not paid to the seller and limited to non-manufacturing rights (right to use trademark, trade name and trade dress formats in advertising, store use and signage) and is not included in the PAPP.
548420 dated Jan. 13, 2004.

The payment of the fees for the use of patented processes, trademarks, copyrights, or other intellectual property rights addressed in the license agreements are payments made by a buyer to a party related to the seller. CBP has found that royalty payments made to a party related to a seller constitute indirect payments to the seller and are part of the price actually paid or payable. The royalty payments made by the importers to the royalty owner are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
548573 dated July 25, 2005; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> W563354 dated Oct. 27, 2010.

The importer purchases electronic instruments from a related German manufacturer, and resells them to end users in the United States. The German manufacturer has certain patent and trademark license rights granted by an unrelated U.S. company, which permit

it to make, use, sell and distribute the instruments to end users. The license agreement provides for a one-time license issue fee and a per unit royalty based on sales to end users. To calculate the amounts due, the importer issues a quarterly report to the German manufacturer of the number of units sold. The German manufacturer then issues an invoice to the importer for the royalties owed to the licensor. The importer pays the royalties to the German manufacturer, which then remits the amounts to the licensor. The royalties are part of the total payment made by the buyer to the seller for the imported goods. Furthermore, they qualify as additions to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D).
W563404 dated Mar. 3, 2006.

The importer imports and manufactures a wide range of chemicals for various industrial applications. It sources over 85% of its imported merchandise from related affiliates, including its parent company. In addition to paying for the imported merchandise, the importer makes royalty and various commission payments to its parent company. The parent in turn pays the importer amounts for research and development expenses the importer incurs on the parent's behalf. The royalty is for the use of the intellectual property in domestic manufacturing and marketing operations, and as such is not included in, or an addition to, the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods. Similarly, the R&D payments made to the importer and the export commissions paid by the importer are not included in transaction value. Evidence is lacking, however, to sustain the importer's position that the party to whom it makes "import" commissions is serving as a buying agent. Consequently, the import commissions are part of the price actually paid or payable for the goods.
W548649 dated Sep. 5, 2006.

The importer purchases merchandise from a Chinese manufacturer. The merchandise is made pursuant to a patent license agreement entered into between the importer and a third-party licensor. The importer, the manufacturer, and the licensor are unrelated. The royalty payments made by the importer to the licensor relate to, and are a condition of sale of, the imported merchandise, and as such, are additions to the price actually paid or payable.
W548692 dated Mar. 2, 2007.

The buyer imports parts from the seller and pays the seller a royalty for the use of various patents in producing merchandise in the U.S. in which the imported parts are incorporated. The royalty payments paid by the buyer to the seller are based upon the sale or disposal of the finished merchandise produced in the U.S. incorporating the imported merchandise and from which the value of the imported merchandise is deducted prior to calculating the royalty. CBP determined the royalty payments are not dutiable.
H024566 dated Oct. 15, 2008.

Licensee purchased DVD players from unrelated suppliers located in various countries. Under a separate agreement with the “Licensor,” Licensee paid a fixed annual fee to Licensor for the right to purchase integrated circuits containing anti-copying technology from Licensor’s authorized suppliers, as well as for the technical data used by the

Importer's suppliers to incorporate those circuits into DVD players. Licensee then imported finished DVD players into the U.S. None of the parties to this transaction, such as manufacturers, Licensee, and Licensor, are related to each other. The Licensee submitted to CBP its DVD Manufacturing License Agreement, which covered the incorporation of the anti-copying technology into the digital devices. The Licensee also provided purchase orders and copies of two Manufacturing Agreements between the Licensee and its manufacturers, as samples. There were no references in these agreements or in the purchase orders to the Licensor or any license fees paid to the Licensor. CBP determined that the licensee fees paid by Licensee to a third-party unrelated Licensor pursuant to the above-referenced License Agreement were not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for export to the United States and did not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D)-(E).
H009113 dated Nov. 17, 2008.

Payments made for royalty for specialized software sold to the customer after the importation of machine tools were not an addition to the price paid or payable of the imported machine tools.
W563562 dated Nov. 20, 2008.

The importer entered into a licensing agreement for the non-exclusive rights to use licensed characters of their footwear. The footwear was produced in China by factories unrelated to the importer or licensor. The licensing agreement required the importer to pay the licensor, a license fee on "the net invoice billings" of the importer for the total quantity of the products sold in the U.S. containing the "License Elements". The license fee was set at 6% of the net invoice billings and was payable each calendar quarter for the term of the agreement. The licensing agreement also provided for a guaranteed payment for the term of the contract. There was also a license fee of 12% assessed on the FOB sales direct from China to third countries. The royalty payment was due after the products were sold in the U.S. and only when the products were sold. It was not payable at the time of the export of merchandise and the license fee was not a requirement for production of the products in China. While the agreement contained quality control clauses conduct codes, the importer could purchase the merchandise without the payment of a licensing fee. Although the payment was required, in that it must be paid to the extent that the importer earned revenue when it resold the products bearing the trademarks and copyrighted characters, the payment was not paid to the seller, and was not added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The proceeds also did not accrue to the seller.
H034062 dated Mar. 3, 2009.

Licensee entered into a License Agreement with the Licensor, a U.S. corporation, to manufacture, design, advertise, promote, distribute, and sell wearing apparel, golf clubs, and golf-related accessories, including bags, balls, umbrellas, etc., bearing various trade names, marks, and designs managed by the Licensor. Licensor is the exclusive licensing agent for the owners of the marks and designs. Licensee is not related to the Licensor. Licensee sourced the merchandise from various vendors and paid a royalty fee to

Licensor for the use of patents and trademarks in accordance with the terms of the License Agreement, provided to CBP. None of the parties to this transaction, such as manufacturers in China, vendors, Licensee, and Licensor, are related to each other. This ruling applied to the License Agreement as a whole, thus, covering all trademarks and patents specified in the License Agreement. The requestor also submitted a Declaration, executed by the Licensee's Vice President of Product Development, stating that Licensee does not sublicense the use of marks to any vendors or manufacturers. The Licensee's Declaration also stated that although the Licensee had other agreements with its vendors for the manufacture of goods, it did not have a provision either in the manufacturing agreement of any other agreement regarding the use of the marks licensed by Licensor. Based upon the information provided, CBP determined that the license fees paid by Licensee to a third-party unrelated Licensor pursuant to the License Agreement for trademarks and patents was not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for export to the United States and did not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D).
H024979 dated May 6, 2009

The Importers purchase certain electronic devices from unrelated foreign manufacturers. The term of sale is FOB. Following the importation of the electronic devices, the merchandise is stored in the warehouses at various locations in the U.S., and, consequently, sold to individual customers, retailers, or wholesalers in the U.S. The Importers maintain extensive stocks of the imported merchandise, and since a number of different models of various electronic devices are not produced on a continuing basis by foreign manufacturers, the merchandise may remain in inventory for a very considerable amount of time after entry. The royalty fees are payable for the use of software, developed by third parties, which is loaded on or packed with the imported electronic devices prior to their importation. The royalty fees are paid by the importers only after the resale of the merchandise in the U.S. CBP determined that Reconciliation was the appropriate method for accounting for and depositing duty with respect to royalty fees paid by the importers to third party licensors in this case.
H078555 dated Dec. 18, 2009.

The payment of royalties for the use of patented processes in the manufacture, importation and sale of merchandise are included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable because the payments are made by the buyer for the benefit of the related seller of the imported goods. They would also constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise as a royalty, to the extent they are not included in the price. The location of the licensor is not a factor in ascertaining whether the royalties are dutiable.
W563354 dated Oct. 27, 2010; <u>aff'g</u> 548573 dated July 25, 2005.

Payment of a royalty to a unrelated third party that owned a patent but did not produce the imported good where the fee was determined based on net sales of the imported good was held to be included in the price actually paid or payable for the purposes of appraisement under transaction value. Payment of a royalty to a company that owned a patent where the fee was determined based on the use of the imported equipment to

perform medical procedures would not be included in the price actually paid or payable for the purposes of appraisement under transaction value.
H064075 dated Mar. 25, 2011.

The importers pay the license fee to the licensor, an unrelated third party, in consideration for the right to use the licensor trademark in the U.S. sale and marketing of footwear made using or incorporating the trademark material, and the U.S. sales and support services provided to the customers of the finished footwear. The license fees are not paid to the seller of the imported merchandise or a party related to the seller. The importers are not required to purchase the imported merchandise from a particular manufacturer. The licensing agreement and the purchase agreement provided indicate that the fees paid by the importers to the licensor are not involved in the sale of the imported merchandise. While the licensing agreement contains certain quality control provisions, the importers could purchase the merchandise without the payment of a licensing fee. Accordingly, the license fees paid by the importers to the licensor are not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for export to the U.S. and do not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
H127377 dated Mar. 31, 2011.

Royalties were not dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable, as royalties, or as proceeds when the imported merchandise was not manufactured under patent, the know-how provided was for domestic manufacturing using the imported merchandise as raw materials, and the imported merchandise was not imported from the related party licensing the know-how for the domestic manufacturing. Royalties were also not dutiable when the facts were the same, except a few of the imported raw materials were being purchased from the licensor-parent. The fact that the importer and seller are related and the seller is also the licensor, will not necessarily mean the royalties are dutiable. In this case, the buyer was not required to purchase the raw materials from the licensor-parent. The fact that a minimum royalty was owed also did not affect the dutiability of the royalty because the minimum royalty was owed even if all materials were sourced domestically, and the company was required to continue to exploit the rights granted under the license, no matter where the raw materials were sourced. Where the agreement required the purchasing of the domestically-manufactured good from the licensor-parent when the domestic manufacturer could not produce the company's requirements, the royalties were dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable.
H128018 dated Apr. 6, 2011.

Although the amount of the royalty payments due was calculated based on the invoice price of the licensed products, the licensing agreement did not specify the sale for exportation between the seller and importer/buyer triggered the obligation to pay the license fees. In addition, the royalties were paid to a third party unrelated to seller, and the licensor did not exercise any control over the choice of factories and had any other input over the production of the licensed merchandise other than normal quality control and trademark protection concerns. Therefore, license fees/royalties paid by the importers to a third party licensor for the right use trademarks pursuant to trademark licensing agreement were not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for export

to the U.S. and were not a dutiable addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a((b)(1)(D).
H174030 dated Nov. 15, 2011.

Royalty fees were paid on certain merchandise to parties unrelated to the manufacturers, importer, or licensees, for the use of software in the U.S. upon the resale of the imported merchandise in the U.S. CBP ruled that the imported merchandise was not manufactured under patent because none of the patents covered the processes used in manufacture of the imported merchandise. Instead, the patents covered the navigation applications, map data, and voice software. The actual manufacturing process for the GPS devices being imported did not involve any patents, other than the patents, held by the seller. Further, the cost of the software for the GPS devices was already included in the price from the seller to the importer. The importer also did not make any royalty payments to the suppliers of the GPS devices (imported merchandise). The payments were made to unrelated third-party licensors for the software to be incorporated into the GPS devices (imported merchandise). The royalty was not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise because there was no evidence that the licensed fee was linked to individual sales agreements or purchase orders. Finally, CBP stated that since the importer could buy the product without paying the fee, the royalty fees in question did not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D) or (E).
H089759 dated Dec. 23, 2011.

Development payments made by the parent company/seller of the imported active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) were part of the price actually paid or payable when they covered development work for both the API and the finished drug, except to the extent the development related to the manufacture of the finished drug in the United States and the payment related to such manufacturing development could be reasonably allocated. Royalty payments made to the parent/seller of the imported API were included in the price actually paid or payable or could be added to the price actually paid or payable as a royalty when the license agreement covered the know-how for the both the API and the finished drug. Milestone payments made under the same agreement as the royalty payments and in exchange for the same rights, could also be considered part of the price actually paid or payable or could fall under 19 U.S.C. 1401(a)(b)(1)(D) as a royalty or license fee, to the same extent as the traditional royalty payment.
H137435 dated Jan. 5, 2012.

A trademark royalty paid to a foreign parent, who was not related to the seller of the merchandise, was not dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable or as a proceed as it was not paid to the seller. It was also not dutiable as an addition to the price actually paid or payable when there was no indication the payment of the royalty was a part of the sales transaction between the importer and the foreign unrelated manufacturer and the ability to use the parent's suppliers was optional. The quality control rights given to the foreign parent by the trademark license agreement at issue did not affect the dutiability of the royalty, as quality control clauses are standard in trademark license agreements. Clothing design work undertaken by the foreign parent pursuant to a services agreement

was dutiable as an assist valued as the cost of creating the designs and the garment review process. The review process occurred prior to manufacture, and was therefore necessary for the production process and considered part of the assist. The assist could not be valued at the percent fee paid pursuant to the agreement because that would be considered the cost of acquisition, and the parties to the agreement were related.
H172356 dated Jan. 9, 2012.

Royalty payments tied to the right to use patents to manufacture batteries but not tied to the right to buy and import equipment, replacement parts or components, were not a part of the price actually paid or payable for imported spare parts. Further, (1) the imported parts were standard machinery parts not manufactured under the patents at issue, (2) the royalty payment was not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise, and (3) the importer could buy the merchandise without paying the royalty. In addition, the obligation to pay the royalty only arose when the importer used a patent to manufacture batteries and was not tied to the subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported parts. Consequently, the royalty payments were not dutiable as additions to the price for the merchandise because the payments were not related to the imported merchandise.
H186056 dated Mar. 26, 2013.

Company A is a U.S. company that proposes to purchase software alterable machines from the Manufacturer and resell those machines to the end-use customers in the United States. As imported into the United States, the software alterable machines will be fully functional. The software alterable machines consist of both hardware components and software components (or firmware that controls all the functions of the software alterable machines). However, the firmware on these machines can be reprogrammed so as to either expand or limit the capabilities of the machines. This reprogramming requires a license key from the manufacturer and the download of a new program. Therefore, after the sale for export to the United States of the software alterable machines, Company A may purchase a license key from manufacturer and download the software necessary to expand the capabilities of the imported machines, from the manufacturer's website. Based upon the information provided, CBP determined that the license fees that Company A may pay manufacturer for a license key and download are not dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable, nor are they additions to value as royalties, pursuant to 19 U.S.C 1401a(b)(1)(D), or proceeds, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E).
H239671 dated June 7, 2013.

The importer/licensee is a U.S. company that sources the finished goods, as well as the materials and parts, from domestic and foreign suppliers. The importer/licensee entered into a Brand License Agreement with another related company, licensor. Under the terms of the Brand License Agreement, the importer/licensee received a non-exclusive, non-transferable, revocable license to use the brand. The Brand License Agreement also applied to all goods marketed, distributed, and sold by the importer/iicensee in the United States, regardless of whether such items have been imported from the related manufacturers or domestically sourced from the unrelated suppliers. In consideration for the license granted, the importer/licensee pays the licensor a royalty fee equal to a certain

percentage of the "net purchase price." Licensor separately entered into Manufacturing Know-How License Agreements with three of the importer/licensee's related suppliers to grant the related supplied the right to manufacture, use, and sell or otherwise supply the imported goods. Based upon the information provided, CBP found that the royalty payments made pursuant to the Brand License Agreement were not dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable, nor are they additions to value as royalties, pursuant to 19 U.S.C 1401a(b)(1)(D), or proceeds, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E).
H236746 dated July 1, 2013.

Greenbrier International, Inc. ("Greenbrier") purchased and imported into the United States "3-inch PU Foam Marvel 360 balls" from an unrelated manufacturer in China. The royalty payments were made by Greenbrier to the unrelated third party licensor, which acquired the rights to use the trademarks appearing on the imported merchandise from Marvel. The royalty payments were calculated based on the quantity of the merchandise imported multiplied by the determined royalty/profit margin for the particular shipment. Even though Greenbrier provided a letter from Marvel's general counsel, authorizing Greenbrier to import merchandise from approved factories in approved quantities, bearing Marvel's trademark, such merchandise had to be manufactured under the license agreement and its subsequent amendments between Marvel and a third party unrelated licensor to whom Greenbrier paid the royalty. No royalty or license agreement, specifying the terms and provisions surrounding the royalty payments from Greenbrier to Marvel, was provided for CBP's review. Based on the information presented and in the absence of the royalty or license agreement governing the transaction between the parties in this case, CBP determined that the royalty or license fees paid by the importer constituted an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D).
H234735 dated June 23, 2014.

H262685 dated Mar. 23, 2015 – See Proceeds of a Subsequent Resale, addition to the price actually paid or payable.

proceeds of a subsequent resale

See 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E); 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1)(v); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph l(d)

When a royalty or license fee is found not to be a part of transaction value under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA, no authority exists for including the fee in transaction value under section 402(b)(1)(E), as the proceeds of a subsequent resale.
542900 dated Dec. 9, 1982 (TAA No. 56); 542926 dated Jan. 21, 1983; 543529 dated Oct. 7, 1985; 543773 dated Aug. 28, 1986; 544102 dated Aug. 16, 1988, aff'd by 544300 dated Feb. 17, 1989. Overruled by 544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991, C.S.D. 91-6, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 25, No. 18, June, 1991.

Payments made to the seller pursuant to a royalty agreement are added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(E)

as proceeds of a subsequent resale. The royalty payments are due upon the importer's resale of the merchandise. These proceeds of the subsequent resale inure to the benefit of the seller.
544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991; Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 25, No. 18, June, 1991; modifies 542900 dated Dec. 9, 1982 (TAA No. 56), 542926 dated Jan. 21, 1983, 543529 dated Oct. 7, 1985, 543773 dated Aug. 28, 1986, 544102 dated Aug. 16, 1988.

The payments made to the seller are not based upon the resale of the imported product. Rather, the payments are based on the resale of a finished product that includes U.S. components. Thus, a substantial portion of the payments is based on components that were not actually imported. As a result, the payments made are not dutiable as proceeds of a subsequent resale pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.
544656 dated June 19, 1991.

546951 dated Oct. 22, 1999 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, price actually paid or payable.

H242894 dated Dec. 4, 2013 – See Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D); 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1)(iv); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph l(c)

A distributorship or exclusivity fee paid to the seller of merchandise is not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise. The fee may not be added to the price actually paid or payable as a royalty or license fee.
542360 dated June 10, 1981 (TAA No. 29).

Royalty payments made to a U.S. patent holder are not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise and, therefore, the payments are not dutiable.
542818 dated May 27, 1982.

Payments made by the importer to an unrelated licensor were not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise.
542842 dated June 18, 1982.

Where the value of imported components is specifically excluded from a royalty-trademark fee computation formula paid by the buyer to its related seller, the fee is not related to the imported merchandise, and is not included in transaction value.
542900 dated Dec. 9, 1982 (TAA No. 56); modified by 544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991.

Royalty payments made to the foreign seller and which inure to the benefit of the U.S. patent holder are not a condition of the sale and, therefore, the payments are

non-dutiable.
542926 dated Jan. 21, 1983; modified by 544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991.

A royalty fee paid by the buyer to a third party licensor for a patent covering a process to manufacture the imported merchandise is dutiable. The fee is related to the merchandise and is a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise.
543070 dated July 28, 1983.

The buyer pays a royalty fee to the seller. The royalty fee is neither required as a condition of the sale of merchandise nor is it related to the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the royalty fee is not added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
543192 dated Oct. 24, 1983; 543062 dated Nov. 8, 1983.

The royalty payments in question are paid in exchange for rights that are separate and apart from the ownership of the imported merchandise. These rights are not a condition of sale of the imported products and, accordingly, the royalty payments are not dutiable under transaction value.
543370 dated Sep. 18, 1984.

The trademark payment is not made to the seller, but, rather, the payment is made to a third party. The payment is not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise for exportation to the United States, as the importer is not required to use the trademark on the merchandise it imports. The payment is not dutiable under transaction value.
543417 dated Feb. 11, 1985.

The royalty fee in question is not included in the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, and the buyer is not required to pay the royalty as a condition of the sale. The payment is not part of transaction value.
543421 dated Feb. 25, 1985.

The royalties paid to the supplier of the imported merchandise are not a condition of the sale and therefore, are not dutiable under transaction value.
543497 dated June 25, 1985.

The royalty agreement in question specifically states that the royalty payments are not a condition of the sale of products to the licensee-importer; instead, the agreement specifies that the royalty payments are based upon subsequent sales in the United States of products bearing the licensor's trademark. Consequently, the royalty payments are not added to the price actually paid or payable.
543577 dated Aug. 26, 1985.

The fee in question is not related to the imported merchandise and is not paid as a condition of the sale of imported merchandise. Therefore, the royalty fee is not added to the price actually paid or payable.
543529 dated Oct. 7, 1985; modified by 544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991.

The royalty payment is not related to the imported merchandise and it is not paid as a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise. The payment is not connected to the ownership or importation of the merchandise but, rather, the payment is for the use of the trademarks and techniques with regard to the product. The fee is not added to the price actually paid or payable.
543773 dated Aug. 28, 1986; modified by 544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991.

The licensing fee in question is not related to the imported merchandise. The rights granted to the importer relate to the worldwide distribution and servicing of the affected merchandise as well as to the worldwide use of the manufacturer's technical data and trademarks. The fee is not dutiable as part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
543617 dated June 8, 1987.

A fee for the right to manufacture, process, and use the merchandise is not related to the imported merchandise and it is not paid as a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise. The fee is not added to the price actually paid or payable.
543890 dated Aug. 18, 1987.

Payments made to the licensor pursuant to a license agreement are not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise. The fees remitted to the licensor by the importer are separate from the right to import the product. The fees should not be added to the price actually paid or payable to determine the transaction value of the merchandise.
544047 dated Mar. 8, 1988.

The importer purchases color chips used in ink formulation in the production of dry erase markers from the foreign seller. The seller also furnishes the importer with the ink formulation for processing the chips. The royalty is due to the seller even when the seller does not provide the color chips used to produce the ink, i.e., when another company supplies the color chips to the buyer. The royalty fee paid by the importer is separate and apart from the right to import the merchandise. The payment of the royalty fee is not a condition of the sale, and it is not to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
544105 dated Mar. 25, 1988.

The license agreement in question provides for a royalty payment by the importer to the licensor for the use, sale, and manufacture of the product in the United States. The amount used is based upon net sales subsequent to importation and, if the imported product is used for testing or research (uses which do not produce sales), no royalty is owed by the importer. In this case, the royalty fee is not to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
544061 dated May 27, 1988.

The license agreement between the parties grants to the importer an exclusive license in the United States under patent rights and confidential information to make, use, and sell the product. In exchange, the importer agrees to pay the manufacturer a certain advance payment, plus royalties based upon net sales pursuant to a rising royalty schedule. The

royalty payments are not linked to the purchase of the product. The payments are paid for rights that are separate and apart from the right of ownership. These payments are not added to the price actually paid or payable.
544102 dated Aug. 16, 1988; aff'd by 544300 dated Feb. 17, 1989; modified by 544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991.

An addition for a royalty fee paid by the buyer will be made to the price actually paid or payable unless the buyer establishes that such payment is distinct from the price for the imported merchandise, and that such payments are not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise. In this case, the buyer has satisfied these burdens and the payments are not additions to the price actually paid or payable.
544129 dated Aug. 31, 1988.

In the instant case, the royalty payments are not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for export to the United States. The royalties must be paid regardless of whether merchandise is imported into the United States. The royalty payments are not to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
544351 dated Oct. 29, 1990.

It does not appear from the facts presented that the licensing fees are connected to the ownership or importation of the imported merchandise. Rather, the fees are incurred in connection with the sale of the merchandise in the United States. The fees are not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise and, therefore, the fees are not added to the price actually paid or payable.
544575 dated Jan. 31, 1991.

The royalty payments made by the buyer are not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise. The payments are not dutiable royalty payments under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991.

The payments at issue are neither related to the imported merchandise nor are they a condition of the sale. The importer must pay the fees to the seller regardless of whether the importer purchases any parts from the seller. The fees are not added to the price actually paid or payable as a royalty under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
544656 dated June 19, 1991.

The license fee in question is paid for the territorial exclusivity to manufacture, use, and sell in the licensed territory, as a condition of the ownership or importation of the merchandise. The buyer is required to pay the fee as a condition of sale of the imported merchandise and the fee is related to the imported merchandise. Therefore, these payments made from the importer to the manufacturer are part of the transaction value of the imported goods.
544420 dated July 8, 1991.

The royalty payment made by the importer to the seller pursuant to a patent license and

technical assistance agreement is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
544611 dated July 29, 1991.

The license fees, technical aid fees, and royalties are not required to be paid as a condition of sale of the merchandise for export to the United States. The payments are not dutiable under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
544381 dated Nov. 25, 1991.

The royalty fee for use of a particular name is paid to a third party, and not to the sellers of the imported apparel. Under the agreement, the royalty is not a condition of the sale of the merchandise. That is, it does not appear that the royalty is connected to the ownership or the importation of the merchandise. Therefore, the fee is not dutiable as part of the transaction value.
544727 dated Dec. 4, 1991.

A license fee paid to the seller is related to the imported merchandise and it is a condition of sale. As such, the payment must be included in the appraised value of the imported merchandise.
544950 dated May 28, 1992.

The royalty/license fee payments made by the importer for the right to use the patented process and know how necessary to produce the finished products do not qualify as statutory additions to the price actually paid or payable under either sections 402(b)(1)(D) or 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA. As such, they are not to be included in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise. These determinations are to be made on a case by case basis, taking all relevant circumstances into consideration.
545114 dated Sep. 30, 1993.

An importer purchases a variety of merchandise from the seller. When an article bears a specific trademark, the buyer is required to pay a royalty of 10% of the ex-factory purchase price to the licensor. The seller is not related to the licensor and none of the royalty payments inure to the benefit of the seller. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent or trademark, and the royalty is not involved in the production and sale by the seller or the purchase of the merchandise by the buyer. The buyer can purchase the merchandise without paying the royalty to the licensor. The payment of the royalty is not a condition of sale of the merchandise from the seller. The royalty payment is not added to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
544923 dated Feb. 22, 1994.

A “machine amortization charge” appears on invoices of imported wrapping material. The buyers of the imported wrap use it to package beverage bottles. Specialized machinery is used to combine the imported merchandise, i.e., the wrapping material and the beverages. The equipment used in the wrapping process is manufactured in the United States and it is leased to and located on the premises of the bottlers. In this case, there

is a royalty payable by the buyer due on the sale of packaging material. These payments are included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported beverage wraps. However, the “machine amortization charge” is not related to the imported merchandise and should not be added to the price actually paid or payable.
545150 dated Feb. 24, 1994.

The imported garments are not manufactured under patent, rather the agreement gives the buyer the right to use the licensed trademark in connection with the manufacture and sale of the imported garments. The royalty is not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. The royalty for the right to use the trademark in the United States is paid to a third party rather than to the sellers, and is separate from the purchase price of the garments. Finally, the buyer can import the garments without paying the royalty because the royalty only becomes due upon net sales of the licensed merchandise. While the agreement provides for guaranteed minimum royalty payments, this fact does not render the royalty payment a condition of sale. Accordingly, the royalty payment by the buyer is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
544781 dated Mar. 4, 1994.

The importer pays a U.S. company (unrelated to the seller) for the right to use copyrighted fabric designs. The importer pay an initial sum which is later credited towards a royalty of 2.5 percent of the importer’s net revenues on its sales in the United States of apparel which incorporates the design. Although the garments are not manufactured under patent, they incorporate fabric that bears patterns identical or similar to the copyrighted patterns. However, the royalty is not involved in the production or sale of the imported garment. The royalty is paid for the exclusive right of the importer to utilize the copyrighted patterns. The right is separate from the purchase price of the garments. The merchandise may be imported without paying the royalty because the royalty becomes due only upon sale in the United States of the imported merchandise. No portion of the payment accrues, directly or indirectly, to the seller of the imported merchandise. The payments by the buyer are neither royalties under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA, nor are they proceeds under section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.
545370 dated Mar. 4, 1994.

The importer purchases a pharmaceutical product for which a royalty is paid to the seller. The buyer has exclusive marketing rights for the product in the United States, and the agreement specifies that the purchaser shall purchase its requirements for the product from the seller. The amount of compensation payable is fixed by the license agreement and is in the form of a royalty and may include one or more down payments. The royalty is specified at seven percent of the buyer’s net sales, in addition to payment of an initial supply price. The license agreement, read in context with an option agreement between the parties, does not distinguish the royalty payments from the price actually paid or payable. Rather, the agreements expressly define compensation to include the payments. The royalty payment should be treated as part of the price actually paid or payable.
544800 dated May 17, 1994.

The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent because the royalty payments to the licensors are made for the right to use copyrighted fabric design rather than for the imported garments. The royalty payment is made for the right to use the fabric design in the United States in conjunction with the imported garments, and this right is separate from the purchase price of the garments. Finally, because the royalty payments are made to a third party and are triggered by United States sales of the imported merchandise rather than by the sale of the imported merchandise for exportation to the United States, the payments by the buyer to the licensors are not a condition of sale. Accordingly, the royalty payments made by the buyer do not constitute additions to the price actually paid or payable.
545312 dated Mar. 18, 1994.

The royalty payments at issue are not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise and therefore do not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. The imported merchandise was not manufactured under patent. The royalty was not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. In addition, the buyer can purchase the merchandise without paying the royalty fee.
545307 dated Feb. 3, 1995.

The imported merchandise consists of components for a mainframe computer system. The importer used the components to manufacture the computer system. The importer pays royalties to the seller pursuant to a licensing agreement for the use of technical information and know-how related to the development of a computer system. Under the terms of the agreement, the importer is required to purchase the components for the computer system from the seller. Under these circumstances, the royalty is related to the production or sale of the imported merchandise. The agreement also provides that the license fee is to be paid by way of an adjustment to the importer's cost of the computer system. Therefore, the payments are dutiable either as part or the price actually paid or payable, or as an addition to the price pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D).
545380 dated Mar. 30, 1995.

The continuing royalty payments made pursuant to one agreement between the parties are a condition of sale of the imported merchandise. The sales agreement between the parties pertaining to the imported merchandise is subject to the terms of the royalty agreement and conditions one upon the other. The importer cannot buy the product without paying the fee. In addition, the royalty payments from the buyer are involved in the sale of the imported merchandise. Therefore, the royalty is to be added to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
544978 dated Apr. 27, 1995.

The merchandise at issue is not manufactured under patent or trademark. The royalty is not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. The payments to the licensor, which is an unrelated third party, are separate and apart from the payments made to the foreign manufacturers. Finally, the merchandise may be purchased without

paying the fee. Accordingly, the royalty payments are not a condition of sale and do not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545612 dated May 25, 1995.

A manufacturer develops and owns patented proprietary technology used to produce a line of chemicals. The importer manufactures these chemicals and pays a royalty for the use, in the United States, of the manufacturer's patent processes and associated trade secrets. The manufacturer sells to the importer a product that may be used in the production of the chemicals. By the terms of the agreement, the importer may purchase the product from the manufacturer without the payment of any royalty or license fee and the importer is free to source the product from another supplier. Because the imported product is not produced by the patented processes and trade secrets, the value of the rights at issue are readily distinguishable from the value of the imported goods. The payment of the royalty is connected to the sale of the finished products incorporating the patent process and not to the importation of the product. Accordingly, the royalties are not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise and not dutiable as royalties pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
544742 dated June 6, 1995.

With regard to the questions that are outlined in the "Hasbro II Ruling," the answer to the first question is yes, i.e., the machine in question was manufactured under patent. The answer to the section question is yes; the royalty was involved in the sale of the imported machine. The supply agreement specifically states that the importer shall not resell the machine because it includes the production know-how, which is owned by the seller. Thus, in order to purchase and use this patented machine, the importer must pay the seller the royalties in question. The sale of the machine to the importer is inextricably intertwined with the payment of the royalties. Finally, the answer to the third question is no, i.e., the importer could not buy the machine without paying the royalty. The importer/buyer has not established that the royalty payment is distinct from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and that it was not a condition of importation. The royalties are properly added to the price actually paid or payable for the machine pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545784 dated June 6, 1995.

The royalty payments paid by the importer to an unrelated third party do not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent, and the royalty paid by the importer is not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. In addition, the importer can purchase the merchandise from the seller (unrelated to the licensor) without paying the royalty fee. The importer has an independent relationship with the seller and the payments of the royalty are not a condition of sale. The purchase order between the importer and seller makes no reference to the royalty payments the importer pays to the licensor.
545895 dated June 9, 1995.

Based upon the express language of the royalty agreement at issue, the importer has no choice but to pay the royalty amount, i.e., the importer could not buy the imported product without paying the royalty fee. The royalty payments are related to the imported merchandise and are a condition of sale of the imported merchandise. They are to be added to the price actually paid or payable and included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise as a royalty.
545071 dated June 28, 1995; 545321 dated June 30, 1995; 545418 dated June 30, 1995.

The licensee pays a royalty to its wholly owned subsidiary, the licensor, for the right to use the licensor's trademark in connection with the manufacture, use, and sale of imported, trademarked merchandise. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. The royalty is not paid for rights associated with processes to manufacture the imported merchandise. The right to use the licensor's trademarks is not only separate from the production process of the merchandise, but also, given that the licensor and seller are unrelated, this right is separate from the sale for exportation to the United States of the imported merchandise. The royalty is not involved in the sale of the imported merchandise. It appears as if the buyer can purchase the imported merchandise from the seller without having to pay the royalty. The royalty is not a condition of sale for exportation to the United States, and consequently, the payment is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545930 dated June 28, 1995.

The importer purchases ornamental hairbands from various foreign sellers and imports them into the United States. In connection with these importations, the importer pays a royalty to the licensor, the owner of a U.S. design patent related to the imported hairbands. The licensor is not related to the importer or to the foreign sellers. In the agreement, the licensor grants to the importer a non-exclusive license to sell, manufacture, or have manufactured, ornamental hairbands, in exchange for quarterly payments made by the importer to the licensor. The royalty is paid to the licensor for the non-exclusive right to use the licensor's design in connection with the manufacture and resale of the imported, licensed merchandise. The royalty is not linked to the sale of the imported merchandise. The royalty payment is not referenced in purchase contracts or other documentation between the importer and the foreign sellers. It appears that the importer may purchase the merchandise from the sellers without having to pay the royalty. Consequently, the royalty is not a condition of sale and, therefore, it is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545379 dated July 7, 1995.

The importer is a manufacturer, distributor, and a retailer of wearing apparel. The importer also owns a particular trademark in the United States and in other countries. However, Company X owns the right to a similar trademark in additional countries. The manufacturers of the wearing apparel, to which the trademark may be affixed, are unrelated to either the importer or Company X. In accordance with their agreement, the importer pays Company X a royalty if, in fact, the former's trademark is affixed in a country where Company X owns the right to the similar trademark. The royalty is not involved in

the production or sale of the imported merchandise, but rather, the royalty payment serves as consideration for the right to sell merchandise bearing the importer's trademark affixed in Company X's territory. The royalty payments are not a condition of sale, and are not added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545486 dated July 14, 1995.

A licensee/buyer purchases and imports trademarked merchandise manufactured and sold by a seller unrelated to either the licensor or the licensee. The licensee pays the licensor a royalty based on a percentage of the selling price of the imported merchandise. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. The royalty is paid in consideration for the right to affix the licensor's trademarks and trade names to the products, to sell in the designated territory, and to use the trademarks and trade names on retail shops, rather than for the right to manufacture the imported merchandise. The royalty is not paid for rights associated with processes to manufacture the merchandise nor is there any indication that the royalty payment is subject to the terms of the sale for export. It appears as if the buyer can purchase the merchandise from the seller without paying the royalty. Therefore, the royalty is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. In a second situation, the licensee purchases and imports merchandise from the licensor. Where the licensor and the seller are the same party, and the payment is made to the licensor/seller, the royalty is a condition of the sale of the merchandise for exportation to the United States. The payment is not optional, but must be made to the licensor in its capacity as seller. In this situation, an addition to the price actually paid or payable is proper. In the third situation, the licensee purchases the imported merchandise from a seller related to the licensor. The royalty is paid indirectly as a condition of the sale for exportation. The payment is not optional and must be made to the licensor. It is an addition to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545361 dated July 20, 1995.

Under the terms of the licensing agreement at issue, a royalty is paid in consideration for the license to use the trademarks in connection with the manufacture, sale, and distribution of licensed products in the licensed territory. The royalty payments are not subject to the sale for exportation to the United States, nor are the royalties involved in the production of the imported merchandise. The royalty payments are not made to the seller, nor has any evidence been presented which ties the royalty to a sales agreement for the imported merchandise, e.g., a requirement by the seller that the buyer pay the royalty to the licensor. The royalty payments paid by the licensee to third party licensors pursuant to the terms of the trademark licensing agreement are not dutiable under section 402(b)(1)(D).
545528 dated Aug. 3, 1995.

The importer purchases alcoholic beverages from its parent company in the United Kingdom. The beverage is marketed worldwide under a well-known trademarked brand name. A Netherlands company owns the U.S. trademark rights for the product. The Netherlands company is related to both the importer and seller. The licensor and importer

intend to enter into an agreement under which the licensor grants to the importer the exclusive right, limited to the United States, to use the licensed trademark solely in connection with the importation, distribution, promotion and sale of liquor products bearing and sold under the licensed mark. In exchange, the importer pays the licensor a trademark royalty. The payments are calculated on the basis of the gross margin realized by the importer on the sale in the United States of the imported liquor. The royalty is due on all licensed trademarked goods imported and sold by the importer/buyer and such royalties are paid to the licensor, a party related to the seller. To the extent that the licensed products are imported, the royalties are dutiable under section 402(b)(1)(D) as an addition to the price actually paid or payable of such imported products. If there are no importations of licensed products, the payment of minimum royalties has no duty consequences.

545035 dated Aug. 23, 1995.

A U.S. company imports merchandise purchased from a Japanese seller. Pursuant to an agreement with a related party licensor, the importer pays a royalty on the products purchased from the Japanese seller. The seller is not related to either the importer or the licensor. A royalty is paid for the right to use a trademark in connection with the manufacture in Japan and sales in the United States of the products manufactured by the Japanese seller. The royalty amount is based upon the FOB Japan price of the product sold to the importer. The agreement specifically identifies the seller as the party with whom the importer contracts for the manufacture of merchandise incorporating the trademark. The agreement further restricts the seller's use of the trademark to merchandise manufactured for and sold to the importer. The royalty is paid in consideration for the seller's right to manufacture and the buyer's right to purchase merchandise that bears the licensor's trademark. Under these circumstances, the payments are a condition of sale of the imported merchandise. The royalty payments pursuant to this agreement are dutiable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. In a subsequent agreement between the importer and the licensor, there is no requirement that the royalties are to be paid in consideration for the right to "manufacture" the imported merchandise. Rather, the subsequent agreement provides that the licensor grants to the importer an exclusive, non-transferable right, license and privilege, for the use of the mark. Under this second agreement, the use of the trademark does not bear relation to the production of the imported merchandise. In addition, the royalty payments are not subject to the sale for exportation to the United States. Although the royalty payment is not optional, it is not paid to the seller, nor is the royalty tied to a sales agreement for the imported merchandise. In the subsequent agreement, the payments are not dutiable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.

544982 dated Aug. 23, 1995.

An importer purchases a bagged magnifying glass from the foreign seller. The magnifying glass is incorporated into a game. The only imported part for the game is the magnifying glass and all other parts of the game are U.S.-made. Royalty payments are made to the seller in exchange for the exclusive right and license to manufacture or have manufactured and to sell, in specific countries, the national versions of a board game for sale under the trademark. The royalties are paid on the sales of the complete games in

the United Sates and not based upon sales of the individual pieces or components included in the complete packaged games. In this case, the imported merchandise, the magnifying glass, was not manufactured under patent. The royalty payment is made for the use of a trademark on the complete game and is not involved in the production or sale for exportation. In addition, the importer can buy the magnifying glass without having to pay the royalty because there is no indication that the sale of the product is subject to the terms of the license agreement. The payments are not dutiable as royalties under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545824 dated Aug. 28, 1995.

It is not in dispute that the imported merchandise is manufactured under patent. Second, the royalty at issue is involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. The licensing agreements provide the parent company and its subsidiaries with the right to have the patented technologies used by the manufacturer in the production of VCRs and camcorders imported by the importer. The technologies for which the royalties are paid are incorporated into the imported merchandise. The goods will only be manufactured, imported and subsequently resold based on the understanding that the royalties are paid. It is our conclusion that the importer cannot buy the imported merchandise without paying the fee, and the royalty payments are a condition of sale of the imported merchandise. The payments made to the licensor constitute royalties to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545777 dated Sep. 1, 1995; 545778 dated Sep. 1, 1995.

The importer manufactures and sells certain machines using parts supplied by its parent company in Japan, as well as parts supplied by others. In this case, the party to whom the royalties are paid is both the seller and the licensor. The royalties are paid in consideration of the licensed technology and technical assistance provided by the seller in order for the importer to manufacture the machines, and for the license to use a trademark in connection with the manufacture, use, and sale of the machines. The payment of the royalties and the purchase of the imported parts at issue are closely tied together. The payments are a condition of sale and are dutiable as an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
544991 dated Sep. 13, 1995.

545194 dated Sep. 13, 1995; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 546513 dated Feb. 11, 1998; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 547134 dated July 27, 1999 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, direct or indirect payments.

Regarding the first factor in determining the dutiability of royalty payments, it is undisputed that much of the imported merchandise is manufactured under patent rights held by the licensor. With respect to the second factor, the royalty paid to the licensor is involved in the production of the imported merchandise. The imported merchandise is manufactured using a process referred to in the licensing agreement, for which royalties are paid. In addition, the royalty payment is in fact a condition of sale. The buyer could not purchase the imported merchandise without also paying the royalty.
545536 dated Sep. 21, 1995.

The licensee and licensor are, respectively, buyer and seller of the imported merchandise. In the United States, the imported parts and components are used along with domestic parts to manufacture the licensed products. In an agreement between the parties, the licensor granted the licensee the right to manufacture and sell the licensed products and agreed to provide the licensee with technical assistance and know-how in connection with their manufacture. In exchange, the licensee agreed to pay the licensor a fee in an amount equal to a percentage of the net sales price of the licensed products. With regard to the analysis regarding dutiability of the royalty payments, the imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. The royalty payments are not made in respect of a process to manufacture. Finally, there is nothing in the license agreement to link the payment of the royalties to the purchase of the imported components. The purchase orders do not refer to, and are not linked with, the royalty payments. The payments are not a condition of sale of the imported parts and are not an addition to the price actually paid or payable.

545419 dated Nov. 30, 1995.

The buyer is a U.S. company that produces and sells pharmaceutical products. It imports a licensed product produced by a foreign seller. The licensor developed the licensed product, which bears a trademark owned by the licensor. The licensor is the parent company of the seller. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. The royalty agreement provides that the buyer pays the royalties and license fees to the licensor, for the exclusive right and license to use and sell the imported product and to use the licensor's know-how for such purposes. The agreement further provides that the licensed product is to be sold under the licensed trademark. The royalty payment is involved in the sale of the imported merchandise. The license agreement connects the payment of the royalties with the sale of the imported product to the buyer. In addition, in order to buy the licensed product, the buyer must agree to pay the royalty and license fee on each and every importation of the licensed product. The licensor's obligation to supply the licensed product to the buyer is undertaken by the licensor's subsidiary, the seller. The payment of the royalties is a condition of sale of the imported product. As such, the royalty payments should be added to the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.

545728 dated Nov. 30, 1995.

The evidence indicates that the imported merchandise was not manufactured under patent. In addition, the payments were not made in respect of a process to manufacture. Rather, under the agreement, the buyer acquired an exclusive license to use a trademark in the territory in connection with the advertising, promotion, sale, and distribution of the trademarked products. With regard to the third question regarding dutiability of royalties, although the royalties at issue were paid for the right to use the licensor's trademark in the designated area and to sell the trademarked production, a section of the agreement unambiguously links the license payments to the imported merchandise. This demonstrates that the licensee could not have purchased the imported merchandise from the licensor without having paid the fee. Consequently, the royalty payments were a condition of sale of the imported merchandise and properly constitute an addition to the

price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545844 dated Dec. 22, 1995.

Pursuant to a license agreement, the buyer of pharmaceutical products agrees to pay a specific royalty advance and a continuing royalty to the seller, based upon a percentage of all net sales of a pharmaceutical in the United States. The royalty is paid in consideration for the patent rights, trade secrets, know-how, technology, and technical assistance provided by the seller to the buyer associated with the manufacture of the pharmaceutical. According to the language of the supply agreement, the supply agreement terminates upon the termination of the license agreement. Without the license agreement, there is no sale for exportation of the product to the buyer. In addition, the supply agreement requires that the buyer purchase all of its requirements of the product from the seller. It is our conclusion that the buyer is unable to purchase the product for the manufacture of the pharmaceutical without paying the fee. The royalty payments made by the buyer to the seller are to be added to the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
545331 dated Jan. 19, 1996.

The payment of the license fee at issue and the sale and importation of the imported merchandise are tied together and are not exclusive of one another. The royalty is involved with the production or sale of the imported merchandise. The license fee is a condition of sale, and the fee paid to the licensor must be added to the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value.
546033 dated Mar. 14, 1996; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 546433 dated Jan. 9, 1998.

The seller is a Japanese company that designs, produces, and exports cycling apparel and accessories distributed under its own trademarks. The buyer, an unrelated U.S. company, sells cycling apparel and accessories that it imports and, at times, produces. The parties entered into various technology and trademark license agreements, as well as distribution agreements. One type of royalty grants the buyer the exclusive right and license to use the seller's technical information to produce and sell cycling products at its plant and also grants the buyer an exclusive right to use the seller's trademark. In another agreement, royalties are paid based upon quarterly sales, and the buyer is appointed the sole and exclusive distributor of the products manufactured by the seller and agrees to market, promote, and sell the products. This agreement contains provisions regarding royalties as well as the terms of sale concerning the purchase of the imported products. With regard to the first agreement, the fees are not involved in the production or sale, nor are they a condition of sale of the imported merchandise since they relate exclusively to products manufactured by the buyer. With regard to these payments, they are not to be included in the transaction value as royalties under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. However, the payments subject to the second agreement are closely tied to the purchase of the imported products insofar as the agreement includes specific provisions covering both the purchase prices of the merchandise and the license fees. In addition, the agreement provides that the seller may terminate the agreement if the buyer fails to make any such payments. These payments are an addition to the price actually paid or payable

pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545752 dated Apr. 1, 1996.

The importer/distributor and licensor entered into a distribution agreement whereby, for the payment of a royalty fee, the former acquired the right to use certain names, representations, logos, artwork, and the like in connection with the distribution and sales of electronic and household products. Although under this agreement, the importer/distributor was to purchase the products from its parent corporation or authorized supplier, the products were actually manufactured by, and purchased from, independent manufacturers. In addition, the parent and licensor entered into a license agreement whereby the former acquired the right to use names and characters in connection with the manufacture, distribution and sale of the imported products incorporating the various names and characters. Under both agreements, the parent was secondarily liable to the licensor if the importer/distributor failed to make the royalty payments and was primarily liable for proper use of artwork, notice of copyrights/trademarks, and for approval of and quality control of the products. The payments were not made for rights associated with the manufacture of the imported products and were not subject to the terms of sale for exportation. Also, the importer could have purchased the merchandise without paying the fee. The supply agreement did not reference the royalty payments nor did it suggest that the purchase of the merchandise was actually conditioned upon payment of the royalties. Further, the payments were not paid to the seller and were not linked to individual sales agreements or purchase contracts for the products. Finally, the payments were triggered only when the importer/distributor decided to add a licensed image to an imported article, i.e., the payments were for the separate right to use the licensor's trademarks and copyrights on the imported products. The payments are not added to the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
546146 dated May 10, 1996.

The royalty payment is made for the right to use the licensor's trademark in connection with the manufacture, promotion, sale, distribution or any other disposition of various garments sold in the United States. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. The royalty is not paid for rights associated with processes to manufacture or produce the imported merchandise, nor is the royalty involved in the sale of the imported merchandise. The royalty payment is not subject to the terms of sale for exportation to the United States, nor is it closely tied to such sale. The documents pertaining to the sale of the imported merchandise make no reference to the payment of royalties. In addition, the importer can buy the merchandise from the seller and import it without having to pay royalties to the licensor. Therefore, the royalty payment is not an addition to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
546229 dated May 31, 1996.

The sellers of the merchandise and the licensor of the trademarks are related parties. In order to obtain the products, the importer also had to agree to pay the royalty and license fee to the related party. The fact that the licensor eventually pays some of the royalty payments to a third party is irrelevant, as long as royalties must be paid to the licensor in order to purchase the merchandise. The payments are a condition of sale for export. As

such, the royalty payments are added to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D).
545841 dated June 13, 1996.

The importer purchases a pharmaceutical active ingredient from an unrelated company located in Belgium. Upon importation, the importer combines the product with other ingredients of U.S. origin. Various agreements have been entered into between the importer and the seller and between the importer and the licensor (a party related to the seller). Based upon the facts presented, the payment of the royalty in question is a condition of sale of the imported product. Pursuant to a supply agreement entered into between the importer and seller, the importer is required to purchase all of its requirements for the imported product from the licensor's parent company, and the agreement terminates upon termination of the license agreement. The payment of the royalties is closely tied to the sale of the imported product. The royalty payments constitute additions to the price actually paid or payable for the imported product pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545998 dated Nov. 13, 1996.

The royalty payments at issue are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. The payments are related to the imported merchandise which the buyer is required to pay as a condition of sale. Pursuant to the license and supply agreements, as well as the informal royalty payment agreement between all three parties, royalty payments are due on each item that is purchased, imported and sold. The merchandise could not be imported without payment of the fee. Therefore, the royalty payments are added to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(d) of the TAA.
546034 dated May 6, 1997.

The imported merchandise is manufactured under patent. The royalty is involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. The patented know-how granted to the importer relates to the manufacture of the products in their various forms, as imported. Without the licensing agreement and the royalty payments, the imported merchandise as such could not have been produced by the foreign suppliers. It is our conclusion that the importer could not have purchased the imported merchandise without paying the fee. The purchase of the merchandise and the payment of royalties are inextricably intertwined. The royalty payments are included within the transaction value of the imported merchandise as royalties in accordance with section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
546159 dated July 18, 1997.

The payments at issue are not optional. They must be paid in order to acquire rights to and enter the trademark label garments into the United States. Although the payments are not paid to the seller, they are linked to the purchase of the trademark label garments. The payments are a condition of sale of the imported merchandise and therefore, constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported garments.
546565 dated Sep. 11, 1997.

The purchase of the merchandise and payment of the license fees at issue are

inextricably intertwined and the payment of the royalties is closely tied to the purchase of the merchandise. The importer could not purchase the imported merchandise without paying the fee. The licensor appears largely in control of the amount, conditions, supply, type, and payment with regard to the sale of the imported merchandise. The license fees are a condition of sale, and are properly added to the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
546433 dated Jan. 9, 1998; aff'g 546033 dated Mar. 14, 1996.

The importer pays license fees to a trust rather than to the licensee or the buying agent. The trustee for the trust in turn pays the licensors the requisite license fees. The trustee is not related to the sellers, however the licensee, the seller, and the buying agent are all related parties. The importer and the licensor are not related to any of the parties. The licensor grants to the licensee the right to use certain property in connection with the manufacture, sale, and distribution of the licensed property through a specified territory. On each sale of the imported product between the seller and the importer, the seller's related party is obligated to pay a licensee fee to the licensors, and the payment is paid by the importer to the licensor through the trust. The payment of royalties is closely tied to the production and sale for exportation to the United States of the imported products, and the payment of the license fee is a condition of sale for export. Therefore, the license fees are a proper addition to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
546513 dated Feb. 11, 1998; aff'g 545194 dated Sep. 13, 1995; aff'd by 547134 dated July 27, 1999.

The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. There is no linkage between the sale for exportation of the imported merchandise and the payment of the royalties by the buyer, notwithstanding the fact that the payments are made to the licensor/seller. The royalty is paid for the right to manufacture, use, and sell the contract products in the United States. That right is separate from the purchase of the imported merchandise. The fact that the value of the imported merchandise is excluded from the royalty calculation also establishes that the royalty is not related to the sale for exportation to the United States of the imported merchandise. The royalty payments are not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. In addition, the standard agreement governing transactions between the buyer and the licensor/seller does not link the payment of the royalties to the purchase of the materials, components, and assemblies imported by the buyer. Therefore, the payment of the royalties is not a condition of the sale for exportation to the United States of the imported merchandise. The royalty payments should not be added to the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
545951 dated Feb. 12, 1998.

In this case, the royalties should not be added to the price actually paid or payable. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. There is no linkage between the sale for exportation of the imported merchandise and the payment of the royalties by the buyer, notwithstanding the fact that the payments are made by the importer/buyer to the licensor/seller. The importer pays the royalty for the right to manufacture, use, and

sell the contract products in the United States. The value of the imported merchandise is excluded from the royalty calculation. In addition, the agreement governing transactions between the buyer and licensor/seller does not link the payment of the royalties to the purchase of the materials, components, and assemblies imported by the buyer. The payment of the royalties is not a condition of the sale for exportation to the United States of the imported merchandise, and should not be added to the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
545903 dated Apr. 30, 1998.

The royalty fees at issue are not closely related to the imported merchandise purchased by either the importer or a party related to the importer. The royalty fees are paid for technical information necessary to make, have made, use, and sell the merchandise in the United States. Therefore, the royalty fees do not pertain to the production or sale for exportation of the imported merchandise. In addition, the merchandise may be imported without paying the royalty fee. The importer must pay the royalty fee based on the resale price of the finished diagnostic kits regardless of where the imported component materials are sourced. There is no obligation to purchase bulk materials from the seller/licensor. Therefore, it is our conclusion that the importer could purchase the imported bulk materials without paying the fee. The royalty fees are not considered royalties pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
545381 dated May 4, 1998.

The royalty payments at issue are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise. The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent. Rather, the licensing agreements address the payment of royalties in connection with trademark and licensing rights. The royalty is not involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. An examination of the licensing agreements indicates that without the agreements and royalty payments, the imported merchandise still would be produced and sold by the foreign seller. The licensing agreements address the royalty payments separately and apart from the purchase and supply of the merchandise itself. In addition, the importer could buy the imported merchandise without having to pay the fee. The language included in the agreements does not suggest that the payment of the royalties is actually tied to the purchase of the goods. The royalty payments are not to be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546072 dated May 21, 1998.

The royalty at issue is related to and is a condition of sale of the imported merchandise and should be included in transaction value as an addition to the price actually paid or payable. Although the royalties are based on the product finished in the United States, and not on the value of the imported components, because the royalty is tied to the ownership of the imported merchandise, the royalty is related to, and a condition of, the sale of the imported merchandise.
546401 dated May 21, 1998. (NOTE: Reconsideration of 544978 dated Apr. 27, 1995 with additional facts provided, but a different result was not warranted.)

The licensed product in this case is manufactured under patent. In addition, the royalty

is involved in the production and sale of the imported merchandise, and the importer may not purchase the product without the payment of the royalties. The royalties at issue are related to the imported merchandise and the importer is required to pay them as a condition of sale for exportation to the United States of the imported licensed product. The royalty payments constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D).
545710 dated Oct. 30, 1998.

The royalty payments made by the buyer to the licensor/seller pursuant to a license agreement are not optional. The payments are a condition of sale for exportation to the United States and, as such, are an addition to the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, the payments are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. In addition, the payments made by the buyer to the seller constitute proceeds of a subsequent resale within the meaning of section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA.**546787 dated Jan. 11, 1999.**

Pursuant to the terms of the letter agreement, the buyer agrees to pay the seller a royalty for each ton of the goods produced by the equipment *and* shipped months after successful commissioning of the equipment. The payments are not connected to the importation or ownership of the imported merchandise. Moreover, the royalties are not based on the resale of the imported merchandise but on the production of the goods produced in the United States at a factory built in part from the imported merchandise. Thus, payments are not related to, nor a condition of sale of, the imported merchandise. As a result, the royalty payments paid by the buyer to the seller should not be included in the transaction value as additions to the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise under sections 402(b)(1)(D)-(E) of the TAA.
567376 dated Feb. 8, 1999.

The buyer/licensee purchases and imports components and assemblies for use in the manufacture of certain finished products in the United States. Pursuant to Agreement No. l and the Individual Agreement III, the rights for which the royalties are paid relate solely to the manufacture and sale in the United States of finished products made in part from the imported merchandise. The value of the imported components is specifically excluded from the royalty computation. There does not appear to be a linkage of the payment of the royalties to the purchase of the components and assemblies imported by the buyer. Therefore, the royalties are not part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise, nor do they constitute additions thereto under section 402(b)(1)(D)-(E) of the TAA.
546660 dated June 23, 1999.

The license fees or royalties paid by the importer (licensee) to the unrelated licensor are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. Thus the payments are not added to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(E) of the TAA as proceeds of subsequent resale of the imported merchandise. The merchandise is not manufactured under patent, but rather the agreement gives the importer/licensee the right to use a licensed trademark in

connection with the manufacture and sale in the United States of the imported merchandise. The license fee is not involved in the sale of the imported merchandise and the buyer may purchase the imported merchandise without having to pay the fee. Thus, the payments are not a condition of sale and are not added to the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value.
546675 dated June 23, 1999.

Under terms of the license agreements, the fees to be paid by the importer/buyers through the trust to the licensors have the effect of settling a debt owed by the licensee, a party related to the seller. Thus, the payments to the Trust are analogous to the settlement of a debt owed by a party related to the seller and considered an indirect payment to the seller. Even though there is a change in format of settling the payment obligation (the creation of the Trust), the obligation of the parties itself does not change. The fact that a trademark license agreement contains clauses allowing the licensor to retain control over the quality of the product on which the trademark is placed does not in itself render the license fees stemming from the agreement to be dutiable. In this case, the license fees paid by the importer/buyers are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise as part of the price actually paid or payable. The creation of the trust for this case does not change this determination pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
547134 dated July 27, 1999; aff'g 546513 dated Feb. 11, 1998; and 545194 dated Sep. 13, 1995.

The royalty payment is made for the right to use the licensor's trademark in connection with the manufacture, promotion, sale, distribution, or any other disposition of various imported products sold in the United States. It is assumed that the imported merchandise is not manufactured under a patent. Although the payments for the use of the licensed characters are related to the imported goods and are involved in the production and sale of the goods, it is our conclusion that the buyer can buy the merchandise from the seller and import it without having to pay the fee. The license fees paid by the buyer/licensee to the licensor, an unrelated party, are not conditions of sale of the imported merchandise for exportation to the United States. Accordingly, the license fees are not additions to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise as royalties under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA.
547226 dated July 27, 1999.

546951 dated Oct. 22, 1999 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, price actually paid or payable.

The importer entered into an agreement to import partially finished haulers and wheel loaders, which the importer will complete in the United States using U.S. sourced material and labor. The importer makes payments directly to the seller and its related parties. A royalty is involved in the production of the merchandise occurring in the United States, and the importer cannot buy the product without paying this fee. Therefore, the importer's payment of a percentage of the value added after importation is a condition of the sale of the unfinished goods for exportation to the U.S. Thus, the fees paid by the importer to the licensor for use of the licensor's designs, development, know-how, trade secrets, and

goodwill, are included within the transaction value of the imported merchandise, either as part of the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1), or as royalties in accordance with section 402(b)(1)(D).
546367 dated Dec. 1, 1999.

Under the terms of a license agreement the importer agreed to pay the licensor a quarterly payment of the royalty equal to four percent of the net sales of the trademark products in the United States and Canada. The licensor is involved in the production of the imported merchandise to the degree that it provides general styling information and conceptual designs, in the form of sketches and paper patterns to the importer which is used by both the importer/buyer and the seller. The various inter-company design activities undertaken pursuant to the license agreement were used in designing the apparel for the ready-to-wear collection which the importer ultimately purchased from the seller. Accordingly, in the circumstances of this related party transaction, and based on the information submitted, we find that the technical information used in the production of the imported merchandise constitutes an assist under section 402(b)(1)(B) of the TAA. The royalty payments at issue are included in transaction value as either part of the price actually paid or payable, or as an addition thereto under section 402(b)(1)(D) of the TAA. In addition, the technical information supplied by the licensor to the importer constitutes an assist within the meaning of section 402(h)(1)(A)(iv) of the TAA.
546782 dated Dec. 2, 1999.

The importer entered into a Trademark License Agreement, in which the importer grants a non-exclusive right and license to manufacture, or have manufactured and sell Licensed Products bearing the registered trademark in the United States. In return for the license, the importer pays the trademark holder a royalty fee of 10% of the total goods sold. In addition, the 1999 Bags Trademark License Agreement, provides the importer with the non-exclusive right and license to manufacture or have manufactured licensed products and to sell, have sold, or use those products in the United States. The royalty fees paid by the importer to the subsidiary of a trademark holder are not conditions of sale for exportation to the United States, and are therefore, not dutiable.
547557 dated Feb. 13, 2001.

Insufficient evidence was presented to determine whether a *bona fide* sale occurred between the manufacturer and the middleman or whether the merchandise was clearly destined for the United States. If the transaction value between the middleman and the importer is determined to be acceptable, the royalty fee paid is part of the transaction value. The importer/buyer is the party directly paying the royalty fees to a party related to the middleman/seller. As such, unless the payments are unrelated to the imported merchandise, they are considered payments included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547155 dated Mar. 22, 2001.

Pursuant to a supply agreement, seller/licensor agrees to sell the merchandise exclusively to buyer/licensee. If buyer/licensee does not pay the up-front set sum royalty, it may still purchase the merchandise, but does not then have the right to exclude others

from the manufacture of the merchandise. The continuing percentage-based royalty payments are not a condition of the sale for exportation to the United States of imported products. Based on the information provided, the initial up-front sum is included in the appraised value as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The ongoing percentage-based royalty payments are not additions to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(d) of the TAA, in the determination of transaction value, and therefore, are not included in the appraised value.
546626 dated Nov. 9, 2001.

The license fee at issue in this case is related to license rights, technical assistance, basic support, and product design and development of the finished product, not the imported merchandise. There is a rebuttable presumption that all payments made by a buyer to a seller, or a party related to a seller, are part of the price actually paid or payable. As in the instant case, an exception exists when the buyer demonstrates that such payments are completely unrelated to the merchandise. Therefore, the payments are not part of the price actually paid or payable. In addition, the payment of the royalty is not a condition of sale. The payment should not be added to the price actually paid or payable provided under section 402(b)(1)(d) of the TAA.
547761 dated Mar. 14, 2002.

Royalty payments paid for patent and trademark rights, upon importation and subsequent resale benefiting the importer, are dutiable under the TAA as part of the price actually paid or payable. Royalties are dutiable when (1) the imported merchandise was manufactured under patent; (2) the royalty was involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise; and (3) the importer could not buy the product without paying the fee. The fact that a company pays royalties as to both domestically produced and imported patented product does not vitiate the claim that payment of royalties is closely related to the sale of the imported product. Such royalty payments are included as statutory additions to the price actually paid or payable unless the buyer establishes that no portion of the proceeds accrues directly or indirectly to the seller. Additionally, the importer failed to account for future rebates determined by the fluctuation in market prices. If the rebates are not accounted for at the time of entry, this failure precludes the use of these rebates as reimbursements that may offset the duties owed on the royalty payments in a prior disclosure.
548055 dated Mar. 14, 2002.

Payments made to a party related to the seller generally imply that the royalties/license fees are tied to the purchase of merchandise. In this instance, however, Customs determined that such payments are not dutiable under the transaction value method of appraisement. For the subject merchandise, two license fees were paid to the licensor pursuant to two license agreements: one with the seller and a second with the importer. The seller/licensor agreement indicated that the licensor grants the seller the exclusive right to use the trademark to manufacture the subject merchandise. The importer/licensor agreement, by contrast, related to marketing the merchandise in the United States. Royalties and license fees are considered statutory additions to the price actually paid or payable under the transaction value. Duties apply to any royalty or license fee related to

the imported merchandise that the buyer is required to pay as a condition of the sale for export to the United States and/or any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise that accrues to the seller. In this case, the agreement between the licensor and the importer related solely to the distribution and sale of the merchandise within the United States. The agreement was not a condition of the sale for exportation by the vendor to the importer and the seller does not receive any benefit from it. Therefore the respective licensing fee should not be included in the transaction value of the subject merchandise.
547968 dated May 7, 2002.

The importer and the foreign manufacturer are related parties. Additionally, the party to whom the royalties are paid is both the seller and the licensor in this transaction. There is a presumption that royalties paid to the seller are included in transaction value, unless the importer can show otherwise. In this case, the license agreement is replete with requirements regarding the sale of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the royalty payments are a condition of sale for the imported merchandise and are included in the transaction value of imported merchandise.
547148 dated Sep. 12, 2002.

548112 dated Sep. 23, 2002 - <u>See</u> Royalty Payments and License Fees, price actually paid or payable.

The royalty fees in question are not related to the production and sale of the imported merchandise, nor are they a condition of sale for the imported merchandise. Examination of the sales documentation, namely the purchase orders and sales invoices does not reveal any linkage between the sale for exportation to the United States and the payment of the royalty fees. The royalty payments relate to the manufacture and sale of finished licensed products in the United States. The royalty payments do not qualify as dutiable additions to the price actually paid or payable pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(D).
548305 dated Aug. 11, 2003; reconsidered in 547662 dated Sep. 20, 2002 (additional information presented).

The buyer pays a royalty to its related party seller for certain imported merchandise manufactured under patent. The royalty is involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. In addition, the importer cannot import the merchandise without paying the royalty. The payments should be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise either as part of the price actually paid or payable, or as an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
548373 dated Nov. 24, 2003.

Pursuant to a trademark license agreement between the parties, the importer pays the licensor a royalty which is based upon the percentage of net retail sales for the exclusive right to product, market, distribute and sell, to boutiques and outlets products bearing a specified trademark. The royalty payments are related to the imported merchandise; however, the payments are not a condition of sale. The payments are not linked to the purchase order or invoices between the sellers and the importer, and the fees are paid

on products that are manufactured in the United States. Accordingly, the royalty payments are not included in the transaction value as an addition to the price actually paid or payable.
548368 dated Dec. 24, 2003.

The royalty payments constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D). The royalties relate to the imported merchandise and the licensee is required to pay them as a condition of the sale of the merchandise for exportation to the U.S.
548489 dated Aug. 4, 2004.

The royalty fees or payments made pursuant to the license agreement do not constitute an addition to the price paid or payable under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D). The imported merchandise is not manufactured under patent; there is nothing in the record to indicate that the royalty payments are involved in the production of the imported merchandise or are a condition of the sale of the merchandise for exportation to the U.S., and the importer can purchase the merchandise without paying the fee.
548552 dated Aug. 19, 2004.

The importer holds an exclusive license to develop and sell coronary stents that incorporate the licensed pharmaceutical compound. The compound is manufactured in Switzerland by the licensor's subsidiary. The license agreement provides that in consideration of the patent license, trademark license, registration dossier, and other intellectual property rights, the importer agrees to pay fees to the licensor based on the net sales of the compound-coated stents. The payments constitute a royalty that is paid as a condition of the sale under section 402(b)(1)(D). Furthermore, the importer has failed to overcome the presumption that the payments are related to the imported merchandise. Consequently, the payments should be included in the transaction value of the merchandise.
563417 dated Apr. 19, 2006.

The importer pays a royalty to an unrelated third party for the right to use a trademark in connection with the sale of certain merchandise. There is nothing in the license agreement that obligates or requires the importer to purchase merchandise from a particular manufacturer or seller, and the royalty payments are not made to the seller of the imported merchandise or to a party related to the seller. The royalty payments do not appear to be involved in the production of the imported merchandise, nor are they a condition of the sale of the merchandise for exportation to the United States. Therefore, the royalty fees do not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(D).
W563382 dated May 25, 2006.

The importer pays a royalty to an unrelated patent holder for the license to make, offer for sale, import, use, and have others make for it, the licensed products. The licensed products are overshoes, which incorporate soles designed to increase traction on slippery surfaces. An unrelated third party manufactures and sells the licensed products to the

importer. The patents are not design patents covering a product's ornamental design, and although the patents do not technically cover the process by which the imported products are manufactured, we find that the imported products were manufactured under patent. Moreover, the method of calculating the royalty based on the resale price of the goods is not relevant for determining the dutiability of the royalty payment. The license fees relate to and are a condition of sale of the imported merchandise. Therefore, the license fees are dutiable as part of the price actually paid or payable under section 402(b)(1)(D).
H004991 dated Apr. 2, 2007.

The royalties paid by TSA to the Licensor are additions to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D). The licensing agreement granted TSA a license to make a patented snowboard binding system. TSA paid the licensor a royalty fee of 5 percent of the gross sales price of the imported snowboard binding system. It was not relevant to whom the payments were made. What was relevant was whether the royalty was involved in the production or sale of the imported merchandise. TSA would not be able to enter into a contract to manufacture the product covered by the licensor's patent or import and sell that product in the U.S. without having entered into the licensing agreement.
H024980 dated July 22, 2008.

The importer receives bulk active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) from a related foreign supplier, and retains the API in its warehouse until it is sent to a related U.S. manufacturer for production into the finished pharmaceutical product. The U.S. manufacturer makes a supply payment to the foreign supplier of the API. The U.S. manufacturer has entered into license agreements with the related parent company, which authorize it to exercise certain rights with respect to the finished product. One of the license agreements also provides for the supply of the API. The U.S. manufacturer pays a royalty to the parent company based on net sales of the finished product. The cost of the API is excluded from the royalty calculation. The imported API is appraised under transaction value based on the price paid by the U.S. manufacturer to the related foreign supplier. The royalty payments are not dutiable either as part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported API, or as additions under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D) or (E).
H100056 dated Nov. 15, 2010.

The importer contracts with overseas companies for the production of merchandise. The importer, manufacturers and licensees are unrelated parties. The licensing agreements permitted the licensee to manufacture, distribute and sell certain merchandise using the licensed trademarks and copyrights. The licensing agreements were directed to the protection of the trademark and any other intellectual property subject to the agreement and the protection of the reputation of the trademark and the trademark holder, not on the purchase and importation of merchandise bearing the trademarks. CBP determined that the royalty payments were not dutiable as additions to the price actually paid or payable either as royalties or proceeds. The royalty payments went to a third party, unrelated to the seller of the imported merchandise, and did not benefit the seller of the merchandise either directly or indirectly.

H029876 dated Mar. 25, 2011.

The Sports Authority Corporate Services, Inc. ("TSA") requested reconsideration of HRL H047360 dated July 31, 2009. In HRL H047360, CBP reviewed the "Vendor Agreement" letter, dated May 30, 2007, which was addressed to but not executed by TSA, and issued on behalf of the licensee in Missouri. In the absence of the valid Licensing Agreement and given the fact that the "Vendor Agreement" letter referred to the Vendor Agreement between TSA and the licensee, effectively making the licensee a vendor in this transaction, the royalty payments were deemed to be a condition of sale, and, therefore, dutiable. Based upon the additional information provided by counsel in H077419, such as the revised Licensing Agreement effective December of 2009 and executed by TSA and the licensee, containing new information, which was not previously considered by this office in HRL H047360, CBP found that the royalty and license fees paid by licensee to a third-party unrelated licensor pursuant to the above-referenced License Agreement are not a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for export to the United States and do not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D).

H077419 dated Apr. 5, 2011.

The licensee submitted its ruling request concerning the dutiability of certain royalty and license fees paid by the Licensee to a third party patent holder ("licensor"). CBP determined that the technology for which the royalty was paid was incorporated into the imported merchandise and without the License Agreement and the applicable royalty payment, the imported merchandise could not be produced by the licensee; thus, ensuring that the royalty was clearly involved in the production of the imported merchandise. Further, based on the provisions of the License Agreement, CBP found that the royalty and license fees paid by licensee to a third-party patent holder are a condition of sale of the imported merchandise for export to the United States and constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D).

H168397 dated Jul. 5, 2011.

The payments made by the purchaser to the vendors for the imported merchandise are transactions that are separate and apart from the obligation to pay royalties to the licensors. Should the licensee fail to pay the royalty fees to the various licensors, their remedy against the licensees would be through the licensing agreements and not through the purchase agreements with the manufacturers that produce the imported merchandise. Consequently, the agreements and transaction documents demonstrate that the royalty payments paid to unrelated third parties were separate and distinct from the payments made to vendors for the merchandise, and that the licensee is able to purchase such merchandise without having to pay the licensing fees to the licensors. Therefore, the license fees paid by the importer to third party licensors pursuant to the various licensing agreements were not conditions of sale of the imported merchandise for export to the U.S. and did not constitute a dutiable addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(O).

H161675 dated Jan. 27, 2012.

Under the contemplated agreement, the distribution subsidiaries would pay the automotive company a "Territorial Exclusivity Fee" in exchange for the exclusive right to distribute the automotive company's branded products and the exclusive right to use its developed intellectual property for the purposes of distribution, building consumer brand awareness and creating product demand, with a right to the company's affiliated dealers to use the same in a defined territory. The proposed exclusivity fees paid by the U.S. distributor to the related foreign based automotive company pursuant to the Exclusive Distribution Agreement are not included in transaction value as part of the price actually paid or payable. The exclusivity fees also are not a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise for export to the U.S. and thus do not constitute an addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise as royalties under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D). Similarly, the exclusivity fees are not dutiable as proceeds under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(E).
H242894 dated Dec. 4, 2013.

H160935 dated Feb. 11, 2015 – <u>See</u> Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

SALE FOR EXPORTATION

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1) states the following with respect to a sale for exportation:

The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States. . . .
(emphasis added).

The corresponding Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 1, paragraph 1, corresponds with 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1).

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 1.1 - The concept of "sale" in the Agreement. This advisory opinion lists situations in which imported goods would not be deemed to have been the subject of a sale.
I. Free consignments
II. Goods imported on consignment
III. Goods imported by intermediaries, who do not purchase the goods and who sell them after importation
IV. Goods imported by branches which are not separate legal entities
V. Goods imported under a hire or leasing contract
VI. Goods supplied on loan, which remain the property of the sender
VII. Goods (waste or scrap) imported for destruction in the country of importation with the sender paying the importer for his services

In addition, CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 14.1 states the following:

What interpretation should be given to the expression "sold for export to the country of importation" in Article 1 of the Agreement?

The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following opinion:
The Council's Glossary of International Customs Terms defines the term importation as "the act of bringing any goods into a Customs territory" and the term exportation as "the act of taking any goods out of the Customs territory". Therefore, the fact that the goods are presented for valuation of itself establishes their importation which, in turn, establishes the fact of their exportation. The only remaining requirement then, is to identify the transaction relating thereto.

In this respect, there is no need that the sale takes place in a specific country of exportation. If the importer can demonstrate that the immediate sale under consideration took place with the view to export the goods to the country of importation, then Article 1 can apply. It follows that only transactions involving an actual international transfer of

goods may be used in valuing merchandise under the transaction value method.

Examples that illustrate the above principles are then cited in Advisory Opinion 14.1.

Judicial Precedent:

E.C. McAfee Co. et. al. v. United States et. al., 842 F.2d 314 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

This case is an appeal from the Court of International Trade. In the lower court, the plaintiffs challenged the decision by the Customs Service that the value of made-to-measure wearing apparel from Hong Kong when sold to U.S. customers by a Hong Kong distributor represented the transaction value of the goods. The plaintiffs claimed that the transaction value should have been based on the price paid to the distributor of fabric, tailoring, and packing.

The Court of International Trade held that Customs properly determined that the value of the merchandise when sold by the Hong Kong distributor to U.S. customers constituted the price actually paid or payable. The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit reversed the lower court's holding.

The parties stipulated to the following facts. Orders of made-to-measure wearing apparel are taken either in the United States or in Hong Kong. If the orders are taken in the United States, sales representatives of Hong Kong distributors advertise availability and set up a display of fabrics and styles in the United States, usually in a hotel. Customers make selections and measurements are taken. The order is sent to the distributor in Hong Kong. In situations where the orders are taken in Hong Kong, the transactions originate in retail shops of distributors where tourists place orders. In this instance, the clothing is subsequently sent through a freight forwarder to the United States for shipment to the U.S. customer.

Upon receipt of an order, the distributors contract with tailors in Hong Kong to produce the wearing apparel. The distributor supplies the fabric and the tailors manufacture the clothing and then return the finished apparel to the distributor. Upon receipt of the finished clothing, the distributor packs the clothing, addresses the packages to each individual customer, obtains quota and visa, and gives the package to a freight forwarder for shipment to the United States.

The court cites 19 CFR 152.103(a)(3), which states:

In some cases, the price actually paid or payable may represent an amount for assembly of merchandise in which the seller has no interest in the merchandise other than as assembler. In such cases the price actually paid or payable, adjusted by the addition of the value of the components and required adjustments, will form the basis for transaction value.

The issue is stated as follows: whether the custom-made clothing is assembled merchandise within the meaning of the regulation and, if so, whether the transaction value of the merchandise should be determined on that basis.

The Federal Circuit Court of Appeals, relying upon TAA No. 8, C.S.D. 81-92, 15 Cust. B. & Dec. 921 (Oct. 15, 1980), concluded that the cut, make, and trim operation by the Hong Kong tailors must be considered an "assembly" and the imported goods are to be considered "assembled merchandise" within the meaning of the regulation. The issue then becomes whether the merchandise assembled by the tailors, i.e., the transaction between the distributors and the tailors, was one "for exportation to the United States" within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1).

In this case, the Court found that transaction value should be based upon the price the distributor paid the tailor because "the reality of the transaction between the distributors and the tailors is that the goods, at the time of the transaction between the distributors and tailors, are for exportation to the United States." McAfee, 842 F.2d at 319. The clothing is made-to-measure for individual U.S. customers and ultimately shipped to these particular customers.

However, the Court proceeded to indicate that the determination that goods are being sold or assembled for export to the United States is fact-specific and may only be made on a case-by-case basis. In this particular case, the merchandise is unique in that, from the time of the initial contact until the eventual importation, the made-to-measure clothing was being made for a specific U.S. customer and not the U.S. market in general.

Limitation of E.C. McAfee et. al. v. United States et. al, Customs B. & Dec., Vol. 22, No. 18, May 4, 1988.

The U.S. Customs Service issued a general notice indicating that the holding of the above-noted case is limited by the language of the court to the facts of that particular case. The principles set forth within the subject court case should only be applied to the importation of made-to-measure clothing when the distributor and tailor are located in the same country.

Brosterhous, Coleman & Co. A/C Lurgi Chemie Und Huttentechnik GmbH v. United States, 14 Ct. Int'l Trade 307 (1990), overruled by Nissho Iwai American Corp. v. United States, 982 F.2d 505, 11 Fed. Cir. (T) 23, 1992 U.S. App. LEXIS 33746, 14 Int'l Trade Rep. (BNA) 1969 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Crown Zellerbach Corp., a U.S. producer of paper, contracted with the plaintiff, Lurgi, a West German corporation, to design, fabricate, and supervise the construction of a chlorine dioxide bleach plant at Crown's paper-making facility in the United States. The contract did not specify the vendors who would supply the components or the countries from which the components were to be purchased. Lurgi then contracted with vendors in the Federal Republic of Germany for the manufacture of the components and plaintiff Brosterhous, a customs broker, imported the components for Lurgi.

The Customs Service appraised the merchandise pursuant to the transaction value derived from the sale between Lurgi and Crown. The plaintiffs contend that the sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value is that between Lurgi and its suppliers.

The court determined that the contract between Crown and Lurgi did not require that Lurgi purchase the components from any particular vendor or country. In fact, the contract did not preclude Lurgi from purchasing the components in the United States. A specific provision in the contract involving the payment of duties merely stipulated the responsibilities of the parties *if* the merchandise were to be imported.

Pursuant to these facts, the court held that the transactions between Lurgi and its vendors are sales for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value. The prices that Lurgi agreed to pay for the components are the prices to be used in appraising the goods.

Orbisphere Corp. v. United States, 13 Ct. Int'l Trade 866 (1989).

The plaintiff, Orbisphere Corp., sells scientific devices that are manufactured in Switzerland by Orbisphere Labs, a subsidiary of the plaintiff. At issue in this case are sales orders solicited from U.S. customers by the plaintiff's sales staff working in four U.S. sales offices. Orders are forwarded to the New Jersey office, which are then forwarded to Orbisphere Labs in Geneva for manufacture. The Geneva office determines the prices of the products and the local U.S. office has no discretion to vary these prices. The Geneva office also controls the terms and conditions of sale.

The Customs Service appraised the imported merchandise on the basis of transaction value, i.e., the sales prices between the Geneva office and the ultimate U.S. purchasers. The plaintiff contests this decision and claims the goods should be appraised pursuant to their deductive value. Plaintiff argues that the sales of the items at issue occur in the United States, and that they are not sales "for export to the United States" as is required under transaction value.

The Court agreed with the plaintiff and concluded that the proper basis for valuation of the merchandise is deductive value. Based upon the evidence submitted, the court stated that the sales at issue occurred within the United States by a United States company, to United States customers. The merchandise was not sold for exportation to the United States and therefore, transaction value is eliminated as a means of appraisement.

Nissho Iwai American Corp. v. United States, 15 Ct. Int'l Trade 644 (1991) (withdrawn), amended, 16 Ct. Int'l Trade 86, rev'd., 982 F.2d 505 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The dispute between the parties arises over whether the valuation of imported subway cars should be based upon the contract price between the New York City Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) (the U.S. purchaser) and Nissho Iwai American

Corporation (Nissho American), or the price paid by Nissho American's parent company, Nissho Iwai Corporation (Nissho Japan), to the manufacturer of the cars (KHI). The lower court decided that, for purposes of determining transaction value, it was the contract between Nissho American and MTA (the U.S. purchaser) which most directly caused the merchandise to be exported to the United States. The Court rejected the argument that the sale for export was the sale between Nissho and the Japanese manufacturer.

This case was appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The Court reversed the lower court's finding and held that it is the contract between the foreign manufacturer of the subway cars (KHI), and the middleman (Nissho American), which serves as the basis for determining transaction value. Essentially, the Court stated that TAA #57 (542928, 1/21/83), which held that when there are two or more sales which could be used as a transaction value, then Customs looks to the sale which "most directly causes the merchandise to be exported to the United States," is "legally unsound." The Court overruled the requirement of "a weighing of the relative importance of two viable transactions".

Synergy Sport Int'l, Ltd. v. United States, 17 Ct. Int'l Trade 18 (1993).

This case addresses the proper dutiable value of merchandise imported pursuant to a three-tiered distribution arrangement involving a foreign manufacturer, a middleman and an ultimate U.S. purchaser. The issue is which sale, i.e., the sale between the foreign manufacturer and the middleman or the sale from the middleman to the U.S. purchaser, should form the basis of transaction value for appraisement purposes. The middleman in this case is the IOR.

The Court determined that the price actually paid or payable by the middleman/importer to the foreign manufacturer is the proper transaction value. The Court further stated that, in order for a transaction to be viable under the valuation statute, it must be a sale negotiated at arm's length, free from any non-market influences and involving goods clearly destined for export to the United States.

United States v. Hitachi America, Ltd and Hitachi Ltd., 21 Ct. Int'l Trade 373 (1997).

In stating that "[t]he preferred basis for arriving at the proper valuation is the transaction value, defined as the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the seller," the Court began with the price paid by the importer. The Court rejected the related party transactions between the importer and middleman and between the middleman and manufacturer on the grounds that neither was not being statutory viable because the importer failed to meet the burden of demonstrating the acceptability of the related party transaction. Neither the sale between the importer and middleman nor the sale between the middleman and manufacturer represented a statutorily viable transaction value. Therefore, the Court determined that the loss of revenue calculation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1592 should be based on the sale between the importer and the ultimate purchaser in the United States under either transaction value or a modified transaction value under section 402(f) of the TAA.

In addition, the Court supported Customs' position regarding the value information an importer needs to provide to Customs. The Court concluded that the importer was required to disclose and report to Customs all information relevant to determine the value of merchandise under section 402 of the TAA, including the price actually paid or payable and to notify Customs of any changes in the price paid.

United States v. Hitachi America, Ltd,172 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 1999), aff'g in part, vacating in part, rev'd in part, 21 Ct. Int'l Trade 373 (1997).

The United States Federal Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the Court of International Trade regarding the rejection of the sales between the related parties in the determination of transaction value. The Court stated that the fact that the parties are related does not render the transaction unacceptable for valuation purposes "if an examination of the circumstances of the sale of the imported merchandise indicates that the relationship between such buyer and seller did not influence the price actually paid or payable," citing 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(b)(b). The Court of International Trade's decision to use the domestic transaction value rather than the import transaction value as the basis for computing the penalty in this case was reversed and remanded.

Victor Woollen Products of America, Inc., v. United States, 21 Ct. Int'l Trade 1109 (1997).

The Court of International Trade held that Customs correctly appraised melton wool fabrics based upon the sales between Victor Woollen Products of America (VWPA) and its U.S. customers. The Court also analyzed test value comparisons to determine whether the relationship between VWPA and its parent supplier influenced the price of the imported merchandise. The Court concluded that the deductive and computed values submitted by VWPA were insufficient to form a reliable comparison.

Victor Woollen Products of America, Inc., v. United States, 175 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 1999), vacating, 21 Ct. Int'l Trade 1109 (1997).

The Federal Circuit held that transaction value may in fact be applicable, and Customs is to look only to whether the relationship between the parties influenced the price and if the price closely approximates certain test values. If the transaction meets these tests, then it is an acceptable basis for transaction value. The Federal Circuit remanded the case to the CIT for additional fact finding.

La Perla Fashions, Inc., v. United States, 22 C.I.T. 393 (1998), aff'd by 185 F.3d 885 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (decision affirmed without opinion).

In this three-tiered transaction, La Perla imported merchandise from its parent company, Gruppo La Perla (GLP), in Italy, and resold the merchandise to retailers in the United States. Customs appraised the merchandise based on the price paid by the U.S. customers to La Perla. The Court held that the transfer price between GLP and La Perla

was affected by the relationship between the parties. The Court determined that Customs correctly appraised the merchandise based on the sales between the importer, La Perla, and its U.S. customers.

Victor Woollen Products of America, Inc., v. United States, 21 Ct. Int'l Trade 1109 (1997), vacated and remanded by 175 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 1999), remanded to U.S. Customs Service by 163 F.Supp. 2d 645 (CIT 2001), 259 F.Supp. 2d 1289 (Ct. Int' l Trade 2003), aff'd in part and vac'd in part by, remanded by Victor Woolen Products of America, Inc. v. United States, 117 Fed. Appx. 113, 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 24462 (2004); on remand at, settled by Victor Woolen Products of America., Inc. v. United States, 431 F. Supp. 2d 1322, 2006 Ct. Int'l Trade LEXIS 61 (Ct. Int'l Trade, May 3, 2006).

This case involves the appraisal of wool fabric imported by Victor Woollen Products of America (VWPA) from its parent and the manufacturer, Victor Woollen Products of Canada (VWPC). Customs appraised the wool fabric under the transaction value method based on the price VWPA charged to its U.S. customers. The importer disagreed claiming the fabric should be appraised based on the related party price and filed a protest. The CIT ruled in favor of the government and the importer appealed.

On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit found that the sales from VWPC to VWPA could be used to appraise the merchandise provided certain conditions were met. As noted by the court, the valuation statute allows the use of the transaction value between a related buyer and seller provided the circumstances of the sale indicate that the relationship did not influence the price actually paid or payable. Alternatively, the transaction value between a related buyer and seller may be used if the transaction value closely approximates certain test values - either the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise in sales to unrelated buyers, or the deductive value or computed value for identical or similar merchandise. The CAFC remanded the case to the CIT to determine whether either of the two conditions was satisfied, and if not, to make findings with respect to VWPA's deductive and computed value calculations.

On remand, the CIT held on August 29, 2001, that there was insufficient evidence in the record to determine whether VWPA's transaction value closely approximated a test value or to determine either the deductive or computed value. The lower court consequently remanded the case to Customs with specific instructions to make various findings with regard to the unresolved issues, the primary one being the existence of test values.

The CIT found on March 20, 2003, agreeing with Customs, that for purposes of determining the acceptability of related-party transaction value, "closely approximates" of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B) contemplates a specific transaction value of specific imported merchandise based upon a specific test value. The Court rejected plaintiff's contention that the purpose of the "closely approximates" test for the acceptability of related party prices was to ensure that related-party importers do not evade duties by declaring prices that are too low, and therefore additions to the importer's prices were unnecessary since they would only increase them. Thus, the Court agreed with Customs that transaction value based on the price paid from VWPA to its parent, VWPC, was problematic. In addition, the Court agreed with Customs that documents provided were insufficient to

determine deductive value. The Court concluded, agreeing with Customs, that valuation should be on the basis of sales from the importer to U.S. customers under the fallback method.

Heng Ngai Jewelry, Inc. v. United States, 318 F. Supp.2d 1291, 28 C.I.T. 423 (2004).

In this case, plaintiff, Heng Ngai Jewelry, Inc. (Plaintiff) claimed that Customs erroneously characterized transfers from Plaintiff's related supplier, Heng Ngai, Ltd., as commission transfers rather than *bona fide* sales. Plaintiff initially protested Customs' decision but Customs denied the protests. In a challenge of the denials, both parties sought summary judgment. The court held that: (1) whether the exchange was a *bona fide* sale was a material fact requiring litigation where, under 19 U.S.C. 1401a, the use of transaction value was only appropriate if there was a *bona fide* sale and where the evidence did not resolve the issue of the significance of unit price; (2) summary judgment was inappropriate on whether the importer used reasonable care in providing information to Customs
for the proper appraisal of the merchandise where the importer provided what it considered to be adequate information; (3) Customs' evidence did not eliminate the possibility that is calculation of computed value did not make sufficient use of the information available; and (4) the importer was not estopped from presenting new evidence in court that was not presented in the administrative review process where, under 28 U.S.C. 2640(a)(1), the court had authority to develop a record. Thus, the Court denied both motions for summary judgment.

Headquarters Notices:

General Notice- Determining Transaction Value in Multi-Tiered Transactions, T.D. 96-87, Vol. 30/31, No. 52/1 Cust. B. & Dec. (January 2, 1997).

Customs presumes that transaction value is based upon the price paid by the importer. In order to rebut this presumption and prove that transaction value should be based on another price, complete details of all the relevant transactions and documentation (including purchase orders, invoices, evidence of payment, contracts, and other relevant documents) must be provided. Customs rulings will be based upon the evidence submitted with the request.

Headquarters Rulings:

assembly of merchandise

19 CFR 152.103(a)(3); see chapter on PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE, supra.
543737 dated July 21, 1986; modifies 542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39) – See Assists, materials, components, parts and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

543971 dated July 22, 1987 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, assembly of merchandise.

The importer produces components known as "wafers" in the United States. The wafers are then sent to unrelated foreign assemblers for assembly into integrated circuits. After assembly, the majority of the integrated circuits are sent to foreign affiliates of the importer for testing and packaging. From there, they are placed into inventory at the importer's foreign distributor, from where they may be sold to customers anywhere in the world, including the United States. Some of the integrated circuits are shipped directly from assemblers to the importer. The integrated circuits that are ordered from the distributor's inventory may be appraised under transaction value based upon the price paid by the U.S. customer. Integrated circuits sent directly from the assembler to the importer may be appraised under transaction using the assembly cost in accordance with 19 CFR 152.103(a)(3).
W563428 dated Apr. 11, 2007.

bona fide sale

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1); 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 1, paragraph 1

542476 dated June 10, 1981 (TAA No. 28); partially revoked by 542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59) – See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale ; and Transaction Value, sale for exportation to the U.S.

Transaction value may not be derived from the original contract price for imported merchandise where, subsequent to its importation, the alleged buyer refused to accept or pay for the goods. In such an instance, no sale for exportation to the United States exists, because there was no transfer of ownership to the buyer.
542895 dated Aug. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 51); 544262 dated June 27, 1989.

A bookkeeping debit and credit in the related party company books is insufficient to establish the passage of consideration necessary in a *bona fide* sale.
542673 dated June 10, 1982; 543446 dated Aug. 12, 1985, overruled by 543446 dated Apr. 2, 1986 (same ruling number).

The fact that title to merchandise may pass at some time subsequent to its importation into the United States does not preclude a sale for exportation to the United States which may be used to establish transaction value.
542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59); partially revokes 542476 dated June 10, 1981 (TAA No. 28).

The evidence in this case is not sufficient to establish the existence of a *bona fide* sale between the seller and alleged buyer. On the contrary, evidence exists which indicates that the actual sale for purposes of determining transaction value occurs between the

seller and the ultimate U.S. purchaser.
543016 dated Mar. 18, 1983; 542568 dated Nov. 16, 1981 (542568 overruled on other grounds by 543641 dated Aug. 22, 1986).

543288 dated Nov. 26, 1984 - See Defective Merchandise, defective parts returned to the U.S.

Based upon the circumstances taken as a whole, the method of payment between the related parties does not establish the passage of consideration necessary in a *bona fide* sale. There is no reconciliation or settlement of amounts owed by the buyer for alleged purchases. There is no sale between the parties for purposes of determining transaction value.
543492 dated Feb. 20, 1985; aff'd by 544176 dated July 27, 1988.

543485 dated Feb. 26, 1985 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.

543581 dated Sep. 3, 1985 See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.
.
The evidence available indicates that the transactions do not constitute *bona fide* sales and, therefore, transaction value between the related parties is eliminated as a means of appraisement. However, it is clear that the sale for exportation takes place between the parent corporation (seller) and the ultimate purchaser in the United States.
543544 dated Nov. 26, 1985.

Bona fide sales occur between the related parties. However, the evidence establishes that the price is influenced by the relationship, and therefore, transaction value is eliminated as a means of appraisement.
543615 dated Dec. 4, 1985.

Actual payment of an agreed-upon purchase price from the buyer to the seller is not a prerequisite to a finding of a *bona fide* sale between the parties. However, if lump sum payments made by the buyer to the seller cannot be linked to specific import transactions or invoices, then there is insufficient information on which to determine the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise and transaction value is inapplicable. A *bona fide* sale may exist, and may be the basis of transaction value, even where the agreed-upon price will not be paid until sometime after the importation of the goods.
543446 dated Apr. 2, 1986; overrules 543446 dated Aug. 12, 1985 (same ruling number); 543698 dated June 11, 1986.

The contract between the related parties indicates an intention by the parent to sell and the subsidiary to purchase merchandise for a specific consideration. The proof of payment and the reconciliation sheet verifies the amount of the consideration. The evidence relating to the payment by the subsidiary of freight costs and the assumption by the subsidiary of the risk of loss establishes that there is a transfer of ownership in the

merchandise from the parent to the subsidiary.
543511 dated May 29, 1986.

543698 dated June 11, 1986 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, insufficient information to determine the price actually paid or payable.

Based upon all of the information available and viewed in its entirety, the transactions between the Canadian seller and the U.S. buyer constitute *bona fide* sales. The importer has submitted evidence substantiating that the U.S. company assumes the risk of loss and that title is passed once the goods leave the Canadian warehouse. The U.S. company pays the Canadian company in exchange for ownership of the goods. The price actually paid or payable is represented by the invoice price between the Canadian company the U.S. company.
543633 dated July 7, 1987.

The primary factor to consider in determining whether a *bona fide* sale exists between a foreign seller and its related U.S. importer is whether there is a transfer of ownership (i.e., title and risk of loss) from the seller to the purported buyer. Other facts include whether the amounts remitted to the seller by the buyer equal the related-party transfer prices and whether these payments can be linked to specific import transactions.
543708 dated Apr. 21, 1988.

In this case, a passage of title for a consideration has not been established. The following factors contribute to the conclusion that a *bona fide* sale between the parties does not occur under the circumstances in this case: the lack of regular payment with periodic reconciliation of the account; the inability to identify payments with specific importations at any point in time; the inconsistency of the treatment of currency in payment; the lack of any accounts payable ledger or similar recordkeeping; and an after-the-fact attempt to change the insurable interest in the merchandise.
543876 dated July 22, 1988.

A foreign distributor and a U.S. importer entered into an agreement to purchase men's wearing apparel. It is alleged that the contract was cancelled and that the importer imported the merchandise on its own behalf, thereby negating the sale. However, no documentation establishing cancellation of the contract has been submitted. Transaction value is applicable in appraising the goods.
544352 dated July 12, 1990.

In order for merchandise to be appraised pursuant to transaction value, there must exist a *bona fide* sale between the parties. In order to determine whether title and risk of loss passes between the parties in question, Customs examines whether the contract is a "shipment" or "destination" contract as provided for in the Uniform Commercial Code.
544658 dated Mar. 26, 1991.

In this case, the importer has submitted sufficient evidence to establish that title and risk of loss to the merchandise will pass from the seller to the buyer in order to establish a

bona fide sale between the parties.
544417 dated Apr. 10, 1991.

The importer contracted to purchase merchandise from the foreign seller. However, the merchandise became subject to an embargo, and the importer cancelled the original sale for the merchandise. After the embargo was lifted, the importer withdrew the merchandise from bond and made entry as IOR. In this case, due to the cancellation of the purchase order, no sale was consummated between the two parties and transaction value is not applicable as a means of appraisement.
544661 dated June 28, 1991.

No *bona fide* sale of merchandise occurred between the Canadian parent and its U.S. subsidiary. Rather, a transfer of ownership of property was made directly between the Canadian parent and the ultimate U.S. customer. The price that the U.S. customer paid is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise under transaction value.
544775 dated Apr. 3, 1992.

544608 dated Sep. 21, 1992 - <u>See</u> Selling Commissions, addition to price actually paid or payable.

544949 dated Mar. 17, 1993 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

The issue in this case is whether the transaction between the seller and the supplier, and/or that between the supplier and ultimate consignee are *bona fide* sales such that the price actually paid or payable constitutes a valid transaction value. The supplier took possession of the merchandise at the seller's plant for an instant, before title and risk of loss passed to the ultimate consignee. In essence, the supplier never held title nor did it bear the risk of loss. The supplier acted as a selling agent for the seller, and the merchandise should be appraised under transaction value based on the price paid by the ultimate consignee. The difference between the seller's price and that of the supplier is a selling commission.
545105 dated Nov. 9, 1993.

Under the facts presented, there is no *bona fide* sale between the related party Canadian seller and the importer. Rather, a transfer of ownership of property, including title and risk of loss, is made directly between the Canadian seller and the final U.S. purchaser. Therefore, the price actually paid or payable by the ultimate purchaser constitutes a valid transaction value for purposes of appraisement under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b).
544852 dated Sep. 30, 1994.

The information submitted indicates that a *bona fide* sale did not exist between the Canadian supplier and its wholly owned subsidiary. The appraising officer correctly based the transaction value of the imported merchandise on the price actually paid by the final U.S. customer to the Canadian supplier.
545542 dated Dec. 9, 1994.

Based upon the evidence submitted, a *bona fide* sale exists between the related party seller and U.S. importer. Therefore, the transaction value of the imported merchandise is correctly based upon the price actually paid or payable by the importer.
545705 dated Jan. 27, 1995.

For purposes of determining transaction value, there exists a sale for exportation to the United States between the Japanese manufacturer/exporter and the U.S. customer. The related party importer is acting as a selling agent of the Japanese exporter, and the amounts retained by the importer are considered dutiable selling commissions.
544793 dated Feb. 16, 1995; aff'd 544659 dated July 3, 1991.

There is no *bona fide* sale between the related parties. Rather, the related party in the United States acts as selling agent for the seller. Transaction value is based upon the price actually paid or payable by the ultimate U.S. purchaser, and selling commissions should be added to the price actually paid or payable to the extent not included in the price.
544957 dated Apr. 7, 1995.

The imported merchandise should be appraised based upon the transaction value of the sale between the U.S. company and the foreign seller. In addition, unless the buyer provides evidence establishing that a five percent fee paid to a Bangladesh agent is a non-dutiable buying agency commission, the commission paid is to be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
545522 dated Apr. 26, 1995.

The arrangement described between the related parties cannot serve as the basis of a transaction value because it is not a genuine sale for exportation. Instead, the transaction between the related parties is conducted in the context of an agency relationship, whereby the U.S. subsidiary is performing certain functions on behalf of its related party parent.
545136 dated Apr. 28, 1995.

The circumstances of the transaction indicate that the related parties did not act as seller and buyer of the imported merchandise. Rather, for purposes of determining transaction value, the sale for exportation to the United States occurred between the foreign seller and the final U.S. purchasers.
545571 dated Apr. 28, 1995.

In order for transaction value to be applicable, there must be a sale for exportation to the United States. The merchandise in this case is not sold until after it is imported into the United States. Transaction value is inapplicable as a basis of appraisement.
546017 dated Aug. 11, 1995.

A *bona fide* sale exists between the importer and its related party seller in France. The importer obtains title and risk of loss for the merchandise based on the CIF terms of sales

that it negotiates with the seller. Based upon the importer's knowledge of the seller's capability to have its factories produce the merchandise ordered, and the prices commanded for such merchandise in the market, the importer negotiates a price for the merchandise with its U.S. customers. Once a price is agreed upon between the importer and its U.S. customer, the customer generates a purchase order to the importer. When the importer receives a purchase order from a U.S. customer, it generates a separate purchase order of its own and forwards it to the seller. There are no other contracts linking the rights and obligations of the U.S. customer to the seller. The importer has no authority to contract on behalf of the seller. Invoicing and payment for the merchandise between the seller and the importer are conducted independently of the invoicing and payment between the importer and its U.S. customers. The U.S. customers remit payment for the goods directly to the importer. The importer retains its mark-up and remits to the seller only the amounts negotiated for the imported merchandise.
545518 dated Aug. 17, 1995.

The importer solicits orders in the United States and subsequently places these orders with the foreign manufacturer. By agreement, the manufacturer assumes the credit risk of non-payment by the ultimate U.S. customer. The manufacturer further assumes responsibility for all quality-related matters and credit risks. It is the manufacturer's responsibility to fully insure the merchandise against all risks, i.e., if any ultimate U.S. purchaser of the merchandise institutes legal action against the importer for a claim relating to the quality of the merchandise, then the manufacturer assumes the responsibility of defending the claim and any judgment that may be entered against the importer. The evidence presented does not establish that a sale exists between the importer and the foreign manufacturer upon which to base a transaction value. The sale for exportation to the United States is that between the foreign manufacturer and the ultimate U.S. purchaser, and the price actually paid or payable is represented by the price paid by the ultimate U.S. purchaser.
545865 dated Aug. 25, 1995.

Insufficient evidence has been provided to indicate that a *bona fide* sale occurred between the manufacturer and the middleman. No commercial documents relating to the alleged sale (such as a sales contract, a commercial invoice issued by the manufacturer to the middleman, purchase orders from the middleman to the manufacturer, evidence of payment by the middleman, or correspondence between these parties) were submitted. The importer submitted a textile export license/commercial invoice and bill of lading as evidence of a sale between the manufacturer and middleman. However, the export license/commercial invoice merely lists the middleman as the exporter and the importer as the consignee. This document does not prove that the middleman purchased the imported goods from the manufacturer. The submitted documents do not indicate whether there was a transfer of property or ownership from the manufacturer to the middleman, whether the middleman paid for the goods, whether the middleman assumed the risk of loss, or whether it ever acquired title to the merchandise. Therefore, the price between the middleman and the importer constitutes the price actually paid or payable for purposes of determining transaction value.
546031 dated Oct. 12, 1995.

Based upon the submitted facts and evidence, there is no *bona fide* sale between the importer and its parent corporation in Italy. The imported merchandise should be appraised based upon the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. customer. The evidence regarding the assumption of risk of loss is contradictory. Purchase orders received by the importer from the U.S. customer are addressed to the parent corporation. There is no indication that the importer is either able to set its own resale prices, or even that the importer selects, or can select, its own customers without consulting the seller. The shipping terms appearing on the invoices are inconclusive. In light of the importer's failure to adequately explain certain inconsistencies, the evidence fails to establish that the importer is acting as an independent buyer/reseller of the merchandise. Any selling commission beyond what is remitted in the price actually paid or payable constitutes part of transaction value.
545817 dated Oct. 25, 1995.

It appears as if the related party importer was free to sell the merchandise at any price it desired; able to select its own customers and negotiate with them without consulting the manufacturer; and able, if desired, to have the merchandise delivered for its inventory. These factors indicate that the importer was not subject to control by either the manufacturer or the ultimate U.S. purchaser, and the importer acted primarily for its own account, as is characteristic of an independent buyer/seller rather than an agent. It appears as if *bona fide* sales occurred both between the related party seller and the importer and between the importer and the ultimate United States purchaser. However, it has not been demonstrated that the relationship between the related party seller and importer/buyer did not influence the price actually paid or payable such that transaction value is an appropriate basis of appraisement.
545506 dated Nov. 30, 1995.

The evidence presented is insufficient to support a finding that a *bona fide* sale existed between the manufacturer and middleman. The invoices from the manufacturer do not specify the terms of sale. It is unclear as to when or if title to the goods passed from the manufacturer to the middleman. The documents provided by the importer as to proof of payment from the middleman to the manufacturer do not indicate who is the seller of the merchandise. Because the importer has not established that a *bona fide* sale occurred between the manufacturer and middleman, it is not necessary to determine whether the merchandise was clearly destined for export to the United States. The merchandise was properly appraised based on the importer's price.
545980 dated Dec. 12, 1995.

Title and risk of loss pass from the foreign seller to the U.S. supplier and then pass immediately thereafter from the U.S. supplier to the final U.S. purchaser. The supplier holds title only momentarily, if ever. In a situation where there is a simultaneous passage of title between parties, while an intermediary might take title to the merchandise for a split second, these circumstances negate the fact that in reality a middleman is acting for the seller. As a result, the intermediary operates as a selling agent for the seller, and the amounts retained by the intermediary are selling commissions. The only sale that occurs

in the case is the sale between the foreign seller and the final U.S. purchaser and the imported merchandise should be appraised pursuant to transaction value based on the price paid by the U.S. purchaser.
546192 dated Feb. 23, 1996; <u>modified</u> <u>by</u> 546316 dated May 29, 1996 (additional documentation presented which establishes that a *bona fide* sale occurs between the foreign seller and the U.S. supplier and that the sale constitutes a sale for exportation upon which transaction value may be based).

Based on the information and documentation, there exists a *bona fide* sale between the related parties. The terms of sale indicate that the importer possesses title and risk of loss. The shipping terms provided in the "shipment contract" (CIF U.S. port of destination) between the parties and the "destination contract" between the importer and its U.S. customers, indicate that the importer maintains title and risk of loss from the time of delivery aboard the vessel at the port of shipment until delivery to the importer's U.S. customers. The submitted purchase orders between the seller and importer, customer invoices between the importer and its U.S. customers, proof of payment, and entry documents, indicate consideration is paid for the merchandise and that the parties conduct *bona fide* sales.
546067 dated Oct. 31, 1996.

Based upon the information submitted, it appears that *bona fide* sales occur between the foreign manufacturers and the middleman. (The middleman then resells the imported merchandise to a related party in the United States.) Title passes to the middleman at the time of the manufacturer's sale and does not pass to the importer until the merchandise arrives in the United States. The submitted purchase orders, invoices, and bank orders indicate that the manufacturers sell the merchandise to the middleman who then resells it to the importer.
546377 dated Nov. 12, 1996.

The middleman issues purchase orders to the manufacturers for specific merchandise. The purchase orders show the quantity, sizes, styles, and prices of the merchandise ordered. In turn, the contract manufacturers issue invoices to the middleman for the merchandise, and which correspond with the middleman's purchase orders. These documents are consistent with a buyer-seller relationship. The middleman pays the manufacturers in exchange for the goods and the payments are linked to specific merchandise that the middleman orders and which the manufacturers produce. Based on the totality of the circumstances, the evidence establishes that *bona fide* sales occur between the middleman and the manufacturers.
546233 dated Nov. 25, 1996.

The documentation submitted indicates that the terms of the transaction between the parties are C&F San Juan. It is the buyer who bears the risk of loss or damage from the time the goods pass the ship's rail at the port of shipment. The documents submitted support the position that the parties functioned as buyer and seller. The sale between the parties is a *bona fide* sale. In addition, the sale is one for exportation to the United States. The parties are not related, and it has been demonstrated that the merchandise

is clearly destined for export to the United States at the time of the sale.
546142 dated Nov. 29, 1996.

546015 dated Dec. 13, 1996 - <u>See</u> Selling Commissions, addition to price actually paid or payable.

Based on the evidence submitted, Customs is satisfied that the transactions between the parties are *bona fide* sales. The parties negotiate with one another on prices and payment terms. The related party buyer is free to select its customers and set its own prices when selling merchandise to U.S. customers. The buyer is not required to purchase solely from its related seller and, in fact, the buyer purchases merchandise from other vendors. The sales are *bona fide*, but no evidence regarding the acceptability of transaction value has been submitted. Therefore, Customs cannot determine whether the sales may serve as the basis of transaction value.
546553 dated Mar. 31, 1997.

Since the documentation presented with regard to the "sale" is inconsistent in its entirety and does not reveal the substance of the transaction, including the obligations and roles of the parties, it is insufficient to establish that a *bona fide* sale occurred. In addition, even if there is a valid sale for purposes of determining transaction value, without evidence regarding the substance of the transaction and the roles of the parties involved, Customs cannot determine whether the sale of, or the price actually paid or payable for, the imported merchandise is subject to any condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined. The merchandise should not be appraised pursuant to transaction value.
546640 dated Nov. 7, 1997.

546552 dated Jan. 13, 1998.

The transaction documents (between the middleman and the manufacturer) are consistent with a finding of a *bona fide* sale. There is a contract for the purchase and sale of goods between the parties. The contract refers to the middleman as the buyer and to the manufacturer as the seller. The documents further substantiate that the merchandise was for the account and risk of the middleman.
546429 dated Feb. 5, 1998.

The evidence submitted indicates that the sale between the two parties constitutes a *bona fide* sale for export to the United States. The buyer takes title and assumes risk of loss of the imported merchandise in Panama. All of the buyer's transactions are reflected as sales in its accounting books and financial statements. The end purchasers make payment to the buyer and the end purchasers acknowledge that they are purchasing the wearing apparel from the seller. The buyer maintains an office in Puerto Rico where the majority of its customer orders are placed and the buyer employs its own independent legal and accounting staff. In addition, the buyer maintains an office in Panama to handle quality and customer problems in addition to invoicing, billing, ordering and dispatch of merchandise. The transaction constitutes the price actually paid or payable for purposes

of determining transaction value of the imported wearing apparel.
546629 dated Apr. 2, 1998.

Based upon the evidence submitted, the importer (related to the seller) acts as an independent buyer/reseller of the merchandise. The U.S. customers purchase their merchandise from the importer, pay the importer, and they go to the importer for satisfaction if difficulties arise with their purchases. The importer negotiates prices with its related party seller, is free to buy or not buy a line of shoes, and is free to find its own customers and establish prices with them. Therefore, the transaction value should be based on the price actually paid or payable between the importer and the related party seller. Commissions paid pursuant to a design consulting agreement are paid by the importer for the benefit of the seller. These commissions constitute part of the total payment made for the imported merchandise and are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
546541 dated May 1, 1998. (NOTE: Although this ruling originated as a request for reconsideration of 545817 dated Oct. 25, 1995, it is not a reconsideration; additional information and evidence in support of the importer's claim was presented, thereby warranting a different conclusion.)

Based upon the totality of the information presented, the transaction between the related parties constitutes a *bona fide* sale. The terms of the sale governing the transaction were FOB German North Sea Port. The seller completed its performance of the contract by delivering the goods to the port of shipment, at which point the buyer acquired title to the goods. The sale constitutes a sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value.
546087 dated May 21, 1998.

The evidence submitted fails to establish that a *bona fide* sale took place between the importer and its related party. Moreover, there is no evidence in the documents submitted that the relationship between the parties did not affect the price within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B). In addition, the evidence has failed to establish that the goods were improperly appraised under transaction value based on the price paid by the U.S. customer.
546424 dated Feb. 2, 1999.

Based on the evidence submitted, Customs is satisfied that there exists a *bona fide* sale between the related parties and that the relationship did not influence the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The invoice price between the companies is an appropriate transaction value. The buyer is not a selling agent for the seller, but, rather, the buyer is the importer of the merchandise.
546110 dated Mar. 2, 1999.

The invoice submitted does not establish that a sale occurs, and the remaining documents indicate that there exists only one sale, i.e., that between the middleman and the importer. Based on the evidence presented, a *bona fide* sale does not exist between the manufacturer and the middleman. Thus, the transaction value is based on the price

the importer paid for the imported merchandise. In addition, the fees paid do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and are included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. The evidence available indicates that the importer had no control over the alleged buying agent.
546607 dated Aug. 17, 1999.

Based on the documents submitted, the transaction between the unrelated seller and the buyer is a *bona fide* sale. The buyer and seller have negotiated a price for the lot of surplus bearings. The manner in which the parties have agreed on a “per bearing price” is acceptable for appraisement purposes. In addition, the sale is a "sale for exportation to the United States." Therefore, transaction value is the proper method of appraisement for the lots of surplus bearings imported into the United States by the buyer.
547249 dated Sep. 7, 1999.

546946 dated Sep. 30, 1999 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

547019 dated Mar. 31, 2000 - <u>See</u> Price Actually Paid or Payable, discounts.

Based upon the facts presented and the documentation provided, the transactions between the Canadian IOR and its non-related Far East suppliers are *bona fide* sales of merchandise that are clearly destined for the United States. Therefore, transaction value is the proper method of appraisement for the merchandise imported into the United States by the Importer, provided that the transactions meet the standards established in 19 U.S.C. 1401a.
547594 dated June 27, 2000.

The importer orders and purchases all of its imports from its subsidiary company. The subsidiary in turn purchases the merchandise from foreign suppliers. Based on the evidence presented, the transactions between the subsidiary and the unrelated overseas supplier consist of *bona fide* sales conducted at arm's length, wherein the merchandise is clearly destined for the U.S. importer. Accordingly, the manufacturer's price is the appropriate basis for determining the value of the imported merchandise.
547844 dated Feb. 15, 2001.

547155 dated Mar. 22, 2001 - <u>See</u> Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

Although the importer is the exclusive distributor of the exporter’s merchandise, such an arrangement does not demonstrate that the importer performed as an agent of the exporter. In this particular case, a number of additional factors indicate that there is not a principal-agent relationship: (1) the importer acts independently with regard to ordering, pricing, and selling merchandise; (2) the importer purchases merchandise for its own inventory and assumes responsibility for any first quality merchandise returned by the importer’s customers; and (3) the importer purchases the merchandise on an ex-works basis. Therefore, based on the information presented, such an arrangement does not

demonstrate that the importer performed as an agent of the exporter.
547982 dated May 20, 2002.

548173 dated Dec. 6, 2002 - See Selling Commissions, addition to price actually paid or payable.

548165 dated Mar. 21, 2003 - See Computed Value, elements of computed value.

There is no sale for exportation to the United States for merchandise shipped to a U.S. warehouse by a related party seller whereby the importer withdraws the merchandise from the U.S. warehouse on an as-needed basis. Neither title nor risk of loss pass to the buyer until the merchandise is withdrawn from the warehouse. In addition, the price for the merchandise is not set until the related party buyer withdraws the merchandise from the warehouse, and payment is not due until withdrawal. Transaction value is not applicable in appraising the imported merchandise.
548273 dated Apr. 17, 2003.

The transactions between the manufacturer and the importer are *bona fide* sales wherein the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States. The importer takes orders for merchandise from department store customers at the importer's showroom located in New York City. These orders are then forwarded to the manufacturer. The merchandise is shipped to the importer's U.S. warehouse. Based on the terms of sale between the manufacturer and importer, the importer acquires and retains title and assumes risk of loss for the merchandise from the time the manufacturer ships the merchandise to the importer's warehouse until the time the importer ships the goods to the U.S. customers. Once the merchandise has been received, the importer prepares an invoice and ships the merchandise to its customer. Based upon the description of the quantity, style, sizing, and color of merchandise contained in the commercial documents, it is apparent that the merchandise ordered by the U.S. customers is the same as the merchandise produced by the manufacturer and eventually shipped to these customers.
548239 dated June 5, 2003.

548380 dated Oct. 23, 2003 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

The importers may declare as the transaction value the price actually paid or payable between the middleman and the foreign manufacturers. The sales between these unrelated parties are *bona fide* sales in that the middleman will take title to the merchandise and assume the risk of loss. CBP assumes that the price actually paid or payable by the middleman is one that will be negotiated at arm's length and will not be subject to any non-market influences. The transaction set forth establishes that at the time of sale between the middleman and the foreign manufacturers the merchandise is clearly destined for the U.S.
548504 dated June 3, 2004.

548520 dated July 30, 2004 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value

determination.

There was no *bona fide* sale for exportation between the importer and the various manufacturers. The importer and the manufacturers did not act as buyer and seller; no purchase or cost of goods was recorded by the importer; the importer had no inventory; the importer did not provide instructions to the sellers; the importer could not select its own customers without consulting the manufacturers/sellers; the goods remained the property of the manufacturers/sellers until payment was received; the manufacturers/sellers assumed all risk of loss for the transaction; and the importer did not determine or negotiate discounts, which were determined and negotiated between the manufacturers/sellers and the ultimate U.S. consignees.
548609 dated Apr. 19, 2005.

Merchandise is entered based on the invoice price between the foreign shipper and the importer. There is no transaction value because the importer disclaimed any financial involvement in the product, beyond being the shipper's receiving, distribution and transportation agent in the U.S., and did not provide requested transaction documentation, thus casting doubt on the existence of a *bona fide* sale. The goods are appraised, where available, under the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, or alternatively, under the fallback method, using a modified transaction value of identical or similar merchandise or a price based on daily spot market prices.
W548589 dated Nov. 23, 2005.

The information presented indicates that the sale between the foreign manufacturer and unrelated middleman will be a *bona fide* sale conducted at arm's length and that the merchandise will be clearly destined for export to the U.S. at the time the middleman purchases, or contracts to purchase, the merchandise. The middleman and foreign manufacturer will freely negotiate the price for the goods, and the terms on the sample commercial documents indicate that a *bona fide* sale will occur. Although the merchandise will be shipped to Canada prior to its importation to the U.S., the sample purchase order between the middleman and manufacturer states that the merchandise is to be sold only in the U.S. and that the merchandise will be ultimately delivered to U.S. addresses. The sample shipping documents also confirm this. Moreover, the merchandise is labeled in accordance with U.S. labeling laws for textiles and such labels will not satisfy applicable Canadian laws. As such, the price paid between the manufacturer and middleman may serve as the basis of appraisement under transaction value.
563420 dated Apr. 14, 2006.

The merchandise will be imported pursuant to a multi-tiered sales agreement. The sale between the unrelated manufacturer and middleman constitutes a *bona fide* sale conducted at arm's length. The middleman assumes the risk of loss and title to the merchandise from the foreign port of export to a point just prior to crossing the international boundary of the U.S. A complete paper trail was submitted that evidences that the merchandise is clearly destined for export to the U.S. at the time the middleman purchases, or contracts to purchase, the merchandise. Therefore, the price paid between

the manufacturer and middleman may serve as the basis of appraisement under transaction value.
563482 dated June 29, 2006.

Insufficient evidence has been provided to establish that a *bona fide* sale occurred between the manufacturer and the middleman or that the merchandise was clearly destined for the United States. The terms on the invoices indicate that the middleman held title to the merchandise only momentarily, if at all. Moreover, it does not appear that the middleman ever took possession of the merchandise, and no other evidence has been made available concerning the roles of the parties and the transactions. While the fact that the merchandise was shipped from a third country does not preclude a finding that the merchandise was clearly destined for the U.S., no other evidence has been offered to refute the possibility that a contingency of diversion may exist. The merchandise was appraised correctly based on the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. customer to the foreign middleman.
W563614 dated Mar. 5, 2007.

A Swedish company purchases products from an unrelated vendor in Hong Kong. Products intended for the U.S. market are shipped directly from Hong Kong to the U.S., where they are entered at various ports and then placed in a warehouse in Chicago. The Swedish company then sells the products to U.S. customers. The supporting documentation indicates that *bona fide* sales take place. Furthermore, products ordered for the U.S. market are packaged with U.S. adaptors and placed into containers bound for the United States. Goods designed and destined for other locations are ordered and placed in their own, separate containers. The transactions between the Hong Kong seller and Swedish buyer are sales for exportation to the U.S. The imported products may be appraised under the transaction value method.
H017621 dated Oct. 30, 2007.

Although the contract between the importer and the foreign manufacturer uses the term "consignment," the question that must be answered is whether the imported merchandise is the subject of a *bona fide* sale for exportation to the U.S. The fact that the importer assumes the risk of loss for the imported merchandise is one factor in favor of finding that a *bona fide* sale exists. While the importer does not assume title to the merchandise until after its importation to the U.S., the contract obligates the importer to purchase the merchandise listed in the importer's material releases and issue payment by a specified date. Consequently, based on the evidence presented, these transactions are not true consignments that would prohibit the use of transaction value.
H012659 dated Nov. 14, 2007.

Several factors indicate that there is no *bona fide* sale for exportation to the U.S. between the foreign seller and its related U.S. company. Specifically, the terms of sale between the seller and its related U.S. company and between the related U.S. company and its ultimate U.S. customer are identical, raising the possibility that the related U.S. company never acquires title to the goods. In addition, the supply agreement between the seller and the related U.S. company forgives the related U.S. company from having to pay for

the goods when it does not receive payment from its own customers. The supply agreement also places responsibility for the disposal of the related U.S. company's excess inventory on the foreign seller. These, and other factors, raise doubt about the validity of the purported sales between the two related companies. Accordingly, the merchandise shall be appraised under transaction value based upon the sales between the foreign supplier and the ultimate U.S. customers.
H016966 dated Dec. 17, 2007.

Had there been a *bona fide* sale between the importer and its related foreign seller, it would have been appropriate to make an inquiry regarding the dutiability of the service fees paid by the importer to the seller. In this case, the merchandise should be appraised using the transaction value based on the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. customer. The seller-importer transaction may not form the basis of appraisement of the imported merchandise.
H006576 dated Dec. 19, 2007.

A Canadian company purchases children's dress-up products from a toy manufacturer in Sri Lanka. Upon importation it will store the merchandise in its warehouse in Toronto, a portion of which will be designated as a bonded facility. Ultimately, it will sell its merchandise to both Canadian and U.S. customers. When it places orders with the Sri Lankan manufacturer, the Canadian company will issue separate purchase orders for U.S. destined products. These purchase orders are based on past and projected sales to U.S. customers, not on actual orders already placed. This is done to ensure that there will be sufficient stock to handle the orders when they come in, usually during the Halloween through Christmas seasons. This results in the importation into Canada of the products before any orders are received from U.S. customers. Upon arrival at the Toronto warehouse, Canadian-bound product will be placed into Canadian inventory, while the U.S.-destined products will be sent to the bonded facility. There, any defective U.S. bound products will either be fixed, destroyed under Canadian customs authority supervision, or returned to the vendor in Sri Lanka. Surplus or obsolete U.S. destined product will be sold at toy fairs or trade shows in the United States. Transaction value is properly based on the sales between the Canadian company and its ultimate customers in the United States.
H009727 dated Feb. 5, 2008; <u>modifies</u> 563551 dated Oct. 12, 2006.

The transaction documentation indicated that Canada, and not the U.S., was the

final destination. The purchase order had a "ship to" address in Canada, and the shipping instructions ordered discharge in Canada. The "CIF" Canada terms of sale supposed that the goods were going to Canada. Two bills of lading showed Canada as the port of discharge and delivery. The merchandise was shipped from Bangladesh to Canada and from there apparently to the U.S., where it was entered and immediately returned to Canada for delivery. The commercial invoice listed a Canadian firm as the consignee with the address of its U.S. customs broker. Transaction value could not be used as the basis of appraisement of the merchandise as the merchandise was not sold for exportation to the U.S.
W563468 dated Mar. 24, 2008.

The importer did not present sales agreements or contracts between the related parties which set forth the terms of sale or detail the passage of title and risk of loss for the imported merchandise. Similarly, the sample set of documents that were presented including a purchase order, confirmation and invoice did not indicate the terms of sale, or when title to the merchandise passed. Thus, we have no way of determining if the related buyer in the U.S. ever held title to the imported merchandise. Because the parties are related, without a full evaluation of the business records in transactions between the parties, it cannot be determined if the prices that the Canadian seller charged a related party in the U.S. for the merchandise were adequate to recover all its costs plus a profit equivalent to its overall profit. There is no authority to support the contention that the prices charged by the third party sellers located in China and Taiwan in sales to Canada could be used for validating the transaction value based on sales to the U.S. between the related parties. The information presented indicates that the U.S. purchasers submitted their purchase orders to the company in Canada with no distinction being made between the Canadian company and the U.S. company. Therefore, the sales to the ultimate consignees in the United States constitute sales for exportation to the U.S., can be used as the basis of the appraisement of the imported merchandise.
H023094 dated July 22, 2010.

Three parties, the buyer, the seller and the Chinese manufacturer had various agreements between them whereby the seller would transition the buyer to a direct relationship with the manufacturer over a period of time from one to 12 months. The submitted documentation did not clarify who truly the buyer and seller were for purposes of the sale for export to the U.S. Due to the discrepancies found in the documentation, the port's decision to deny the protest was left undisturbed.
H015414 dated Dec. 30, 2010.

SMT is a Swiss company that manufactures and sells high-end racing bicycles. BMC is a wholesale distributor of SMT-produced and SMT-sourced bicycles in the U.S. Both companies are owned by ISH International Sport Holding AG, and, therefore, related. BMC imports bicycles into the U.S. from Taiwan. Under the scenario, subject to this internal advice request, BMC purchases bicycles from SMT, and these bicycles are made in Taiwan by unrelated contract manufacturers. For these Taiwanese-made bicycles, BMC states that it issues purchase orders to SMT. SMT, in turn, issues purchase orders to Action Trading International, Ltd. ("ATI"), an unrelated trading company in Taiwan that

works with unrelated manufacturers in Taiwan to fill SMT's purchase orders. Once an order is placed, the bicycles are shipped directly from the Taiwanese factory to BMC in the U.S. The issue is whether the transactions between ATI, the unrelated trading company in Taiwan, and SMT, the middleman, may be used to determine the transaction value of the imported merchandise. CBP determined that there was insufficient and inconsistent evidence to substantiate a *bona fide* sale between ATI and SMT. As such, the merchandise could not be appraised based on the "first sale" price.
H221835 dated Aug. 13, 2012.

Orlebar Brown Limited imports wearing apparel from various countries into the U.S. Orlebar Brown purchases the garments from unrelated foreign manufacturers and is the IOR. Some of the garments are shipped directly to Atlanta, GA. Upon arrival in the U.S., the imported garments are placed in the distribution warehouse in Atlanta. Some of the garments, which are identical to garments sent directly to Atlanta from various countries, are first shipped to Orlebar Brown's storage facility in the United Kingdom. These garments are then imported into the U.S. by Orlebar Brown and transferred to the warehouse in Atlanta, GA. CBP held that when garments are imported into the U.S. directly from the foreign manufacturers and stored in the warehouse in Atlanta, transaction value based on the purchase price between Orlebar Brown and the foreign manufacturers may be used as the appropriate method of appraisement. However, there is no *bona fide* sale for export to the U.S. when the imported garments are purchased by Orlebar Brown, shipped to a storage facility in the United Kingdom and then transferred from the United Kingdom to the U.S., eliminating transaction value as an appraisement method. The imported garments must be appraised under the next available appraisement method as discussed in the ruling.
H229701 dated Sep. 19, 2012.

H208055 dated Oct. 12, 2012 – <u>See</u> Related Parties, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

The transactions between the Canadian parent company and U.S. importer did not constitute *bona fide* sales. The information showed that the related parties are so closely intertwined that it was difficult to conclude that the U.S. importer acted separately and apart from its parent company in Canada. The record indicated that the U.S. importer kept separate books from its parent company for the years under review. The U.S. importer's bank account was under control of the parent company. Although U.S. importer was separately incorporated and it may have had its own staff of sales employees, the evidence showed that it really functioned as a selling division under the direction of its parent company. The U.S. importer did not maintain any of its own inventories of merchandise. The Canadian parent company was responsible for all warehousing, purchase order processing, invoicing including invoices prepared for U.S. customers, and distributing and shipping of the merchandise to the U.S. customers. There was no substantiation to establish that *bona fide* sales occurred between the related parties. The transaction sales agreements or contracts between the related parties did not show the terms of sale or indicate that there was a passage of title and risk of loss for the imported merchandise between Canadian parent company and the U.S. importer. Although the

U.S. importer filed an income tax return with the IRS, it does not necessary mean that it functions as an independent buyer and seller of the imported merchandise. Rather than two separate sales, there was only one sale for exportation between the Canadian company and the ultimate purchaser in the U.S., with the affiliated company, U.S. importer serving, in effect, as a sales representative of Canadian exporter for the transactions under review. The subject imported merchandise was to be appraised using the transaction values based on the sales to the company's customers in the U.S. Because there was not a sale between the U.S. importer and the U.S. customers which occurred after the merchandise was imported into the U.S. to use in computing deductive value, appraising the imported merchandise using deductive value would not be acceptable. In addition, because we did not have information regarding importer's profits and general expenses, the imported merchandise could not be appraised through deductive value.
H213946 dated Oct. 12, 2012.

The protestant/IOR acted as a "clearing agent" for the sourcing agent for the U.S. buyer. The agent negotiated an FOB Manila unit price, stated to include the cost of materials, trimmings and labor, with a factory in the Philippines. The U.S. buyer issued purchase orders to the factory which, in turn, issued invoices to the IOR as consignee. The sourcing agent then invoiced the U.S. buyer. The IOR was not a party to any of the transactions and was not acting as an agent of any of the parties. Therefore, a *bona fide* sale from foreign manufacturer to the clearing agent had not taken place. Moreover, the FOB Manila sales between the manufacturer and the U.S. buyer, through its agent, could not be used to establish the value of the imported merchandise because the purchase order had no price and the bank payment did not specify what the payment was for. For the same reason, the alleged LDP prices of the goods could not be relied upon to appraise the goods. Transaction value was not available as a method of appraisement.
H204776 dated Dec. 27, 2012.

H233019 dated Nov. 14, 2013 – <u>See</u> Deductive Value, resale in the United States.

Aritzia LP ("ALP") is a Canadian women's fashion boutique company, headquartered in Vancouver, British Columbia. U.S. Aritzia, Inc. ("AUS") imports wearing apparel from Canada into the U.S. ALP and AUS are related parties, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(g), with shared administrative services for both companies being provided in Canada by ALP. In fact, both companies share the same office, as referenced in multiple documents provided for CBP review. The information presented also indicates that AUS was incorporated in Delaware, but it has no actual corporate presence in the U.S. ALP and AUS share personnel in Canada, and all general and administrative functions are performed by ALP. It is not known if AUS pays ALP a service fee for performing these general and administrative functions. ALP states that the agreement between these parties is that of a supplier and distributor. There is no sale/distributor/vendor agreement. The imported goods were packaged and boxed ready to ship to each individual online customer in the U.S., with an order confirmation invoice listing the retail price paid by the internet customer. AUS declared values for the imported wearing apparel based on the transaction value of alleged sales with its related seller, ALP. Based

on the totality of information presented, CBP concluded that the transactions between ALP and AUS could not be used to appraise the imported merchandise, since the parties did not function as buyer and seller. The merchandise should be appraised based on *bona fide* sales for exportation from ALP to the U.S. customers.
H249150 dated Jan. 28, 2014.

The importer was a clothing distributor that imported apparel obtained from the related seller in Canada. The seller purchased the apparel from various countries, imported it into Canada and then sold it to customers in Canada or supplied them to the related importer. The importer was incorporated in the U.S., wholly-owned by the Canadian seller, and had the same address, and telephone and fax numbers in Canada as the seller. The seller exercised too much control over the importer for it to be established that there was a *bona fide* sale for exportation between the seller and the importer. There was not enough evidence that the seller and the importer were acting as a buyer and seller independent from each other; rather, the evidence indicated that the importer acted as a selling agent for the seller. Moreover, there were no purchase orders or other commercial documents to substantiate the FOB Border terms of sale alleged by the importer. The merchandise was appraised based on sales from the Canadian seller to the U.S. purchasers.
H243327 dated Nov. 5, 2014.

H235553 dated Dec. 23, 2014 – See Sale for Exportation, sale for export to the United States distinguished from domestic sale.

There was no evidence of a sale between the IOR and the exporter because there were no evidence of a contract between the parties and there was no evidence of payments made by the importer to the exporter. Though there was evidence of invoices and such documents that showed payments to the exporter, the payments were from a third party, but without any evidence that the third party was acting on behalf of the importer. Because there was no evidence of a sale between the importer and the exporter, transaction value was not the appropriate method of appraisement.
H257520 dated Jan. 16, 2015.

irrevocably destined for exportation to the United States

542310 dated May 22, 1981 - See Sale for Exportation, timing of sale.

Sales in a foreign country are not "sales for exportation to the United States" unless the merchandise is irrevocably destined for exportation to the United States.
542416 dated July 31, 1981 (TAA No. 38).

A delay in the exportation of merchandise to the United States will not negate the use of transaction value where the merchandise was destined for export at the time of the sale and there was no planned or actual use overseas.
544973 dated Jan. 11, 1993.

The importer has submitted a 1981 invoice from a merchant overseas for eleven carpets. The carpets were exported to the United States in December 1989. Transaction value is not valid as a means of appraisement. The merchandise was not sold for exportation to the United States. When the carpets were acquired in 1981, they were not irrevocably destined for exportation to the United States.
545137 dated May 21, 1993.

CBP ruled that the imported merchandise (clothing) could be appraised based on the first sale. CBP held that the design work provided by the importer free of charge or at a reduced cost to the seller/manufacturer was an assist that had to be included in PAPP. A sourcing fee was paid by the importer to its related party, an independent contractor, was determined not to be a selling commission as it was not paid to or for the benefit of the seller or a party related to the seller and not included in the PAPP. The agreement between the parties provided that their relationship is that of independent contractors, not principal and agent. A royalty payment was not paid to the seller and limited to non-manufacturing rights (right to use trademark, trade name and trade dress formats in advertising, store use and signage) and was not included in the PAPP.
548420 dated Jan. 13, 2004.

The importer/protestant may declare as the entered value the price paid by the middleman to the unrelated foreign manufacturer. The transaction between the middleman and the manufacturer was a *bona fide* sale. The "paper trail" which links purchase orders, invoices, shipping documents and payment documents confirms that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for export to the U.S. when it was ordered by the middleman from the manufacturer. CBP is satisfied as to the information provided by the protestant concerning the statutory additions listed in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1).
548526 dated Jan. 5, 2005.

The importer/protestant may declare as the entered value the price paid by the middleman to the unrelated foreign manufacturer. The transaction between the middleman and the manufacturer was a *bona fide* sale. The "paper trail" which links purchase orders, invoices, shipping documents and payment documents confirms that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for export to the U.S. when it was ordered by the middleman from the manufacturer. CBP is satisfied as to the information provided by the protestant concerning the statutory additions listed in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1).
548494 dated Jan. 26, 2005.

The evidence submitted was not sufficient to establish that the transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based on the alleged sales between the various foreign manufacturers and the middleman, but rather that the transaction value should be based on the sales between the middleman and the importer. Amongst some of the findings was that no information was submitted to show if or when title to and risk of loss passed from the foreign manufacturers to the middleman. The numbers for the original purchase orders also differed from the invoices and entry under consideration. Insufficient documentation was submitted to establish actual payment, and there were inconsistencies between the purchase orders and invoices.

W548683 dated Oct. 9, 2007.

CBP held that the goods could be appraised based on the first sale because the goods were clearly destined for export to the U.S. where the goods were identified by an SKU number corresponding to a physical characteristics that could be tracked and a batch number that could be tracked.
H014885 dated Sep. 18, 2008.

The importer was unable to show that the foreign middleman and the foreign manufacturer of imported textile luggage engaged in an arms length transaction and therefore, first sale was not available as a basis of appraisement. Neither all costs plus a profit based on the income statement of the middleman or a transfer pricing study using the comparable profits method satisfied the circumstances of the sale test in this case.
H016585 dated Dec. 30, 2008.

Based on the evidence presented, the imported goods may not be appraised under transaction value on the basis of the "first sale," the price paid by the middleman to the foreign supplier. The purchase order to the middleman was not included. The information was insufficient to show that the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman was an arm's length sale.
H029330 dated Jan. 2, 2009.

The importer claimed "first sale" in a multi-tiered transaction between a Hong Kong middleman and the sellers from whom the middleman purchases footwear. In all, the transaction involved manufacturers selling to the sellers who sold to the middleman who sold to the importer. The sellers and the middleman were not related. An examination of the documents submitted to support "first sale" between the sellers and middleman satisfied CBP Headquarters that the sales were *bona fide* sales, at arm's length, for the export of footwear to the United States.
H017956 dated Feb. 23, 2009; H043478 dated Mar. 23, 2009; H083958 dated Feb. 17, 2010.

The importer, Target, purchases footwear from a Hong Kong company, Kenth. Kenth placed orders with other companies to have the footwear made in accordance with Target's specifications. The sellers did not make the merchandise, but contracted with Chinese factories to produce the footwear. Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc., a party related to Kenth, provided assistance in designing and sourcing the footwear for which it was paid a commission. The design work is performed in the United States. To substantiate the claim that the transaction value should be based on the sale between the sellers and Kenth (first sale), the entry summary, Kenth's invoice to Target, Target's purchase order to Kenth, the seller's invoice to Kenth which referenced Target's purchase order, style names and numbers, and the quantity were submitted. To this first sale price, royalties for the use of a patent under a Technology and License Agreement with a third party were added, and an assist cost for the value of boxes provided by Kenth to the sellers.
H043478 dated Mar. 23, 2009; <u>see also</u> H017956 dated Feb. 23, 2009.

The documentation submitted does not support the Protestant's claim that the imported merchandise should be appraised based on a sale between the manufacturer and the middleman. In order to establish that transaction value should be based on the first sale in a multi-tier transaction, it is the Protestant's responsibility to explain the transactions in a clear manner and to present the documentation in an understandable and concise format, so that CBP can easily follow how the transactions worked. In this case, the Protestant did not explain the transactions and lay out the documentation in such a manner. In other words, the information presented is not a complete paper trail, which shows the structure and scope of the entire transaction. Therefore, the protestant has failed to rebut the presumption that the price the importer paid, as shown on the invoices presented to CBP at the time of entry of the merchandise, should serve as the basis of transaction value.

H002823 dated July 22, 2009.

Importer purchases denim jeans from a Hong Kong middleman. The middleman buys the jeans from factories or from license holders who buy the jeans from factories. All of the parties are unrelated. The importer claimed "first sale" between the middleman and the factories or license holders from whom the middleman buys the jeans. Documentation submitted to support the claim of "first sale" included: invoices, packing lists, export licenses, multi-country declarations, bills of lading, receipts, purchase orders, and sales confirmations. The documents reflected the transactions between the factories or license holders and the middleman and between the middleman and the importer. After reviewing the submitted documentation, CBP determined that the sale between the factories or license holders to the middleman were *bona fide* sales of merchandise, at arm's length, for export to the U.S.

W563605 dated Nov. 19, 2009.

Importer claimed "first sale" between the manufacturers of garments and the middleman from whom the importer bought the garments. Prior to liquidation, the importer did not provide the necessary documentation to support the claim of "first sale." The port liquidated the merchandise based on the last sale, that is, the middleman to the importer. The importer filed a protest and submitted documentation to support the "first sale" claim, including purchase orders, sales contracts invoices, receipts, proof of payment and bills of lading. After review of the various submitted documents, CBP allowed the protest.

H036078 dated Dec. 18, 2009.

A Canadian non-resident importer of men's dress shirts imports the shirts into the U.S. for sale to unrelated customers. A non-resident importer purchases the merchandise from Gentry 1978, Inc. ("Gentry"), a related company also located in Canada. Gentry, in turn, purchases the men's shirts from Classic SRL, a company located in Italy. A non-resident importer claimed that the merchandise should be appraised and valued as entered based upon the sale between Gentry and a non-resident Importer. Under Nissho Iwai American Corp. v. United States, 982 F.2d 505 (Fed. Cir. 1992), a non-resident Importer met the "clearly destined" standard. However, under Nissho Iwai, the sale between Gentry and a non-resident importer must have been conducted at arm's length

in order to serve as the basis for transaction value. In this case, even though both parties were related, no supporting documentation has been provided to CBP to indicate that the sale was conducted at arm's length and that the value of the merchandise was not influenced by the relationship of the parties. Therefore, due to the lack of evidence to show that the price between Gentry and a non-resident importer was not influenced by the relationship of the parties, CBP determined that the sale between Gentry and a non-resident importer cannot be considered as the sale for export. Accordingly, the merchandise was appraised based on the prices between a non-resident Importer and the U.S. customers.
H067846 dated Mar. 15, 2010.

Internal advice request forwarded by the port involving a claim for first sale in a transaction involving a series of sales between related parties, but the initial sale occurs between unrelated growers of bananas and the first related party in the series of sales to the related importer. Examining the sale between the unrelated growers and the first related entity with a presence in the country of production, CBP found that the sale qualified as a first sale for purposes of value appraisement of the imported bananas because it was a *bona fide* arm's length sale of bananas for export to the United States. Further, CBP found that the bananas were clearly destined for the U.S. at the time of sale from the unrelated growers to the related entity. However, CBP found that further information needed to be supplied to CBP regarding the costs incurred by the buyer for packing costs. The price charged by the buyer to the seller (the unrelated growers) for packing costs was insufficient evidence of the costs incurred by the buyer for packing which is the standard under the value statute.
H023269 dated Oct. 27, 2010.

Merchandise stored in a warehouse in a third country was not clearly destined for the U.S. when the invoices from the foreign vendors and foreign shipping documents did not reference shipment beyond the country of the warehouse belonging to the party claimed to be the buyer's agent, the entered quantities did not equal the amounts ordered by the U.S. party, and there were inconsistencies with regard to whether the purchase orders were initiated by customers or for inventory. There were also inconsistencies regarding whether the merchandise line was sold exclusively for the U.S. market as claimed because the website listed distributors in another country.
H130311 dated Apr. 26, 2011.

A Chinese Manufacturer sold merchandise to a U.S. company. The merchandise would be sent from the Chinese manufacturer to the U.S. company's distribution center in China before being imported into the United States. The issue in this case was whether merchandise sold from a Chinese manufacturer to a U.S. company was considered merchandise sold for exportation to the United States. Though there is a presumption that shipments which are not directly shipped into the United States are not intended for export to the United States, the U.S. company submitted documentation to showed the process used by its international distribution centers to send orders to the United States. The U.S. company also showed that the goods that reached the distribution center were already identified for repacking and shipment to their ultimate destination in the United States.

Because the U.S. company successfully showed that the distribution center was a mere accounting and logistics division of the U.S. company that was only involved in sales between the U.S. company and the Chinese manufacturer, it was held that the transactions between them were sales for exportation to the United States. However, the merchandise which was described by the U.S. company as not having been specifically ordered by the U.S. company, or not having been identified by a unique SKU number that identified the goods as ordered by the U.S. company, were excepted from this holding, as they did not have the indicia necessary to show they were goods destined for the U.S. at the time of the sale.
H202435 dated May 22, 2012.

H254798 dated Aug. 18, 2014 – See Transaction Value, condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined.

sale for export to the United States distinguished from domestic sale

The mere fact that merchandise is subject to a purchase order between two domestic companies prior to the importation does not result in a sale for exportation to the United States between the two domestic companies.
543786 dated Sep. 15, 1986.

In this case, the sale for exportation to the United States is deemed to be that which occurs between a foreign the manufacturer and the importer, rather than the subsequent domestic resale between the importer and the ultimate purchaser in the United States.
543789 dated Feb. 17, 1987.

547844 dated Feb. 15, 2001 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

A nonresident importer based in Montreal, Canada placed orders for garments with factories ahead of an upcoming season and then sold them to various customers in the U.S. and elsewhere at a later date. According to the purchase order, the apparel was shipped to the importer in care of a U.S. warehouse that had no financial interest in the goods. The goods arrived at the Port of Los Angeles, were transported in-bond by rail to Montreal, Canada, and the next day, the container was unloaded in a bonded warehouse and goods bound for the U.S. were trucked to the border crossing at Lacolle, Canada. The next day they were entered into the U.S. and customs duties were paid. The declared value was based on the transaction between the Chinese manufacturer and the non-resident importer. On the same date that the goods were entered into the U.S, they were exported to Canada to be warehoused, and CBP issued a Certificate of Registration to the importer for, "Articles reported for export to Canada for similar use agreement, storage and warehousing to be reexported to the USA." Also on that date, the goods were entered into Canada and warehoused under a duty deferral program. There was no known U.S. customer when the goods were sold by the manufacturer in China, and a U.S. customer was identified only after the goods had been stored in Canada. Although some of the transactional and shipping documents list the U.S. warehouse as a point of contact or use the U.S. warehouse's address, nothing in the record indicated that a sale to the

warehouse caused the goods to be shipped to the U.S. from China, such that a Nissho Iwai first sale situation exists. Rather, the U.S. warehouse was merely a nominal consignee. Moreover, the importer stated that it sold the same goods to customers worldwide, including in the U.S., and there was nothing that designated any of the goods for only the U.S. market. Given these facts, the "clearly destined" standard in Nissho Iwai was not been satisfied and, accordingly, transaction value was not available as a method of appraisement.
H219346 dated June 18, 2014.

A Canadian company, both the exporter and importer of merchandise, made various entries of the merchandise to a related U.S. consignee, which was incorporated in the U.S., but had no physical presence in the U.S., and the same legal address as the Canadian company. The issue was whether there was a *bona fide* sale between these related companies to appraise the merchandise under transaction value. Because the seller exercised too much control over the U.S. consignee and there was not enough evidence that they were acting as independent buyer and seller, it was found that there was no *bona fide* sale between the parties. Thus the transaction could not be appraised under the transaction value of the price actually paid by the U.S. consignee to the Canadian company. Instead, some of the entries could be based on the invoice price of the U.S. consignee's resale of the merchandise to U.S. customers, taking into account deductions for applicable discounts, and additions for freight and applicable taping or embroidery charges.
H235553 dated Dec. 23, 2014.

sale which most directly causes merchandise to be exported to United States

(NOTE: See Nissho, supra, indicating that "[t]he transaction which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported to the United States" analysis is no longer acceptable.)

The transaction to which the phrase when sold for exportation to the United States refers, when there are two or more transactions that might give rise to a transaction value, is the transaction which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported to the United States.
542928 dated Jan. 21, 1983 (TAA No. 57); 071374 dated Sep. 27, 1983; 543098 dated Dec. 1, 1983; 543407 dated Dec. 14, 1984, aff'd by 543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988; 543545 dated June 3, 1985; 543498 dated Apr. 15, 1985; 543673 dated Feb. 4, 1986; 543721 dated Apr. 11, 1986; 543687 dated May 6, 1986; 543746 dated May 22, 1986; 543710 dated June 3, 1986; 543726 dated Aug. 25, 1986; 543921 dated May 5, 1987; 543861 dated July 7, 1987; 543624 dated Aug. 26, 1987, aff'd by 544450 dated Nov. 5, 1990; 543776 dated Oct. 21, 1987 (overruled by court case); 543911 dated Nov. 1, 1988; 554998 dated Jan. 24, 1989; 544284 dated Jan. 26, 1989; 544280 dated Feb. 2, 1989; 544286 dated Feb. 2, 1989; 544283 dated Feb. 23, 1989; 555312 dated June 26, 1989; 544288 dated Aug. 25, 1989; 544279 dated Sep. 13, 1989; 555040 dated Oct. 24, 1989; 544289 dated Nov. 6, 1989; 544313 dated Jan. 22, 1990, aff'd. by 544595 dated Mar. 8, 1991; 544465 dated Mar. 12, 1990; 544382 dated Oct. 9, 1990.

(See also Nissho, supra. The analysis regarding "sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported" is no longer applicable.)

Under appropriate circumstances, a sale of merchandise from a middleman (who in turn purchases the merchandise from a manufacturer) to an importer may constitute a sale for exportation to the United States. The transaction may also be the one that most directly causes the goods to be exported to the United States.
542992 dated May 16, 1983. (The analysis regarding "sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported" is no longer applicable. See Nissho, supra.)

543737 dated July 21, 1986; modifies 542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39) – See Assists, materials, components, parts and similar items incorporated in the imported merchandise.

The facts indicate that the sale for exportation to the United States is between the foreign seller and the alleged U.S. ultimate purchaser. The company related to the seller in the United States merely processes the entries and serves as IOR - it is not the buyer for transaction value purposes.
544383 dated Jan. 18, 1991.

A U.S. purchaser placed an order for goods with a foreign distributor, who in turn purchased goods from a foreign manufacturer to fill the order. Under such circumstances it is the sale between the foreign distributor and the U.S. purchaser that most directly causes the goods to be exported to the United States.
544595 dated Mar. 8, 1991; aff'd 544313 dated Jan. 22, 1990 and 544314 dated Apr. 15, 1991. (The analysis regarding "sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported" is no longer applicable. See Nissho, supra.)

The standard that Customs has consistently applied to determine which of two or more sales should be the basis of transaction value, is which sale or transaction most directly causes the merchandise to be exported to the U.S. The fact that title to the imported merchandise may pass at some time subsequent to the importation of the merchandise does not preclude a sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value.
544417 dated Apr. 10, 1991; 544314 dated Apr. 15, 1991. (The analysis regarding "sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported" is no longer applicable. See Nissho, supra.)

In this case, the sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported to the United States is the sale between the intermediary and the vendors.
544670 dated July 16, 1992. (The analysis regarding "sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported" is no longer applicable. See Nissho, supra.)

In approaching a sale for exportation issue, Customs first determines whether a sale has

actually occurred. When there is more than one sale, Customs policy is that transaction value should be based on the sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported to the United States.
544772 dated Oct. 8, 1992. (The analysis regarding "sale which most directly causes the merchandise to be exported" is no longer applicable. See Nissho, supra.)

terms of sale

The difference between ex-factory and FOB sales is that the former results in the transfer of title and risk of loss to the buyer at the factory, whereas the latter results in the transfer of title and risk of loss at the situs of the FOB transaction. In this case, an ex-factory sale is claimed, although the seller arranges, as an accommodation to the buyer, for the shipment of the goods from the factory to the port of exportation. Consequently, the burden is on the importer to establish that legal responsibility for the goods passes to the importer at the factory.
543804 dated Sep. 30, 1986.

The buyer purchases methanol from its related party seller on an ex-factory basis. In some cases, the related party seller prepays freight on behalf of the buyer. Based upon the evidence submitted, the parties have established that the prepayment of freight represents an acceptable accommodation arrangement and that the merchandise is in fact sold on an ex-factory basis.
544181 dated June 23, 1989.

547844 dated Feb. 15, 2001 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

An imported grinding machine between a related buyer and seller was considered a *bona fide* sale based on the terms of sale. The seller did not impose restrictions on the buyer and the buyer was free to sell to any customer it chose; there was no minimum purchase requirement; the seller did not determine the place, time and method of delivery for any purchases made by the buyer; title and risk of loss passed from the seller to the buyer when the goods entered the U.S.; and all sales from the seller to the buyer were final. There was insufficient information submitted to determine if the circumstances of sale test was satisfied.
563400 dated Mar. 29, 2006.

The U.S. retailer specializing in clothing, luggage and home furnishings through mail order and internet sales requested a ruling on the appropriate valuation method for returned merchandise that was imported under the U.S.-Columbia Trade Promotion Agreement. With returns for a credit, the buyer's credit card is credited the purchase price upon receipt by the appropriate central collection point, or for countries without a central collection point, the U.S. facility. Credits are never done as merchandise or store credits, only for the purchase price to the buyer's credit card. If exchanged, the credit is issued and a new charge is created, both as separate transactions. The retailer did not consider return transactions as sales from the buyer to the company. However,

CBP found the return to be a sale and not a "sale on approval" (as discussed in U.C.C. § 2-326 and 2-327, with the title and risk of loss remaining with the seller until the buyer accepts in a sale on approval), since there is a transfer of title from one party to another for consideration. Further, the ruling noted that upon receipt of the returned goods, the company credits the full purchase price to the customer's credit card. Therefore, CBP found a transfer of title such that there is a sale for export to the U.S., and transaction value method is appropriate.
H218759 dated July 9, 2012.

This decision modifies H218759. CBP still found the transactions not to be "sales on approval." In this case, CBP followed VWP of America, Inc. v. United States, 175 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 1999), which found a sale is a transfer of title from one party to another for consideration, and in this case, upon receipt of the returned goods. CBP found a transfer of title for consideration when there is a credit for full price to the customer's credit card, whether it is sent to a central collection point, and not directly to the company's U.S. facility. CBP noted the purpose of the collection point is to return the goods to the U.S., which is the point where title transfers. Thus, CBP found the sale is a sale for export to the U.S., and transaction value method of appraisement to apply, but consideration of the U.C.C. was not necessary.
H231895 dated September 4, 2012.

The importer, a U.S. importer and wholesaler of apparel, received purchase orders from a U.S. company on Delivered Duty Paid (DDP) terms of sale. In turn, the importer issued purchase orders to a Hong Kong vendor on FOB Hong Kong terms of sale. The goods were manufactured in China by a wholly owned subsidiary of the Hong Kong seller. The transactions between the Hong Kong seller and its Chinese subsidiary were not at issue. The Hong Kong seller prepaid the shipping charges to the U.S. and was reimbursed by the importer, an arrangement known in the shipping industry as “FOB origin, freight prepaid and charged back,” which means that although the shipper pays the freight, the cost is actually borne by the buyer, who assumes title and the risk of loss at the FOB port, prior to shipment. The seller also paid the customs duties and related customs fees when the goods were imported into the U.S., and was also reimbursed by the importer for these payments. The Incoterm for these arrangements (FOB origin, freight prepaid and charged back + duty and fees paid and charged back) is DDP (Delivered Duty Paid). Accordingly, the seller sold the goods on DDP Ohio terms of sale, not FOB Hong Kong, and risk of loss and title passed from the seller when the goods were delivered to the DDP destination. Although the importer’s invoices to the U.S. Customer also stated that the U.S. customer acquired the goods under DDP terms of sale, based on the documentary evidence, it was not proven that the importer acted as an independent buyer or seller. The goods were appraised using the DDP prices paid by the U.S. customer, with deductions made from the DDP prices for substantiated charges for international shipping, customs duty, services incidental to the international shipment of the merchandise, and post-importation transportation.
H236428 dated Sep. 8, 2014.

timing of sale

Merchandise that is sold in Italy to a U.S. buyer and is stored in France for an indefinite amount of time is not sold for exportation to the United States within the meaning of transaction value. In order for transaction value to be applicable, the merchandise must be destined for export to the United States at the time of the sale.
542310 dated May 22, 1981.

Jewelry purchased six years prior to export to the United States is not a sale for exportation within the meaning of section 402(b)(1) of the TAA.
542791 dated June 10, 1982.

For purposes of determining transaction value in appraising imported merchandise, the sale for exportation to the United States must take place at some unspecified time prior to the exportation of the goods. If the sale for exportation does not take place prior to the export of the goods, transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement.
543868 dated Mar. 5, 1987.

Automobiles imported into the United States that are purchased pursuant to a program whereby the ultimate purchaser takes delivery abroad and uses the automobile for a specified amount of time in a foreign country prior to exportation to the United States may not be appraised pursuant to transaction value. There is no sale for exportation to the United States with respect to these automobiles.
548371 dated Nov. 19, 2003; aff'g 547197 dated Aug. 22, 2000 (regarding the issue of the acceptability of transaction value) – <u>See</u> Transaction Value of Identical or Similar Merchandise, transaction value readily available.

The supplier, which is the parent company of the importer, ships the merchandise to the importer on a DDP basis but retains title to the goods after importation. The importer is required to purchase the merchandise either upon withdrawal, or the passage of a specific period of time after entry into inventory. The importer must also issue payment for the merchandise within a certain period of time from the issuance of the monthly sales report prepared for the supplier. In most instances, the importer's payments for the imported merchandise will be the same as the transfer price used for entry purposes. Although title to the imported merchandise does not pass until after importation, the presence of the other factors suggests that the transactions are *bona fide* sales for exportation to the U.S. Consequently, the imported merchandise should be appraised under transaction value pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b).
H092448 dated May 4, 2010.

Parent company provides assists for the manufacturer of goods in the form of design work, fabric, trim, accessories, packaging, labels and hangtags. Parent buys the goods from a Hong Kong company which subcontracted production and sells to its U.S. subsidiary under trademarked labels owned by the parent. Parent acts as the non-resident IOR and claims that the sale between the unrelated manufacturer and itself is

the sale for export to the U.S. for appraisement purposes. Among documents submitted to CBP was an agreement between the parent and Hong Kong supplier governed by German law. The sale was presumed to be arm's length as the parties are not related. Risk of loss transferred from the Hong Kong seller to the parent at delivery of the goods in Hong Kong based on the Incoterms used. However, the agreement between the parties was silent as to passage of title for the goods. Under German law, the merchandise remained the property of the Hong Kong supplier until payment by the parent after delivery of the merchandise into the U.S. Based on the evidence of the sale between the parent and supplier, the purchase orders and invoices, proof of payment, direct shipment and fact that title was held by the Hong Kong supplier at the time of entry into the U.S., the sale between the parent company and the Hong Kong supplier was held to be the sale for export to the U.S. for appraisement purposes.
H095240 dated Sep. 12, 2014.

transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale

Transaction value does not exist when there is no price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States. The absence of a transaction value leads to the use of deductive or superdeductive value as a means of appraising the merchandise.
542476 dated June 10, 1981 (TAA No. 28); partially revoked by 542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59) – See also Transaction Value, sale for exportation to the U.S.

542895 dated Aug. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 51); 544262 dated June 27, 1989 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39); modified by 543737 dated July 21, 1986 - See Defective Merchandise, in-transit damage to imported goods.

The evidence in this case indicates that title to the imported merchandise does not pass to the related party U.S. subsidiary. Rather, title passes directly to the U.S. customer. Transaction value is eliminated as a means of appraisement.
542568 dated Nov. 16, 1981; overruled on other grounds by 543641 dated Aug. 22, 1986.

542791 dated June 10, 1982 - See Sale for Exportation, timing of sale.

A vehicle which is purchased in a foreign country and used for an extended period of time in that country prior to its exportation cannot be considered to have been sold for export to the United States. The proper dutiable value can be obtained by adjusting downward the price paid for the vehicle to reflect reasonable depreciation.
542962 dated Dec. 29, 1982.

In a transaction where a machine is imported by two joint-owners and only one of the importer "purchases" its portion prior to exportation, the machine is not sold for export to

the United States and therefore, transaction value is inapplicable.
543243 dated Apr. 30, 1984.

543288 dated Nov. 26, 1984 - <u>See</u> Defective Merchandise, defective parts returned to the U.S.

Merchandise is imported and placed into a bonded warehouse. The importer refuses to pay for the goods and the seller locates a new buyer in the United State who is willing to purchase the merchandise. In this case, there is no price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States.
543485 dated Feb. 26, 1985.

Transaction value is eliminated as a means of appraisement when the importer obtains the merchandise free of charge. In this case, there is no sale for exportation to the U.S.
543581 dated Sep. 3, 1985.

544352 dated July 12, 1990 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

Merchandise is entered into the United States for the purpose of possibly selling the merchandise in trade shows. The evidence indicates that, if in fact the merchandise is not sold at the trade shows, it is returned to the foreign supplier. Transaction value is not applicable as a means of appraising the merchandise.
546673 dated Mar. 17, 1998.

547591 dated Apr. 21, 2000; 547573 dated Apr. 21, 2000; 547628 dated Apr. 21, 2000 - <u>See</u> Consignments, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.

Test fixtures provided by the seller free of charge which remain an asset of the buyer and eventually returned to the buyer cannot be appraised based on transaction value since there is no sale. The price reduced by straight-line depreciation reflecting the book value of the test fixtures is an acceptable basis of appraisement. Imported goods returned to the U.S. manufacturer for repair or replacement cannot be appraised based on transaction value since there is no sale for exportation. A formula starting with the list price applying a deduction for the average repair cost and a deduction for depreciation based on a 7-year life span is an acceptable basis of appraisement.
563355 dated Jan. 18, 2006.

A Canadian corporation imports fasteners from a related supplier in China. Upon arrival in the U.S. they are placed in the Canadian corporation's U.S. distributor's warehouse. The warehoused fasteners remain the property of the Canadian corporation until sold by the distributor. As there is no sale, the fasteners may not be appraised under the transaction value method. The sequential bases of appraisement must be used to determine the appropriate valuation method.
H005402 dated Apr. 11, 2007.

There was no sale for exportation to the U.S. when aircraft parts previouslyimported were

re-imported into the U.S. to be placed in inventory after being continuously moved from one repair facility to another, either domestically or foreign. No transfer of ownership occurred and no financial consideration was offered. Accordingly, transaction value was not an available basis of appraisement. The valuation of the imported equipment using the fallback method and using a rolling weighted-average method was acceptable. The "Fresh Start" valuation consisted of evaluating tangible assets, for which the original transaction price was used as the starting point. Deductions were made from the list price for depreciation and the estimated cost of repair, and a sampling methodology was employed. This method was deemed acceptable as it was based on a fair market value assessment and accounted for an adjustment for depreciation and for costs of repairs.
H019722 dated Mar. 21, 2008.

A U.S. corporation instructed its related agent to place purchase orders for merchandise with two Hong Kong sellers. The Hong Kong sellers, in turn, both placed orders for the merchandise with the same Chinese manufacturer. Under both contracts, the merchandise was shipped from Hong Kong to the U.S. and entered by the importer, characterized as being the "alter ego" of the Hong Kong sellers, appointed to act as IOR on behalf of each Hong Kong seller. A freight management company acted as an agent for both Hong Kong sellers and was responsible for paying for cargo insurance, provisional import charges and duties for both contracts. In addition, the selling agent was authorized to receive payment from the buying agent on behalf of one of the Hong Kong sellers. The selling agent and the IOR are not related. There was no evidence of sales between the IOR and the Hong Kong sellers or their agent, nor was there any indication that the IOR was an agent of the Hong Kong sellers or in any way related to their selling agent. Thus, the IOR could not rely on the documents of third parties to appraise its entries. Transaction value was not available as a method of appraisement.
H105276 dated Aug. 17, 2012.

Related party transactions involving a foreign parent and U.S. subsidiary in which the parent "sold" goods to its subsidiary and the subsidiary factored all of its accounts receivable to the parent. CBP found that no sale occurred between the parent and the subsidiary as the factoring agreement was not an arm's length agreement and consideration was not transferred from the subsidiary to the parent for the imported goods. CBP found the subsidiary was a selling agent of the parent. As there was no sale, transaction value could not serve as the basis for appraisement of the imported goods. The parent maintained an internal price list with four levels of prices for each product. Goods were to be appraised based on the sale between the parent and the customer in the U.S. when the customer was clearly identified as the ultimate consignee at the time of entry, the customer in the U.S. was known to the importer at the time of entry, and the goods were delivered to the customer in the U.S. at or about the time of entry. Goods which were entered into inventory for the subsidiary for later sale, i.e., goods from entries other than where the customer in the U.S. was clearly identified as the ultimate consignee at the time of entry, the customer in the U.S. was known to the importer at the time of entry, or the goods were delivered to the customer in the U.S. at or about the time of entry, were to be appraised based upon modified transaction value utilizing prices from the parent's price list.

H008101 dated Oct. 9, 2012.

transaction value determination

The evidence in this case indicates that the sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value is that between the manufacturer and the ultimate U.S. purchaser. The importer acts as a selling agent, and the amount retained by the importer from the invoiced prices to the purchaser is considered to be a dutiable selling commission.
544659 dated July 3, 1991; aff'd by 544793 dated Feb. 16, 1995.

Printing presses are purchased from a foreign vendor by a U.S. buyer with instructions to ship the presses to Canada for exhibition in a trade show. The presses are subsequently stored in Toronto until they are sold to a second U.S. buyer. The sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of transaction value is the second sale. It was not until the second sale that the merchandise was in fact exported to the United States.
544633 dated Aug. 2, 1991.

The evidence submitted in this case does not establish that the merchandise was ever sold for exportation to the United States within the meaning of section 402(b)(1) of the TAA. Since it cannot be established that the merchandise was ever sold for export to the U.S., transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement.
544544 dated Nov. 1, 1991.

A U.S. company receives orders from its U.S. customers and, in turn, submits the orders to its related company in Italy. There is no sale for export between the two related parties because the transfer does not constitute a sale. It is the sale between the Italian company and the final U.S. customer, as facilitated by the related U.S. company, that causes the merchandise to be exported to the United States. There is a transaction value, and the U.S. company is a selling agent. The commission that the U.S. customer incurs for the U.S. company's services as a selling agent should be added to the price actually paid or payable.
544949 dated Mar. 17, 1993.

Once it is determined that both the manufacturer's price and a middleman's price are statutorily viable transaction values, then the manufacturer's price, rather than the price from the middleman to the purchaser, is used as transaction value. However, the manufacturer's price constitutes a viable transaction value when the goods are clearly destined for export to the United States and the manufacturer and middleman deal with one another at arm's length, in the absence of any non-market influences that affect the legitimacy of the sales price. Here, the manufacturer and middleman did not deal with each other at arm's length and the price was influenced by the relationship. There is only one statutorily viable transaction value that is acceptable, and it is the sale between the middleman and U.S. purchaser.
544579 dated Sep. 30, 1993.

If an importer requests appraisement based upon the price paid by a middleman to the foreign manufacturer, and the importer is not the middleman, it is the importer's responsibility to show that the price is acceptable. If requested by Customs, the importer must provide sufficient evidence to indicate that the sale was an "arm's length sale," and that it was "a sale for export to the United States," within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b). If the importer is unable to provide sufficient evidence from the middleman supporting the claim, then Customs has no authority to appraise under transaction value based on any price other than what the importer paid. In this case, no evidence was submitted to indicate that the goods were clearly destined for the United States or that the sale was at arm's length. The merchandise should be appraised based on the price paid by the importer to the foreign seller.
545144 dated Jan. 19, 1994.

The middleman sells exclusively to purchasers in the United States. Every item the middleman purchases from its suppliers, whether for inventory or in response to a specific purchase order, is destined for the United States at the time of sale. The middleman is not related to any of its suppliers and the sales between the middleman and the suppliers are at "arm's length." The transaction value may be based upon the price the middleman/distributor paid to its suppliers/manufacturers, even though the middleman is not the importer.
545265 dated Mar. 4, 1994.

The middleman and the manufacturers are not related and they deal with each other on an arm's length basis. Evidence has been submitted to indicate that the merchandise is destined for the United States. Purchase contracts between the importer and the middleman indicate that the merchandise is designed and manufactured according to the importer's specifications. The merchandise is tagged with the importer's label and sent directly from the manufacturer to the importer. The purchase orders indicate that the manufacturer has access to the quota-visa required to ensure entry of the merchandise. The price between the manufacturers and the middleman constitutes the price actually paid or payable.
545271 dated Mar. 4, 1994.

The middleman and the manufacturer of the equipment at issue are not related and they deal with each other on an arm's length basis. The purchase orders between the middleman and the foreign manufacturer indicate that the imported merchandise is designed to meet U.S. standards, including a clause that indicates that all materials and fabrication for the equipment should be in accordance with the ASME (American Society for Mechanical Engineers) Code. The purchase order notes that all nameplates and caution signs associated with the imported equipment are to be supplied by, and bear the name of, the middleman. The manufacturer is aware not only that the middleman is a U.S. company, but that the middleman's customer is also a U.S. company. The purchase order leaves no doubt that the merchandise is clearly destined for export to the United States. Consequently, the manufacturer's price constitutes a valid transaction value.
545262 dated Mar. 11, 1994.

A *bona fide* sale for exportation occurs between the seller in Canada and the ultimate U.S. buyer in instances where the seller ships the merchandise directly to the buyer, FOB Vancouver, with title and risk of loss passing to the buyer at the time the merchandise is placed on the carrier for shipment to the United States. As long as it is possible to determine the price actually paid or payable, it is proper to appraise the merchandise under transaction value. However, transaction value may not be used unless there is sufficient information available to determine the price actually paid or payable. There is no evidence that a sale for exportation existed between the Canadian seller and the ultimate U.S. buyer on those occasions where the merchandise is first shipped to an agent in the United States. As a result, merchandise imported under these conditions must be appraised using a method other than transaction value.
545447 dated May 12, 1994.

Sufficient evidence was submitted to demonstrate that (1) the sale was "at arm's length" and (2) at the time the middleman purchased, or contracted to purchase, the imported goods, they were "clearly destined for the United States." Therefore, the transaction value of the imported merchandise may be based upon the sale for exportation between the Hong Kong middleman and the manufacturer.
545360 dated May 31, 1994.

There is no dispute that the merchandise in question originated in Indonesia; however, nothing in the documentation submitted indicates that the merchandise was destined for the United States at the time it was exported from Indonesia. To the contrary, each of the documents submitted indicates Canada as the final destination of the goods. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that the merchandise was sold for exportation to the United States at the time it was exported from Indonesia. Nor is there any evidence or claim that a *bona fide* sale for exportation occurred between the Canadian company and the importer in the United States. In the absence of any sale for exportation to the United States, transaction value is not an appropriate means of appraisement.
545434 dated May 31, 1994.

The only sale for exportation to the United States occurred between the foreign seller and the ultimate U.S. purchaser. The merchandise in question was shipped directly to the U.S. purchaser. The ultimate purchaser was the IOR, which had title to and bore the risk of loss for the merchandise when it entered the United States. Consequently, there is only one statutorily viable transaction value.
544835 dated June 15, 1994.

Insufficient evidence has been presented to overcome the presumption that transaction value should be based upon the price paid by the importer to the middleman. The Korean seller's invoice and the export visa submitted are insufficient to establish that the goods were clearly destined for the United States.
545648 dated Aug. 31, 1994.

The documentation is insufficient to establish that the sale for exportation to the United

States took place between the manufacturer and the middleman. Therefore, the importer has not overcome the presumption that the price it paid to the middleman should serve as the basis of transaction value. The transaction value of the merchandise should be based upon the price paid by the importer.
545499 dated Oct. 13, 1994.

The appraising officer correctly based the transaction value of the imported merchandise on the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman. The documentation submitted is insufficient to support the importer's claim that the transaction value should be based upon the price paid by the middleman to the manufacturer.
545560 dated Oct. 14, 1994.

With regard to whether the transaction value may be based on the sale between the middleman and the manufacturer, the appropriate evidence needs to be tendered to the appraising officer. Such evidence includes invoices, purchase orders, letters of credit, bills of lading, agreements between the parties, and proof of payment. The evidence must establish that the transaction was "a sale for export to the United States," that is, that at the time the middleman purchased, or contracted to purchase, the imported goods were clearly destined for the United States and that the transaction was an "arm's length sale." At that point, a determination may be made as to whether the transaction value should be based on the sale between the middleman and the foreign manufacturer.
545714 dated Nov. 9, 1994.

Because the manufacturer and the middleman are related parties and insufficient evidence was submitted to demonstrate that they dealt with each other at arm's length, the transaction value was properly based upon the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise by the importer.
545377 dated Nov. 10, 1994.

The importer has established that the sale from the foreign manufacturer to the middleman is conducted at "arm's length." In addition, the importer has provided sufficient evidence that the duffle bags were clearly destined for the United States, even though they were shipped through Canada. The duffle bags were special ordered by a specific U.S. purchaser, bore its logo, and were ultimately sent to that purchaser. Even though the bags were initially shipped to Canada, the evidence indicates that they were shipped in-bond and there is no indication that there was any planned or actual use of the bags in Canada. The sale for exportation to the United States occurred between the middleman and the foreign seller.
545254 dated Nov. 22, 1994; <u>modifies</u> 544714 dated Mar. 3, 1992 (additional clarifying evidence presented).

The manufacturer and middleman are related parties and insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that they dealt with each other at arm's length. The price paid by the middleman to the manufacturer can not serve as the basis of transaction value.
544711 dated Dec. 23, 1994.

Sufficient evidence was submitted to demonstrate that (1) the sales were at "arm's length" and (2) at the time the middleman purchased, or contracted to purchase, the imported goods, they were "clearly destined for the United States." Therefore, the transaction value of the imported merchandise may be based upon the sale for exportation between the middleman and the manufacturer.
545508 dated Jan. 20, 1995.

Transaction value is based upon the price paid by the importer which is the invoiced amount paid by the importer including the amount remitted to the manufacturers and the markup retained by the middleman.
545129 dated Mar. 6, 1995.

Transaction value of the imported merchandise should be determined with respect to the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman. There is no basis for determining that the manufacturer's price constitutes a viable transaction value. Accordingly, the presumption that the importer's price is the appropriate basis of appraisement has not been overcome. In addition, this price paid by the importer includes the cost of quota. Consequently, these amounts are properly part of the price actually paid or payable.
545603 dated Mar. 10, 1995; 545604 dated Mar. 10, 1995.

There is a presumption that transaction value is based upon the price that the importer pays. Absent sufficient information to determine that another transaction is a *bona fide* sale, the merchandise is to be appraised based upon the price paid by the importer. When the importer presents an invoice from a sale between the middleman and the foreign seller, it is the importer's burden to show that such a sale was at "arm's length" and that the goods sold were "clearly destined for the United States." The importer has not met this burden, and transaction value should be based upon the price paid by the importer.
545645 dated Apr. 11, 1995.

The appraising officer correctly based the transaction value of the imported merchandise on the price that the importer paid to the middleman. It is not clear from the evidence presented whether there exists a sale between the manufacturer and the middleman.
545595 dated Apr. 26, 1995.

The presumption that transaction value should be based upon the price paid by the importer to the middleman has not been overcome. No evidence has been provided that indicates that the merchandise is "clearly destined" for the United States at the time it is sold from the manufacturer to the middleman. Also, the middleman resells merchandise to countries other than the United States and the purchase orders do not designate which of the items in the order are destined for the United States. The transaction value should be based upon the price paid by the importer to the middleman.
545815 dated Apr. 28, 1995.

The appraising officer correctly based the transaction value of the imported merchandise

on the price that the importer paid to the middleman. With regard to whether transaction value may be based on the transaction between the middleman and the manufacturer, it is unclear whether there was a sale between the manufacturer and the middleman. No documentation has been provided to establish a sale between the manufacturer and middleman.

545657 dated May 5, 1995.

The middleman and the foreign manufacturer are not related and the sales from the foreign manufacturer to the middleman constitute independent, arm's length transactions. Evidence has been submitted to establish that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States. The invoices and purchase orders indicate that the merchandise is to be shipped to the importer. When the middleman contracts with the manufacturer and before the merchandise for export to the United States is produced, the parties are aware that the product is being produced for export to the United States. A sale for exportation occurred between the middleman and the foreign manufacturer. Consequently, the transaction value of the merchandise is correctly based on the price actually paid or payable by the middleman to the foreign manufacturer.

545709 dated May 12, 1995.

The middleman and the foreign manufacturers are not related and the sales are at arm's length. In addition, the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States at the time it is sold from the manufacturer to the middleman. The merchandise is designed and manufactured according to the importer's specifications and is shipped directly to the importer. Based upon the evidence presented, the transaction value of the imported merchandise is appropriately based on the price paid by the middleman to the manufacturers.

545612 dated May 25, 1995.

The submitted documents relating to the transaction between the middleman and foreign seller, such as order confirmations and invoices, indicate that the merchandise was to be shipped to New York or to another location in the United States. In addition, the evidence indicates that the imported goods were manufactured specifically for the middleman's customer. At the time that the middleman purchased the merchandise from the foreign seller, it was clearly destined for the United States. In addition, the sale between the middleman and the foreign seller was at arm's length. The transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the sale from the foreign seller to the middleman.

545898 dated June 12, 1995.

The importer has presented a number of factors that indicate that the imported hair dryers are clearly destined for the United States. First, there is the exclusive use of the English language on the packaging and use care manual. Second, the electrical products bear the Underwriters Laboratory Trademark, indicating that the products meet safety standards of an organization that tests products for the U.S. market. Third, the electrical products are made to operate on 110-volt electrical current, which is not used outside of North America. Fourth, the products bear a U.S. trademark which is licensed to the

importer. Finally, the shipping documents indicate that the merchandise is to be delivered to the importer in the United States. In addition, the importer has established that the manufacturer and the middleman are unrelated and it is presumed that they negotiated with each other at arm's length. Therefore, the transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the price actually paid or payable by the middleman to the manufacturer.

545368 dated July 6, 1995.

In order to appraise the imported merchandise on the lower price that the middleman pays to the manufacturer, the importer must present sufficient evidence that the sale was an arm's length sale and that it was a sale for exportation to the United States. The foreign manufacturers in this case are not related to the middleman, and the sales from the foreign manufacturers to the middleman constitute independent, arm's length transactions. In addition, evidence demonstrating that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States has been presented. The imported merchandise is the result of an order from the importer to the middleman who in turn places an order with the manufacturer. The merchandise is manufactured specifically for the importer for the U.S. market. Transaction value may be based on the price that the middleman pays the manufacturer.

545967 dated July 7, 1995.

The importer has established that there was a *bona fide* sale between the foreign manufacturer and the middleman and that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for exportation to the United States when sold by the manufacturer to the middleman. However, the importer has not established that the transactions were at arm's length and that the relationship between the middleman and the manufacturer did not influence the price. Consequently, the transaction value of the merchandise should be based on the price actually paid or payable by the importer.

545272 dated Aug. 17, 1995.

The importer purchases cameras, lenses, and other merchandise from its Japanese parent company. The parent company acts as middleman in the transaction. The middleman and the foreign manufacturer are unrelated, that is, they deal with one another at "arm's length." The importer has also established that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States at the time it is sold to the middleman. A copy of warranty information that accompanies all merchandise purchased for the U.S. market has been submitted. The warranty applies only to merchandise sold in the United States. In addition, the manner in which the merchandise is purchased further supports a finding that the merchandise is clearly destined for export to the United States. Based on the information presented, the manufacturer's price to the middleman constitutes a viable transaction value under section 402(b)(1) of the TAA.

545979 dated Aug. 24, 1995.

A *bona fide* sale exists between the middleman and the unrelated foreign manufacturers. The sales between the manufacturers and the middleman are independent, arm's length transactions. The evidence presented demonstrates that at the time the purchase orders

for the footwear are placed with the manufacturers, the goods are clearly destined for the United States. Purchase orders include instructions to ship the merchandise directly from the factory to the United States. The manufacturers are instructed to mark the merchandise in English with the country of origin, and labels relating to constituent materials must comply with particular labeling guidelines of the Federal Trade Commission. Further, the manufacturers are required to mark the cartons in which the merchandise is packed for international shipment with the name and address of the U.S. importer. In addition, the manufacturers are required to complete a special invoice that is intended to satisfy U.S. Customs' invoicing requirements for certain classes of footwear. A sale for exportation to the United States takes place between the middleman and the foreign manufacturers. The transaction value is based on the price actually paid or payable by the middleman to the manufacturers.
545474 dated Aug. 25, 1995.

Without information indicating whether the middleman and the foreign manufacturers are related, it cannot be concluded that the transactions are conducted at arm's length. Furthermore, evidence indicating that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States is insufficient, by itself, to rebut the presumption that the importer's price is the basis of transaction value. Regarding the evidence submitted concerning whether the goods are clearly destined for the United States, the manufacturer's invoice does not specify the name of the importer, nor does it indicate that the goods are destined for delivery in the United States. To the contrary, the invoice specifies that delivery of the merchandise is local. Additionally, no purchase orders were submitted from the importer that could link the imported merchandise to the merchandise referenced on the manufacturer's invoice. The transaction value should be based upon the price actually paid or payable by the importer.
545627 dated Sep. 13, 1995.

There is no evidence to establish that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for the United States at the time of the alleged sale between the toy manufacturer and middleman. The middleman sells its products to many countries. The middleman is under no contractual obligation to deliver specific merchandise to the importer at a certain time. In addition, the evidence fails to establish that the transactions between the manufacturer and the middleman were at arm's length. The imported merchandise should not be appraised based on the transaction between the middleman and the toy manufacturer.
546091 dated Jan. 3, 1996.

The suppliers of the imported merchandise and the middleman are not related, and the sales occur at arm's length. The commercial invoices indicate that the merchandise is to be shipped by the suppliers directly to the importer in the United States. The importer orders the goods from the middleman who, in turn, orders them from the suppliers, and all parties are aware that the goods are produced for export to the United States. The merchandise purchased by the middleman from the suppliers is clearly destined for export to the importer in the United States. Therefore, the sale between the suppliers and the middleman constitutes a sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of

determining transaction value.
546143 dated Feb. 23, 1996.

Based upon the documentation, Customs cannot determine whether the middleman was acting as an independent buyer/reseller of imported goods, or whether instead, the middleman was acting as a selling agent for its parent company, the manufacturer of the merchandise. The importer has failed to persuade Customs that the claimed transaction is a valid sale for exportation. Therefore, the presumption that transaction value is based on the price actually paid or payable by the importer controls in this case.
545804 dated Feb. 27, 1996.

The imported merchandise is designed, ordered, produced, and labeled explicitly for the U.S. market. The wearing apparel is labeled in accordance with relevant Federal Trade Commission requirements pertaining to content and care instructions, as well as with both U.S. designations and the private labels of the U.S. retailers. In addition, the apparel is accompanied by properly visaed export licenses issued by the appropriate authorities in the People's Republic of China. The evidence available indicates that the sale between the middleman and manufacturer is a *bona fide*, arm's length sale for export to the United States. Therefore, the price between the middleman and manufacturer constitutes the price actually paid or payable for purposes of determining transaction value.
546206 dated Apr. 11, 1996.

The imported garments are made pursuant to the U.S. customer's specifications. These specifications are set forth on purchase orders that the importer receives from its customers. The importer then provides the specifications to the middleman. The middleman then provides the manufacturers with the specifications. The purchase orders between the middleman and the manufacturers state that the finished goods are for export to the United States and must comport with the specifications. The export packing identifies the goods as destined for the United States. In addition, the manufacturer and the middleman are not related. The sale is an arm's length sale and is free from any non-market influences that affect the legitimacy of the sales price. Accordingly, the sale between the manufacturers and the middleman constitutes a sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value.
546288 dated July 11, 1996.

The importer has not overcome the presumption that the imported merchandise should be appraised on the basis of the price that the importer paid the middleman. The documentation submitted contains certain discrepancies. There are discrepancies between the manufacturer's price as reflected on the commercial invoice and the manufacturer's price as stated on the visaed invoice. The discrepancies between the commercial and visaed invoices raise the presumption that the documents contain false or erroneous information in regard to appraisement. The imported merchandise should be based upon the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman.
545920 dated July 25, 1996.

The importer has failed to rebut the presumption that the price the importer paid, as shown on the

invoices presented to Customs at the time of entry of the merchandise, should serve as the basis of transaction value. The evidence presented does not establish that there were sales for exportation to the United States between the supplier and the alleged middleman. The transaction value should be based on the price actually paid or payable by the importer.
546128 dated July 26, 1996.

The evidence submitted fails to show that the manufactured goods were clearly destined for the United States at the time of the sale between the manufacturers and the middleman. The majority of the invoices do not designate any shipping terms. No other evidence (such as purchase orders, bills of lading, or other shipping documents) showing that the products were clearly destined for the United States was provided. Therefore, the transactions between the manufacturers and the middleman do not determine the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
545878 dated July 31, 1996.

Although the evidence submitted establishes that a *bona fide* sale occurs between the manufacturer and the middleman, the evidence does not support the position that the sale is a sale for export clearly destined for the United States. The merchandise is not shipped to the U.S. customer from the factory; instead, it is first shipped to the middleman for quality testing. The invoices to the middleman make no reference to the United States or otherwise indicate that the merchandise is destined for the United States. In addition, the freight documents do not indicate that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States, nor do the invoices indicate the terms of sale. Insufficient evidence has been submitted to overcome the presumption that the transaction value is based upon the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman.
546069 dated Aug. 1, 1996.

In order for the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman to be a sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value, the imported merchandise must have been clearly destined for export to the United States, and the manufacturer and the middleman must have dealt with each other at arm′s length. None of the parties are related in this case. With respect to the clearly destined standard, copies of purchase orders, commercial invoices, correspondence, and other related documents have been provided. The documentation indicates that the manufacturer shipped the merchandise directly to the importer in the United States. The export certificate prepared by the manufacturer indicates that the goods were at all times destined for the importer. The sale between the manufacturer and the middleman constituted a *bona fide* sale and a sale for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value.
546098 dated Sep. 18, 1996.

The middleman and the foreign manufacturers are not related, and the sales between the middleman and foreign manufacturers are freely negotiated, arm's length transactions. In addition, the merchandise is clearly destined for the U.S. when it is sold to the middleman. The submitted invoices, purchase orders, and packing lists indicate that the merchandise is produced and sold for export to the United States, and specifically to the

U.S. customer in Los Angeles. The marks and numbers on the shipping cartons as well as trademarks (registered in the United States) placed on the merchandise are consistent with such a finding. Accordingly, the sales between the middleman the foreign manufacturers are "arm's length" sales and the merchandise is sold for exportation to the United States within the meaning of section 402(b)(1).

546377 dated Nov. 12, 1996.

The documentation indicates that there exists a *bona fide* sale between the middleman and the manufacturers. The ordering of the imported merchandise is initiated when the importer receives an order from a U.S. customer. Once it receives an order, the importer places the order with the middleman. Pursuant to the instructions received from the importer, the middleman arranges to have the merchandise produced by one of the contract manufacturers. Consequently, the imported merchandise is produced in accordance with an order made by the importer's U.S. customer, who chooses the fabrics, style, and design of the merchandise. To comply with the order from the importer's U.S. customer, the merchandise must be sized and labeled to meet U.S. standards. The transaction documents indicate that the merchandise is made for a specific U.S. retailer. During the production of the merchandise, the articles are marked with tracking codes to ensure that the products arrive at the intended destination and are not diverted to alternative purchasers and locations. The use of this tracking system and inventory control, which the manufacturers must abide by, demonstrates that the parties understand that the merchandise is intended for the United States when sold to the middleman. The merchandise is clearly destined for the United States when it is sold to the middleman. The contract manufacturers are not related to the middleman, therefore, it is presumed that they negotiate with each other at arm's length. The transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the sale between the manufacturers and the middleman.

546233 dated Nov. 25, 1996.

The middleman and the manufacturer are related parties. No information regarding the influence that the relationship may have had on negotiations or dealings between the parties has been submitted. It has not been demonstrated that the transaction value between the parties is acceptable. Therefore, Customs cannot conclude that the transactions were conducted at arm's length. Although the evidence may establish that the merchandise was clearly destined for the United States, this is insufficient, by itself, to overcome the presumption that the price paid by the importer is the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.

546015 dated Dec. 13, 1996.

There are *bona fide* sales of imported appliances from unrelated Asian manufacturers to the middleman, and the parties deal with one another at arm's length. However, the evidence does not establish that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States. Prior to when the boxes are addressed and delivered to a carrier, there is no indication that the appliances are specifically ordered and made only for the United States. The contracts between the parties indicate that the merchandise could be going to countries other than the United States. The transaction value of the imported appliances cannot

be based upon the price that the middleman pays the manufacturers.
545985 dated Dec. 19, 1996.

Women's wearing apparel is exported from Germany to both the United States and Canada. All of the merchandise that is intended for the U.S. market, as well as the merchandise intended for the Canadian market, is shipped to Canada. In Canada, the merchandise is placed in a bonded warehouse, and a quality control inspection is performed. Any merchandise that is intended for the U.S. market and which is of inferior quality is either entered into the commerce of Canada, where an attempt is made to sell it, or it is returned to Germany, and the account of the U.S. importer is credited. The fact that some or all of the merchandise could be sold in Canada creates a contingency of diversion. Accordingly, the merchandise is not sold for exportation to the United States and transaction value is not applicable.
546427 dated Dec. 19, 1996.

The importer is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the middleman and it is also the exclusive U.S. distributor of the imported equipment. The middleman and the foreign manufacturer are related parties. The information submitted concerning the circumstances of the manufacturer-middleman sale supports a finding that, despite the relationship, the manufacturer and middleman deal with one another at arm's length. In addition, the importer has proven that the merchandise is clearly destined for export to the importer in the United States. The presumption that the importer's price is the appropriate basis of appraisement has been overcome. Transaction value is based on the price paid by the middleman to the manufacturer.
546089 dated Jan. 17, 1997.

The middleman is not related to the seller. Therefore, it is assumed that the sales between the middleman and seller are at arm's length. The merchandise is "cut to order" for a U.S. company and the shipping documents clearly state that the goods are destined for sale in the United States. Based upon the description of the transactions, and provided that, upon request, the importer is able to present to Customs the kind of supporting documentation described in T.D. 96-87, it appears that a sale for exportation to the United States occurs between the middleman and seller, with the middleman fulfilling a role characteristic of a buyer/reseller. Transaction value may be based upon the sale between the middleman and seller.
546464 dated Apr. 3, 1997.

Based upon the submitted documents, such as purchase orders, the manufacturers' invoices, and the airway bills, the importer has established that the merchandise was clearly destined to the United States at the time that the middleman purchased it from the manufacturers. In addition, the middleman and the manufacturers are not related; therefore, it is presumed that they negotiate with each other at arm's length. The evidence establishes that the sales between the middleman and the manufacturers are sales for exportation to the United States for purposes of determining transaction value.
546225 dated Apr. 14, 1997.

A *bona fide* sale for exportation occurs between a related importer and seller. However, the information and documents submitted do not support the acceptability of the transfer price pursuant to section 402(b)(2(B) of the TAA. Therefore, the sale between the related importer and seller does not represent a viable transaction value. The merchandise should be appraised based on the transaction between the importer and the unrelated U.S. customer. The transaction value is determined to be the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. customers plus an addition for selling commissions paid to the importer's selling agent.
546260 dated June 6, 1997.

Based on the information submitted, there exists a sale between the middleman and the manufacturer of the merchandise. The middleman and the manufacturer are not related parties, and the sale is considered to be at arm's length. However, considering the totality of the evidence, the burden of establishing that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States at the time it is purchased by the middleman from the manufacturer has not been met. Therefore, the transaction value cannot be based on the price the middleman pays the manufacturer, but rather, should be based on the importer's price.
545902 dated June 18, 1997.

The middleman and the manufacturer are not related parties; therefore, it is presumed that they deal with one another on an arm's length basis. The merchandise is made to order for the importer pursuant to the retailer's specifications, and the merchandise is shipped directly to the importer's premises. A review of the submitted documents indicates that the merchandise is made to order as per the requirements of the importer for retail sale in the United States. The transaction value may be based on the sale between the middleman and the manufacturer.
546450 dated July 3, 1997.

Invoices are submitted which indicate that the manufacture sold liquor to a U.S. distributor, and that the U.S. distributor in turn resold the liquor to a U.S. retailer. Assuming the manufacturer and the U.S. distributor are not related parties, the sales are presumed to be arm's length transactions. With regard to whether the goods are clearly destined for the United States, freight bills have been submitted from the carrier who shipped the merchandise, and the bills indicate that the merchandise was shipped from the manufacturer to the United States. At the time the orders were placed with the foreign seller, the goods were clearly destined for the United States. Therefore, the transaction value may be based upon the sales between the manufacturer and middleman.
546253 dated July 9, 1997.

In determining whether the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States at the time it is sold for exportation, Customs notes that the merchandise in question could not be legally exported from Hong Kong without using a quota allocation from the Hong Kong government. In this instance, in the transaction between the middleman and manufacturer, the manufacturer did not use a quota allocation from the Hong Kong government. Accordingly, the manufacturer could not legally export the merchandise to

the United States. Instead, when the merchandise was exported from Hong Kong to the United States, the middleman supplied the quota. Consequently, the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman was not a sale for exportation to the United States that could serve as the basis of transaction value. The sale between the middleman and the importer, which used quota from Hong Kong government, was the only available sale for exportation to the United States upon which to appraise the merchandise. Therefore, the Nissho decision is not applicable to this case, and transaction value was properly based on the price actually paid or payable by the importer.
546409 dated July 9, 1997.

The importer issues a purchase order for specific merchandise to the middleman. In turn, the middleman issues a purchase order to factories of its choice in Asia for the same merchandise. The factories are not related to either the middleman or the importer. In this case, the merchandise is shipped directly from the factories in Hong Kong to the importer in the United States. The factories know that the goods, although purchased by the middleman, are destined for export to the United States. In all cases, the importer decides when to order what goods, and in what quantities, but the middleman chooses the supplier with whom it places the order. The documentation submitted supports the conclusion that the merchandise is destined for export to the United States at the time of purchase. In addition, the documents indicate that there is a sale between the middleman and the Asian factories. Finally, the importer and the middleman deal with each other at arm's length. The manufacturer's price actually paid or payable to the middleman constitutes a viable transaction value for appraisement purposes.
546750 dated Aug. 6, 1997.

Commercial invoices and shipping documents indicate that the imported merchandise is to be shipped by the suppliers directly to the importer in the United States. The invoices submitted indicate that the importer orders the goods from the middleman who, in turn, orders them from the suppliers. The invoices also indicate that all parties are aware that the goods are being produced for export to the United States. The merchandise is clearly destined for export to the United States. However, the importer, middleman, and manufacturer are all related parties. The information submitted concerning the circumstances of the sale at issue supports a finding that, despite the relationship, the manufacturer and middleman deal with each other at arm's length. The manufacturer's price is adequate to ensure recovery of all costs plus a profit equivalent to the manufacturer's overall profit for the relevant period. Accordingly, transaction value may be based on the manufacturer-middleman sale.
546357 dated Aug. 26, 1997.

The importer has not presented Customs with copies of invoices from factories, purchase orders, or other correspondence between the middleman and the factories that might indicate that the transaction is a sale. Customs has not been furnished with any proof of payment or anything resembling a complete set of transaction documents. Under these circumstances, the importer has not overcome the presumption that transaction value is based on the price actually paid or payable by the importer.
546691 dated Sep. 8, 1997.

The transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the price paid by the importer. The submitted evidence does not enable Customs to find that the sales between the manufacturer and middleman were clearly destined for the United States. The supply agreements provide that the exclusive products not only will be purchased for distribution and sale in the United States, but also for distribution in other such countries and territories as the parties mutually may agree in their dealings.
545948 dated Dec. 5, 1997.

For purposes of determining transaction value based on the sale between the middleman and the manufacturer, the evidence submitted does not establish that the merchandise was clearly destined for export to the United States under the Nissho standard. Consequently, the importer has not met its burden to establish that the merchandise should be appraised on a transaction other than that between the importer and the middleman.
546535 dated Dec. 19, 1997.

The importer issues a blanket purchase order to the middleman for goods it desires to purchase for export to the United States. The importer only purchases goods made to U.S. specification and which it intends to sell in the United States. This information is then sent to the manufacturer, which produces the goods to U.S. specification, labels the merchandise for shipment to the United States, and then places the goods with the carrier under cover of a through bill of lading for shipment. Customs is satisfied that throughout the entire transaction, the goods are clearly destined to the United States based submitted documents and the importer's representations concerning the following: that the goods are manufactured to conform to U.S. electrical requirements; that the model numbers differ depending on the ultimate destination of the product (U.S. goods versus other countries); that the middleman does not purchase goods for inventory; and that the goods are sent directly from the manufacturer to the United States. The middleman purchases the products from unrelated manufacturers; therefore, these sales are conducted at "arm's length." The sale between the middleman and the manufacturer is a sale for exportation to the United States upon which transaction value may be based.
546658 dated Jan. 30, 1998. (NOTE: Although this ruling originated as a request for reconsideration of 545985 dated Dec. 19, 1996, it is not a reconsideration; additional information and evidence in support of the importer's claim was presented, thereby warranting a different conclusion.)

The evidence submitted establishes that the merchandise, when sold to the middleman by the manufacturer, was clearly destined for export to the United States. The contract indicates the port of destination for the merchandise as Jacksonville. It further references the contract between the middleman and the importer, indicating that the middleman entered into the contract with the manufacturer to satisfy its contractual obligations with the importer. The middleman and the manufacturer are related parties. Therefore, the importer must establish that the transaction between these related parties was at arm's length. If Customs determines that the "circumstances of sale" test is satisfied (as alleged by the importer), then the price paid by the middleman to the manufacturer should serve

as the basis of transaction value.
546429 dated Feb. 5, 1998.

Based upon the information presented, all parties to the transactions are aware that the goods are being produced for export to the United States, and the merchandise is clearly destined for export to the United States. The commercial invoices indicate that the merchandise is to be shipped directly by the manufacturer to the importer in the United States. Also, the labels sewn into the imported garments by the factory conform to U.S. textile labeling requirements and reflect the identity of the U.S. distributor. The middleman and the manufacturer are not related parties; therefore, they deal with one another at "arm's length." The sales between the middleman and the unrelated manufacturer constitute sales for exportation to the United States for the purposes of determining transaction value.
546518 dated Feb. 9, 1998.

The importer is claiming that the transaction value for the imported merchandise should be based on the transaction between the middleman and the unrelated suppliers. Because the suppliers are unrelated to the middleman, it is assumed that the parties deal with one another on an arm's length basis. The importer has submitted purchase order reports, purchase orders and invoices between the parties, certificates of origin, bills of lading, and packing lists. The documents all support the claim that, at the time the merchandise is purchased by the middleman from the manufacturers, the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States. Based upon the submitted evidence, the merchandise at issue is imported pursuant to a sale for exportation to the United States between the middleman and the unrelated suppliers.
546825 dated Feb. 20, 1998.

The merchandise at issue is sold for exportation and destined for the United States at the time the buyer purchased it from the Asian sellers. The importer has submitted purchase orders, invoices, packing lists, Customs forms, and bills of lading as evidence that the products are sold for exportation and destined for the United States at the time it purchased the products from the sellers. Both the purchase orders and invoices indicate that the terms of sale or shipping terms are FOB Asian shipping port through Los Angeles to McAllen, Texas. The bills of lading show shipment from Asia to the United States, and designate the importer as the consignee who is responsible for paying the shipping costs. The imported merchandise (and its packaging) complies with the U.S. Customs Service country of origin marking requirements in that it carries the statement, in English, that the product is "Made in China."
546561 dated Mar. 16, 1998.

Insufficient evidence has been submitted to rebut the presumption that the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. customer (as the importer) is presumed to be the basis of transaction value of the imported merchandise. It is up to the importer to rebut this presumption. Relevant documents including purchase orders, invoices, proof of payment, contracts, and any additional documents must be submitted to support a claim that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States. No such documents were

submitted in this case. Therefore, the price actually paid or payable by the importer is presumed to be the basis of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
546821 dated July 15, 1998.

The submitted documentation establishes a complete paper trail of the imported merchandise, showing the structure of the transaction and demonstrating that, throughout the entire transaction, the merchandise is clearly destined for exportation to the United States. The evidence establishes that there is a sale of the merchandise between the foreign producers and the middleman. In addition, the middleman and foreign producers deal with one another at arm's length. The merchandise may be appraised based upon the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise by the middleman.
546813 dated July 23, 1998.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a four-tiered sales arrangement. The importer allegedly purchased the goods from a middleman in Taiwan, who, in turn, purchased the goods from a middleman in Hong Kong, who bought the goods from various factories in Hong Kong. The importer has not overcome the presumption that the importer's price is the basis of transaction value; the transaction value is based upon the price actually paid or payable by the importer.
546681 dated July 31, 1998.

Although the importer has submitted documentation that supports a finding that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for the United States, the evidence does not establish that a *bona fide*, arm's length sale occurred between the foreign manufacturer and the middleman, who are related parties. The imported merchandise should be appraised based on the price actually paid or payable between the middleman and the importer.
546267 dated Dec. 4, 1998.

The importer has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for the United States and that, where related, the manufacturers and the middleman dealt with one another on an arm's length basis. The imported merchandise was correctly appraised under the transaction value method on the basis of the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman.
546353 dated Dec. 15, 1998.

546424 dated Feb. 2, 1999 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a three-tiered sales agreement. There is sufficient evidence to establish that *bona fide* sales occurred between the middleman and manufacturer. The requirements of <u>Nissho</u> are met, in that the merchandise is clearly destined for export to the United States at the time it is sold to the middleman, and neither the importer nor the middleman is related to the manufacturer. In addition, it is presumed that they negotiated with each other at arm's length. Therefore, the transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the price actually paid or payable by the middleman to the manufacturer(s). In addition, the quota

charges that are remitted, directly or indirectly, to the seller are part of the price actually paid or payable.
546871 dated Feb. 17, 1999.

The importer has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for export to the United States at the time of sale. The manufacturer and the middleman are not related parties, and the business transactions were conducted at "arms length." Additionally, no discrepancies were found in the entry documents filed with Customs. Therefore, the evidence submitted establishes that the transaction between the unrelated trading company and the middleman determines the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise pursuant to transaction value.
546760 dated Mar. 2, 1999.

546873 dated Mar. 24, 1999 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a multi-tiered sales agreement. There is sufficient evidence to establish that *bona fide* sales occurred between the unrelated vendor and the middleman. The destination of the merchandise is evidenced by the vendor's commercial invoice, which indicates a U.S. destination at the time of sale. In addition, it is presumed that the parties negotiated with each other at arm's length. Therefore, the transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the price actually paid or payable by the unrelated vendor to the middleman.
546875 dated Apr. 2, 1999.

Based on the evidence presented regarding the three scenarios of a multi-tiered sales transaction, we find that there are *bona fide* sales between the vendor and the middleman. In this case, the requirements of Nissho are satisfied, in that the merchandise was clearly destined for export to the United States at the time it was sold to the middleman. In addition, the middleman and vendor are unrelated and they negotiated with each other at arm's length. Where the middleman and vendor are related, there must be sufficient evidence to demonstrate that transaction value is acceptable. In such case, transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the price actually paid or payable between the middleman and the vendors. The charges paid to the third parties unrelated to the seller are not included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise, provided there is evidence that they do not accrue directly or indirectly to the seller of the merchandise.
546586 dated June 23, 1999.

Based on the evidence presented, the importer has not established that the manufacturer's price to the middleman (importer's parent company) may be used as the basis of appraisement consistent with the requirements of Nissho. Accordingly, the price between the middleman and the unrelated manufacturer may not constitute the price actually paid or payable for purposes of determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise. Instead, the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman will be the proper basis of appraisement.

546887 dated June 23, 1999.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a three-tiered sales agreement. There is sufficient evidence to establish that a *bona fide* sale occurred between the middleman and its foreign supplier. The requirements of Nissho have been met, in that the imported merchandise is clearly destined for exportation to the United States at the time of the sale and the middleman and its manufacturer negotiated with each other on an arm's length basis. Therefore, the transaction value of the imported merchandise should be based upon the price actually paid or payable by the middleman to the manufacturer.

546810 dated July 16, 1999.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a three-tiered sales agreement. The transaction between the manufacturer and the middleman may *not* be used for the purpose of determining the appraised value of the imported merchandise, in that there is insufficient evidence to support the claim that a *bona fide* sale occurred between the manufacturer and the middleman. The sale for exportation for purposes of determining transaction value is that between the middleman and the importer. Accordingly, the quota payments made by the importer to the middleman (the actual seller) are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. In addition, an unrelated third party acts as the buying agent for the importer and the fee paid to the unrelated third party is a *bona fide* buying commission; therefore, it is not included in the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.

547054 dated Aug. 6, 1999.

546607 dated Aug. 17, 1999 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a multi-tiered sales agreement. Although the evidence submitted establishes that a *bona fide* sale occurs between the two middlemen, the evidence does not support the position that the sale is a sale for export clearly destined for the United States. None of the purchase orders, invoices, shipping documents, etc. pertaining to this transaction make any mention that the goods were for a specified U.S. purchaser or reference any of the documents pertaining to the sale to the U.S. purchaser. In addition, there is no indication that the goods were packaged for the United States or met any special U.S. labeling requirements. Therefore, insufficient evidence has been submitted to overcome the presumption that the transaction value is based upon the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman.

547035 dated Aug. 18, 1999.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a multi-tiered sales agreement. The documentation submitted is insufficient to establish that a *bona fide* sale occurred between the manufacturer and the middleman. Based on the evidence presented, the transactions are not sales for exportation clearly destined to the United States. Consequently, these transactions cannot be used as a basis for transaction value, in that insufficient evidence has been submitted to overcome the presumption that the

transaction value should be based upon the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the middleman.
547046 dated Aug. 18, 1999.

The imported merchandise was purchased pursuant to a three-tiered sales agreement. There is insufficient evidence to establish that a *bona fide* sale occurred between the middleman and the manufacturer. The requirements of Nissho are not met in this case. Accordingly, the subject merchandise should not be appraised pursuant to transaction value and based on the transactions between the middleman and the manufacturer.
546946 dated Sep. 30, 1999.

Based on the facts presented, it appears that transactions between the factories and the importer are *bona fide* sales and it appears that the sales between the importer and the unrelated factories are at "arm's length." However, there are factors indicating that the merchandise is not clearly destined for export to the United States at the time the importer purchases the garments from the factories. Therefore, transaction value cannot be based on the sale between the importer and the factories. Rather, it should be appraised pursuant to the price actually paid or payable between the importer and its U.S. customers.
547349 dated May 5, 2000.

546858 dated June 2, 2000 - See Selling Commissions, addition to the price actually paid or payable.

The documentation presented demonstrates that the circumstances of sale of the imported merchandise between the related buyer and seller indicate that the relationship between the buyer and seller did not influence the price actually paid or payable. Therefore, we find that transaction value has been supported as an appropriate valuation method for the transaction between the related companies from January 1, 1995 and onward.
546898 dated July 27, 2000; reconsideration of 546260 dated June 6, 1997 (additional evidence presented).

The evidence available indicates that the sale between the foreign supplier and middleman is a *bona fide*, arm's length sale for export to the United States. Therefore, the price between the foreign supplier and the middleman constitutes the price actually paid or payable for purposes of determining transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547436 dated Aug. 10, 2000.

A vehicle is purchased from a foreign manufacturer for export to the United States. The vehicle is not exported immediately to the United States; rather, it is used overseas. The buyer and seller developed a program to provide *bona fide* retail customers an opportunity to drive their vehicles in Europe before shipment to the United States and to tour the vehicle production facilities. The only time limit in the program requires the U.S. customer to return the vehicle to the factory within twelve months of delivery to receive free

shipment. Also, the only penalty for non-compliance with the program is the possible removal of buyer from the program, and no penalty is imposed on the U.S. customer if the vehicle is not exported to the United States. Thus, based on the evidence submitted, the transactions between the buyer and foreign do not involve goods which are destined for the United States. Accordingly, a sale for exportation exists does not exist and the price between buyer and the foreign seller is not an acceptable transaction value.
547197 dated Aug. 22, 2000; aff'd by 548371 dated Nov. 19, 2003.

The merchandise is exported to the United States according to the contract of sale between the importer and the foreign supplier. However, the importer does not take title and possession of the merchandise or make final payment until it is removed from the premises of a warehouse supplier. The price therefore, is payable to the seller at the time of export, but not paid. Payment and transfer of title are conditioned on the removal of the merchandise from the warehouse. Thus, although the importer does not take title to the merchandise or make payment at the time of import, the sales between the importer and its foreign suppliers are sales for exportation to the United States within the meaning of section 1401a(b)(1) permitting the use of transaction value. The retroactive price reductions between unrelated parties, after importation, are not taken into account in determining transaction value.
547798 dated Aug. 23, 2000.

There was insufficient evidence provided to prove that the imported merchandise should have been appraised based on transaction value between the middleman and the foreign manufacture in a multi-tiered sales transaction. As such, it is impossible to determine which parties are functioning as buyers and sellers and whether a transfer of property or ownership occurred or who may or may not have assumed risk of loss or acquired title to the merchandise. The merchandise was properly appraised based upon the sale between the middleman and the importer.
547116 dated Mar. 22, 2001.

547155 dated Mar. 22, 2001 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

The importer purchases the subject merchandise pursuant to a multi-tiered sales transaction whereby the middleman contracts with another company for the production of merchandise to fill a purchase order from the importer. The parent company of the importer forwards the importer's orders to the middleman. The middleman then chooses several independent and unrelated manufacturers and/or vendors and the parent company provides the manufacturers/vendors with the appropriate garment designs and with materials and accessories to be used in actual production. The parent company makes its choice with input from the middleman and importer. Price negotiations originate between the importer and the vendor/manufacturer, although subsequent negotiations may occur after discussions with the parent company. The parent company then determines the final prices the middleman will charge the importer. The middleman sells the merchandise to the importer at a predetermined price. Sufficient evidence was not submitted to verify that the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman constitutes

the sale for exportation to the United States in a multi-tiered sales transaction. Therefore, the transactions between the middleman and the vendors/manufacturers cannot serve as the basis for transaction value.
546957 dated Mar. 26, 2001.

The transaction between the related parties cannot be treated as a sale for exportation subject to transaction value. The evidence indicates that it is a consignment delivery. However, there exists a sale between unrelated parties that supports the use of transaction value. Notwithstanding the fact that the two parties are U.S. entities, the sale between these parties is a sale for export to the United States upon which to appraise the merchandise under transaction value
547480 dated Oct. 31, 2001.

The subject merchandise was purchased and imported by the importer from the middleman. The middleman in turn purchased the merchandise from the supplier, a vendor in Hong Kong. The supplier subsequently contracted with its related factory in China, for the manufacture of the goods on a cut, make, and trim (CMT) basis. The supplier also contracted with five suppliers for fabric, which was provided to the manufacturer, and with an export quota holder for the cost of securing quotas. Based on the evidence submitted, the sale between the supplier and the middleman represents a *bona fide* sale conducted at arm's length in which the exported merchandise was clearly destined for export to the United States. Therefore, the sale from the supplier to the middleman is an appropriate basis for determining the transaction value.
547071 dated Nov. 1, 2001.

In this case, counsel contends that the transaction involves a three-tiered transaction involving an importer, a middleman, and a factory. However, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that a sale for export occurred between the factory and middleman. As such, for the entry in question, this transaction between the factory and middleman may not be used as the basis for transaction value. The transaction value should be based on the price paid by the importer.
547625 dated Nov. 2, 2001.

547635 dated Nov. 7, 2001 - <u>See</u> Quota Charges, payments to unrelated third parties.

According to the importer's submission, the manufacturer sold titanium sponge to the middleman, which resold the material to the importer, which resold it to the customer. Although the importer was designated as the consignee on the importer's purchase order, the manufacturer's sales contract and invoice make no reference to the importer or to the United States as the ultimate destination of the merchandise. Based on the evidence submitted, there exists a possibility of diversion in that the merchandise from the manufacturer was not clearly destined for the United States at the time of sale. Consequently, transaction value cannot be based on the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman. Therefore, the transaction value should be based on the sales between the middleman and the importer.

547859 dated Nov. 26, 2001.

There is insufficient evidence to prove the existence of *bona fide* sales between the manufacturers and the middleman. Therefore, because the Nissho standard has not been met, the manufacturers' prices cannot be used to determine transaction value. Thus, the imported merchandise was appraised properly pursuant to the transaction value method, on the basis of the price paid by the importer to the middleman.

547697 dated Dec. 27, 2001.

The sale from the manufacturer to the middleman may be used as the basis of appraisement where there is a legitimate choice between two statutorily viable transaction values in a multi-tiered transaction. The importer must demonstrate that the sale from the manufacturer to the middleman is a *bona fide*, arm's length sale of goods clearly destined for export to the United States. However, in this case, the U.S. importer failed to provide sufficient proof of the price for the assists provided to the foreign manufacturers by the Danish middleman. Therefore, transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement for the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman. The basis of appraisement for this transaction must be based on the sale between the middleman and the importer.

547588 dated Jan. 18, 2002.

Failure to demonstrate that the manufacturer and the middleman bought and sold from each other as if they were unrelated parties precludes the use of transaction value as a method of appraisement. In this case, the importer did not establish that the prices paid by the middleman in the related party transactions with the manufacturer were at arm's length. The sale between the middleman and the U.S. importer should be used as the basis for determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.

547332 dated Jan. 22, 2002.

The transaction between the UK middleman and the UK manufacturer is a *bona fide* sale for export to the United States conducted at arm's length. As such, it is an acceptable basis for appraisement using transaction value. The presumption is that merchandise shipped to a foreign party and location is not sold for export to the United States. The importer must present sufficient evidence to show that the merchandise is clearly destined for the United States at the time of the sale to the middleman. Two factors generally indicate that the subject merchandise is for export to the United States: (1) intended direct shipment to the United States; and (2) a unique quality in the merchandise itself that limits its destination to the United States. In this case, the merchandise is sold ex-works from the manufacturer to the middleman and then ex-works warehouse to the United States. The stamping of a shoe with a U.S. customer identification number is insufficient evidence that a shoe is destined only for the United States market. Several additional factors, when considered with the stamping, indicate that the shoes were sold for export to the United States: These factors include: the document trail, the carton labeling, an exclusive distributorship, a tracking system, etc. The sale between the middleman and the manufacturer may be used for purposes of determining transaction value.

547382 dated Feb. 14, 2002.

The price paid for merchandise by the middleman to the manufacturer(s) may be used to determine the transaction value in a multi-tiered transaction. It is incumbent upon the importer to provide a complete paper trail for the imported merchandise. The paper trail should include the structure and documentation for the entire transaction. If an insufficient amount of documents is identified, then the paper trail will be deemed insufficient evidence to conclude that a *bona fide* sale for export occurred between the manufacturers and the middleman.
547607 dated Feb. 14, 2002.

The sales between the importer and the manufacturer are conducted pursuant to an agreement that is lengthy and comprehensive. It is presumed that the agreement reflects entirely the intentions of its drafters. The delivery arrangements of the agreement clearly indicate that a sale took place between the manufacturer and its subsidiary, the importer. The importer is not a principal in these arrangements; it is an agent facilitating the delivery of payment for the subject merchandise via the trading companies. Under the manufacturer's orders, foreign trading companies delivered subject merchandise to the importer. Even if property rights were exchanged, the transactions between the trading companies and the importer are not actual sales for exportation. Thus the importer and the trading companies are agents of the manufacturer. For the purposes of determining the transaction value, the only *bona fide* sale is between the importer and the manufacturer. The selling commissions are already included in the price actually paid or payable, so there should not be an addition made for these amounts.
547158 dated Mar. 1, 2002.

The manufacturer is related to the middleman and to the importer. The sale between the manufacturer and the middleman is a *bona fide* sale for export to the United States. Whether that sale may be used to appraise the merchandise under transaction value is contingent upon the acceptability of the price between the related parties. If the parties buy and sell from one another as if they were unrelated, then the price paid or payable for the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman will be considered an acceptable basis for appraisement. In this case, there is an insufficient evidentiary basis to overcome the presumption that transaction value should be based on the price paid by the importer. Multi-tiered transactions should be documented in accordance with the guidelines set forth in T.D. 96-87. The requestor must describe in detail the roles of all of the various parties and furnish relevant documents pertaining to each transaction that is involved in the exportation of the merchandise to the United States.
547421 dated May 8, 2002.

The importer did not provide to Customs sufficient evidence to determine the nature of the relationship between the parties involved in this multi-tiered transaction. Given the evidence presented, it is unclear whether the transactions between the related parties qualify as *bona fide* sales for export to the United States. In addition, the parties have failed to demonstrate that they conduct their transactions at arm's length. Customs cannot conclude that the proper method of appraisement would be transaction value.
548057 dated May 20, 2002.

The importer purchased apparel from its overseas parent corporation, the exporter, for resale to the United States. Neither party is related to the manufacturer. The transaction between the manufacturer and the middleman is a *bona fide* sale that is clearly destined for export to the United States. As such, the sale between the manufacturer and the exporter is a valid basis for transaction value.
548079 dated June 25, 2002.

In situations involving multi-tiered transactions, Customs presumes that the price paid by the importer is the basis of the transaction value. In order to rebut this presumption, the importer must provide evidence that establishes that the manufacturer's transaction was conducted at arm's length and that the merchandise was clearly destined for export to the United States. The documentary evidence suggests an agency relationship between the middleman and the importer. The importer has not overcome the presumption that transaction value should be based on the price paid by the importer. Additionally, the importer failed to provide sufficient evidence to substantiate a *bona fide* buying agency. The fees do not constitute *bona fide* buying commissions and are, therefore, included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547668 dated July 31, 2002.

The substance of the import transaction reveals a multi-tiered transaction involving two foreign intermediaries located in the same country. It also reveals that neither of these intermediaries has title to or risk of loss for the goods for more than an instant. Neither of the intermediaries obtained physical possession of the goods. Under these circumstances, the transaction documents by themselves are insufficient to establish the roles of the intermediaries as buyer and seller for the purposes of appraisement under transaction value. Therefore, the transaction value is properly based on the price paid by the importer.
547712 dated Aug. 1, 2002.

The merchandise is shipped directly from the manufacturer to the importer's warehouse, both of which are located in Italy. The purpose of the warehousing is for the importer to coordinate the shipment of merchandise from various manufacturers prior to export to the United States. The fact that merchandise is shipped to the importer's warehouse does not preclude a determination that the merchandise is destined for export to the United States. In this case, counsel provided a comprehensive paper trail demonstrating that the garments ordered by the distributor from the importer were of the same quantity, style, and fabric as the merchandise ordered by the importer from the manufacturer. Additionally, the manufacturer's invoice and hang tags include the comment "USA," indicating that the merchandise was intended for export to the United States. The likelihood of diversion is further reduced by the fact that there is no transshipment of the merchandise into a third country for storage purposes. Thus, the merchandise is destined for export to the United States even if it is stored in an Italian warehouse. The sale between the importer and the manufacturer is an acceptable basis for determining transaction value.
548112 dated Sep. 23, 2002.

The merchandise was appraised under transaction value, using the price between the IOR and the related U.S. purchasers. The importer filed a protest, seeking to appraise the merchandise using the price between the IOR and the related factories. The evidence submitted by counsel in support of the protest is insufficient. Not only does the evidence submitted fail to clarify how the price was arrived at, but it also fails to establish what the actual final price is between the importer and the factories. Ambiguities remain concerning the roles played by multiple parties in the transactions, how the price was arrived at between the factories and the importer, and who bears the risk of loss for the merchandise compel. Accordingly, the protestant has not overcome the presumption of correctness attached to the import specialist's appraisement.
546820 dated Sep. 28, 2002.

In this multi-tiered transaction, Customs will not appraise the imported merchandise on the basis of the "first sale" between the foreign middleman and the manufacturer because it is unclear as to whether a *bona fide* sale occurred between the two parties. Instead, Customs will determine the transaction value of the imported merchandise based upon the price paid by the importer to the middleman. Generally speaking, if merchandise is not directly shipped to the United States, then it is not considered to have been destined for export to the United States. In this multi-tiered transaction, the documentation supports the importer's claim that the goods were, at all times, clearly destined for export to the United States. However, two of the sub-assemblies were shipped to Canada before their eventual importation to the United States. In Canada, the merchandise undergoes further manufacturing, under the middleman. The manufacturing adds value to the merchandise and the process significantly alters its physical nature. Thus the product that enters the United States is not the same product that was the subject of the first sale between the middleman and the manufacturer. Accordingly, customs cannot conclude that the two sub-assemblies were clearly destined for export to the United States.
548198 dated Dec. 26, 2002.

548236 dated Mar. 27, 2003 - <u>See</u> Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, sequential order.

The only "sale" upon which to base a transaction value takes place between the U.S. importer and its unrelated U.S. customers. The sales are "for exportation to the United States" for purposes of determining transaction value. The merchandise is manufactured in direct response to an order placed by the U.S. customer. The manufacturer prepares the shipping documents and invoices, on behalf of the importer, and direct ships the merchandise to the U.S. customers, and the U.S. customers pays the importer the invoice price.
548380 dated Oct. 23, 2003.

CBP ruled that the imported merchandise (clothing) could be appraised based on the first sale. CBP held that the design work was an assist that had to be included in PAPP. A sourcing fee was paid to an independent contractor and was determined not to be a selling commission and not included in the PAPP. The royalty payment was not paid to

the seller and limited to non-manufacturing rights (right to use trademark, trade name and trade dress formats in advertising, store use and signage) and is not included in the PAPP.

548420 dated Jan. 13, 2004.

CBP ruled that the imported goods (candles, candleholders and ceramic tableware) were not clearly destined for export to the U.S. There was nothing unique about the merchandise, its production or designation to indicate that it was clearly destined to the U.S. for a particular consumer. Some of the goods were shipped to Hong Kong before the U.S. CBP also held that there were no *bona fide* sales between the two middlemen and the various factories. There were inconsistencies with the invoices (invoices were post dated) from the factories and the records of payment to the factories (illegible or name of factory hand-written). Further, it appeared that there was simultaneous passage of title.

548520 dated July 30, 2004.

A U.S. corporation was established to import and sell certain footwear to retail stores in the United States. Other parties included a related trading company based in Switzerland, and a Spanish-based design company. Unrelated manufacturers manufactured the shoes in Spain and Italy and allegedly sold them to the Swiss trading company. Once manufactured, the shoes were either shipped immediately to the U.S. or stored in warehouses in Spain or Italy for short periods of time. The U.S. corporation was the IOR. The manufacturers will transmit pertinent copies of any ocean bills of lading or airway bills, the commercial invoices between the manufacturers and Swiss trading company, certificates of origin and packing lists. At the same time, the Swiss trading company will invoice the U.S. corporation for the imported footwear, using a transfer price between those two companies. No evidence was provided when both putative buyer will assume risk of loss and obtain title. The exact roles of the parties were questioned due to fact that an agreement existed between the U.S. corporation and the manufactures, and whether the trading company was truly an independent buyer/seller. The goods may not be appraised under transaction value on the basis of the price paid by the Swiss trading company to the factories.

W563545 dated Jan. 9, 2007.

A U.S. importer of food purchases the food from its parent corporation in Japan, who in turn purchases the food from various unrelated Asian manufacturers. The purchase orders and invoices show that the goods are ordered, sold to the parent, and then sold to the importer, with corresponding payments to each. The parent accounts for the merchandise it purchases as inventory on its books. An e-mail from the parent to the U.S. importer states that when merchandise arrives at the warehouse of the forwarder, the parent takes title to the merchandise and assumes the risks of loss prior to shipment. The documents submitted are not satisfactory to determine whether the parent takes title to the merchandise and assumes the risk of loss. Carrying merchandise in inventory is not evidence of ownership. Accordingly, the proper basis of appraisement will be the price actually paid or payable by the importer to the parent.

H005222 dated June 13, 2007.

This ruling involves a multi-tiered transaction, in which the importer, the U.K middleman, and the Italian manufacturer are all related. The importer failed to demonstrate its right to declare the "first sale" price between the U.K. middleman and the Italian manufacturer, because it presented an incomplete paper trail of its transactions and thus, could not establish *bona fide* sales between the manufacturer and the middleman, and it did not provide any information to show that the purported sales were at arm's length. Accordingly, the merchandise is properly appraised under transaction value based on the sales price paid by the importer to the related Italian manufacturer.
W563602 dated Sep. 4, 2007.

The imported wearing apparel should be appraised on the basis of the first sale between the manufacturer and the unrelated foreign intermediary. Based on the transaction documents and the circumstances of the transaction, including evidence regarding the role of the parties, there was a *bona fide* sale between the manufacturer and the intermediary. Based on the submitted paper trail and the fact that the merchandise was shipped directly from the manufacturer to the U.S., the merchandise was clearly destined to the U.S.
W548670 dated Nov. 19, 2007.

The importer entered apparel using first sale. CBP examined two entries and determined that the importer supplied a complete paper trail for one entry but not the second. For the second entry, the purchase order showed Celebrity as the manufacturer but Mindanao was the actual manufacturer. No documentation was submitted to explain the relationship between Celebrity and Mindanao. Further, the quantity amounts for the Celebrity purchase order and Mindanao's invoice do not match up and are significantly different (18,000 pieces vs. 5,190 pieces). Although the importer made a payment to an unrelated company pursuant to a royalty agreement, the importer stated that the payment was made to avoid litigation. Based on an affidavit submitted and a lack of information that the importer in fact used the manufacturing process covered by the agreement, CBP held that the payment was not a dutiable addition to the price actually paid or payable for the imported shirts. CBP reviewed the service agreement between the importer and Gold Mine and the sample Gold Mine invoice, and concluded that the importer showed that there is a non-dutiable buying agency relationship between it and Gold Mine. The service agreement describes a relationship where the importer chooses the fabric supplier and pays Gold Mine a commission, which it bills quarterly, and Gold Mine agrees to purchase fabric on behalf of the importer and inspect the fabric to insure certain quality standards are met and supervise the relationship with the supplier.
H086776 dated Oct. 25, 2011.

CBP denied first sale to the importer in this case involving apparel. The middleman and importer were related parties. The middleman financed the transaction with the unrelated factory through the trust receipt, which it did not repay to the bank until after the goods were entered into the U.S. There was a simultaneous transfer of title in this case. There was no bonafide sale between the manufacturer and the middleman. The goods should be appraised based on the transaction between the importer and the middleman.

H097616 dated Nov. 21, 2011.

H161677 dated July 11, 2013 – See Related Party Transactions, Examination of the Circumstances of the Sale.

The importer, a clothing retailer, protested the port's decision to deny appraisal under transaction value based on the price paid by the middleman to the manufacturer. Although the importer provided sufficient evidence to show that the merchandise was clearly destined for the U.S., it did not establish that the sale between the manufacturer and the middleman, a related party, was at arm's-length. Therefore, under Nissho Iwai and Synergy Sport Int'l, the imported goods could not be appraised under transaction value on the basis of the "first sale" between the middleman and the foreign manufacturer. **H241090 dated Dec. 23, 2013.**

The evidence presented in the form of documents from the transactions, shows that the sale between the Chinese manufacturer and middleman (Company) constitutes a *bona fide* sale conducted at arm's length and that the merchandise will be clearly destined for export to the United States at the time the middleman purchases, or contracts to purchase, the merchandise. Therefore, the price paid between the manufacturer and middleman may serve as the basis of appraisement under transaction value for the imported merchandise.
H246429 dated Jan. 7, 2014.

The U.S. purchaser places an order with a middleman/importer who will source the production to an unrelated foreign manufacturer. The importer claimed "first sale." CBP determined that the "first sale" value may be used, provided that the importer presents paperwork to connect the payment to the carrier to the transaction at hand. However, the information presented was not a complete paper trail, which shows the structure and scope of the entire transaction.
H246654 dated Mar. 6, 2014.

The non-resident importer imported various types of bags from Hong Kong. The U.S. customer was listed as the ultimate consignee. The declared values for all entries were the prices at which the importer sold the bags to its U.S. customer, adjusted to account for international transportation, duties, fees, insurance and clearance. The importer later filed a protest on the basis that the entries should have been appraised based on the prices paid by the importer to unrelated sellers in Hong Kong and China. The importer purchased the merchandise from the sellers on FOB Hong Kong or China port terms of sale and resold it to its U.S. customer on Delivered Ex Quay ("DEQ") (Duty Paid) New York terms. The merchandise sold to the importer pursuant to FOB Hong Kong or China port terms of sale, and resold by the importer under DEQ (Duty Paid) New York terms of sale to its U.S. customer, could be appraised using the sales between the sellers in Hong Kong and China and the importer, provided both sales were substantiated by invoices in English.
H219520 dated Apr. 1, 2014.

The importer/protestant was a non-resident importer based in Hong Kong that purchased women's apparel from a Chinese manufacturer, and then sold the imported goods to a U.S. company. None of the parties were related. The manufacturer shipped the goods directly to the U.S. to an alleged buying agent, which did not take physical possession of the goods but arranged for U.S. Customs clearance and domestic delivery to the U.S. buyer. The importer paid all importation fees and duties as well as the agent's commission directly to the Chinese manufacturer or to a Chinese freight forwarder, which then forwarded the commission payments to the agent. No documents substantiating the importer's payment of U.S. import duties and fees, or the agent's commission to the Chinese manufacturer were submitted, and the onward payment of the commission by the Chinese manufacturer to the agent was not substantiated. Initially, some of the entries under protest were attempted by the alleged buying agent of the non-resident importer, but were denied by CBP. Applying 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1), it was found that sufficient information was not available to determine the values of the transactions between the Chinese manufacturer and the importer because the value of assists and "commission" and other payments was unknown. The transactions between the non-resident importer and the U.S. buyer were the correct bases of appraisement; however, substantiated amounts for international shipping should be deducted from the values.
H218258 dated July 24, 2014.

Importer presented 5 scenarios, all of which sought the use of the sale of shoes from the Chinese manufacturer to the Canadian party as the sale for export to the U.S. ("First sale" transaction value). In some cases, the shoes would be shipped directly to the U.S., but in others, the shoes would be shipped to Canada. In the case of shoes shipped to Canada, the shoes would either be: transported in-bond by rail and trucked across Canada before being entered into the U.S.; shipped in-bond to the Canadian company's warehouse where they would be stored for up to one year under Canada's duty deferral program; or imported into Canada and sold in Canada or sold and shipped to the U.S. or sold elsewhere in the world. It was presumed that merchandise shipped to a foreign party and location was not sold for exportation to the United States. To rebut this presumption, sufficient evidence must be presented to show the merchandise is clearly destined for exportation to the U.S. at the time of sale to the middleman. Sample documentation (mock-ups) was presented for each scenario. CBP determined that in scenarios 1, 2, and 3, the shoes were clearly destined for the U.S. and "first sale" transaction value could be used (shipped directly to U.S. or transported in-bond by rail and trucked across Canada before being entered into the U.S.). However, under scenario 4, the identities of the U.S. customers would not be known until after importation into Canada for warehousing (shipped in-bond to the Canadian company's warehouse where they would be stored for up to one year under Canada's duty deferral program) and, as such, the requirement that the goods be clearly destined for the U.S. was not met. Similarly, scenario 5 also failed to meet the clearly destined requirement for use of transaction value (imported into Canada and subsequently sold to the U.S., in Canada, or elsewhere in the world).
H251797 dated July 28, 2014.

In order to establish a *bona fide* sale, the sales terms on the transaction documents should indicate which specific port the merchandise will be shipped from, or if the specific

port of export at the time the invoice is prepared is not known, at a minimum the shipping terms should indicate the country of export in which the parties intend to have title to the merchandise pass. For example, the shipping terms could be designated as "FOB PORT OF EXPORT CHINA", which would indicate that the parties intend to have title to the merchandise pass from the seller to the buyer when the merchandise is delivered to the ship at the port of export in China. The information presented indicated that the transaction between the Chinese manufacturer and the middleman constituted a *bona fide* sale conducted at arm's length and that the merchandise would be clearly destined for export to the United States at the time the middleman purchases, or contracts to purchase, the merchandise. Therefore, in accordance with Nissho Iwai, the price paid between the manufacturer and the middleman may be used as the basis of appraisement value for the imported merchandise.
H255028 dated Nov. 21, 2014.

An importer presented information to show that the price actually paid by its related, foreign middleman to unrelated, foreign manufacturers (first sale) could serve as the basis for appraisement under transaction value because such information would constitute a *bona fide* sale conducted at arm's length, with the merchandise being clearly destined for export to the United States. A *bona fide* sale was shown between the middleman and manufacturers because their contracts indicated an FOB sale, with risk of loss and title passing from the manufacturers to the middleman on the date of the port loading, which was differentiated from the passing of risk of loss and title between the middleman and importer. This latter passage of risk of loss and title between middleman and importer was specified in their contract and invoices, which indicated that such would pass five days from the bill of lading dates (same dates as their respective FOB sale), showing that the middleman would hold title and risk of loss for five days before it transferred to the importer. It was shown that the merchandise would be clearly destined to the United States because the final destination on the commercial invoices and purchase orders between the middleman and manufacturers, and between the middleman and importer, were the same per respective entry, which also aligned with the final destination on their respective bills of lading, and there was no indication that the merchandise could be diverted from the United States. An arm's length transaction was shown because the manufacturers and middleman were unrelated, and though the importer and middleman were related, there was no indication that the importer's relationship to the middleman would influence the negotiated prices between the middleman and the manufacturers.
H259476 dated Mar. 24, 2015.

SELLING COMMISSIONS

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1) provides for the following:

TRANSACTION VALUE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.-(1) The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to- . . . (B) any selling commission incurred by the buyer with respect to the imported merchandise.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

With respect to selling commissions which are added to the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise, CCC Technical Committee Explanatory Note 2.1 paragraphs 7 and 8, state the following:

7. A selling agent is a person who acts for the account of a seller; he seeks customers and collects orders, and in some cases he may arrange for storage and delivery of the goods. The remuneration he receives for services rendered in the conclusion of a contract is usually termed "selling commission." Goods sold through the seller's agent cannot usually be purchased without payment of the selling agent's commission. These payments can be made in the ways set out below.
8. Foreign suppliers who deliver their goods in pursuance of orders placed through a selling agent usually pay for the latter's services themselves, and quote inclusive prices to their customers. In such cases, there is no need for the invoice price to be adjusted to take account of these services. If the terms of the sale require the buyer to pay, usually direct to the intermediary, a commission that is additional to the price invoiced for the goods, this commission must be added to the price when determining transaction value under Article 1 of the Agreement.

Judicial Precedent:

Victor Woollen Products of America., Inc. v. United States, 117 Fed. Appx. 113, 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 24462, 27 Int'l Trade Rep. (BNA) 1224 (Fed. Cir., Nov. 24, 2004); rehearing denied by Victor Woollen Products of America., Inc. v. United States, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 2291 (Fed. Cir., Jan. 10, 2005).

This case involves the appraisal of wool fabric imported by Victor Woollen Products of America (VWPA) from its parent and the manufacturer, Victor Woollen Products of Canada (VWPC) and follows a series of decisions by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (court) and the United States Court of International Trade (trade court) over seven years. In this matter, the Court decided that the trade court was free to look beyond corporate formalities to ascertain whether VWPA continued to control the selling agent's selling activities. The official transfer of authority from plaintiff's parent company to Plaintiff did not mean that the parent divested itself of all actual control over the selling agent. The definition of "selling commission" should not be limited according

to corporate structure. The Court also decided that since the amount of selling agent's commissions should not be determined by Customs, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (transaction value) could not serve as a basis for valuation.

Headquarters Rulings:

addition to price actually paid or payable

A five percent commission paid to an agent who is under the control and direction of the seller is a selling commission and is to be added to the price actually paid or payable.
542493 dated Aug. 12, 1981.

543053 dated July 11, 1983 - See Buying Commissions, totality of circumstances.

A U.S. party that is related to the foreign seller is acting as its selling agent and enters into sales agreements for the purchase of merchandise with U.S. buyers. The merchandise is appraised pursuant to transaction value, with the selling commission added to the price actually paid or payable.
543774 dated June 4, 1987; aff'd by 544116 dated Apr. 19, 1988.

Selling commissions may be added to the price actually paid or payable by the buyer to the seller only if they are "incurred by the buyer" in the sale for exportation. The statute neither contemplates nor authorizes the addition of selling commissions incurred by a subsequent purchaser in a domestic sale made after the sale for exportation.
543708 dated Apr. 21, 1988.

Transaction value is defined as the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to any selling commission incurred by the buyer with respect to the merchandise. The addition to the price for the selling commission must be based upon sufficient information. If sufficient information is not available, then the transaction value of the imported merchandise cannot be determined.
544177 dated Sep. 19, 1988.

The actions of the alleged buying agent are those performed by a seller of merchandise and not by a buying agent. Invoices have been submitted which indicate that the alleged agent is actually the manufacturer. The commissions paid are dutiable selling commissions.
544110 dated Apr. 26, 1990.

The documents submitted establish the existence of a selling agency relationship between the parties. The documents include purchase orders detailing the contract terms, copies of checks, and work orders and invoices specifying the details of additional processing.
544382 dated Oct. 9, 1990.

The evidence available supports the conclusion that the amount listed on the invoice as

a commission is a dutiable selling commission and not a trade discount as alleged by the importer.
544907 dated Apr. 13, 1992.

No evidence exists to establish that a sale occurred between the foreign seller and the ultimate U.S. purchaser of imported merchandise. Rather, a *bona fide* sale took place between the foreign seller and the importer. Absent any evidence regarding an alleged sale between the foreign seller and the ultimate U.S. purchaser, the importer cannot be considered a selling agent for the foreign seller.
544608 dated Sep. 21, 1992.

544949 dated Mar. 17, 1993 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

The issue in this case is whether the transaction between the seller and the supplier, and/or that between the supplier and ultimate consignee are *bona fide* sales such that the price actually paid or payable constitutes a valid transaction value. The supplier took possession of the merchandise at the seller's plant for an instant, before title and risk of loss passed to the ultimate consignee. In essence, the supplier never held title nor did it bear the risk of loss. The supplier acted as a selling agent for the seller, and the merchandise should be appraised under transaction value based on the price paid by the ultimate consignee. The difference between the seller's price and that of the supplier is a selling commission.
545105 dated Nov. 9, 1993 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

Based upon the facts presented, the protesting party has not offered sufficient evidence to indicate that it is operating other than as a selling agent. Consequently, the selling commission should be added to the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value.
545376 dated July 29, 1994.

Based upon the information presented, the importer is operating as a selling agent rather than as the purchaser of merchandise. The amounts deducted from the invoice are the selling agent’s commissions for arranging the sale. The shipping terms obligate the seller to bear the risk of loss for the merchandise until it reaches the U.S. customer’s place of business. The property or ownership of the imported merchandise never transfers to the agent, but rather, remains with the seller until it reaches the U.S. customer’s place of business. The selling commission is added to the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
546037 dated Jan. 31, 1996.

There is no *bona fide* sale between the foreign seller and its wholly-owned subsidiary in the United States. The U.S. subsidiary is a selling agent for the seller and the alleged discount is in fact a selling commission and should be included in the price actually paid or payable in the determination of transaction value.
545958 dated Apr. 12, 1996.

Based upon conflicting information and documentation provided, Customs cannot conclude whether the middleman acted as a buyer/seller or as a selling agent regarding the transactions in question. The shipping terms on the submitted invoices are inconclusive as to whether property or ownership was transferred to the middleman. No invoices from the ultimate purchasers were submitted. Evidence such as proof of payment demonstrating the manner in which payment passed between the parties is lacking. Assuming that the middleman served as a selling agent, as opposed to an independent buyer/seller, transaction value would be based on the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. purchasers with additions, as appropriate, for selling commissions incurred by the U.S. purchasers pursuant to section 402(b)(1)(B) of the TAA.
546015 dated Dec. 13, 1996.

Based on the evidence available, the sale for exportation occurred between the U.S. customer and the foreign supplier. The importer is the selling agent for the foreign supplier and the commissions paid are included in the price actually paid or payable. Transaction value is the appropriate method of appraisement. The price actually paid or payable does not include the costs associated with post-import services, international freight, duties and taxes, and any domestic sourced goods.
546858 dated June 2, 2000.

A company operates an electronic commerce business that facilitates international trade in apparel and textiles by providing a platform for direct communication between buyers and sellers. Buyers may post requests for quotations on the company's website and sellers may list the goods for sale on the website, either in an auction format or a fixed price format. Fees, based on the percentage of the sales price, are paid to the company if the buyer procures goods as a result of the posting or if the seller sells the goods as a result of the posting on the web site. The company is not acting as an agent for the seller when posting the seller's goods for sale. Therefore, the fees paid by such buyers and sellers to the company posting the merchandise on its website are not dutiable selling commissions within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 401a(b)(1)(B) and 19 CFR 152.102(b).
547596 dated July 13, 2000.

547225 dated Nov. 9, 2001 - <u>See</u> Buying Commissions, control over agent.

Based on the lack of documentation demonstrating that the importer controls the seller or buyer's actions and the unclear roles of the buying agents and the U.S. seller/agent, the existence of a *bona fide* buying agency relationship between the importer and the seller is rejected. Thus, the fees paid to the seller/agent are to be added to the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise and should be included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
547417 dated Nov. 9, 2001.

547158 dated Mar. 1, 2002 - <u>See</u> Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

A multinational corporation (MNC) entered into an agreement with a company that serves as the U.S. IOR. The agreement stipulates that the latter serves as both the sales representative and the exclusive distributor of the MNC's products to U.S. purchasers. In this case, a foreign subsidiary of the MNC produced the subject merchandise. The U.S. company did not function as an independent buyer of the imported merchandise, but rather as a selling agent on behalf of MNC. Therefore, the commissions received by the U.S. company constitute dutiable selling commissions. In the absence of a *bona fide* sale between the foreign subsidiary of the MNC and the U.S. company, the price paid by the U.S. purchasers, which already includes the selling commission, is the appropriate transaction value to be used for customs valuation purposes.
548173 dated Dec. 6, 2002.

The protestant has not established that the subject commissions were not *bona fide* selling commissions. Therefore, the commissions were properly included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
548515 dated Sep. 28, 2004.

Commissions paid by the buyer to a third party do not constitute selling commissions pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(B) because the evidence presented indicated that the third party acted as the buyer's sales agent in connection with the sale of the garments to the buyer's U.S. customers.
W548670 dated Nov. 19, 2007.

The non-resident importer sold products to unrelated customers in the U.S. through home presentations organized by its sales consultants. The consultants solicited sales at a home party, submitted orders to the importer, and arranged for payment. The consultant's commission was deducted from the total amount of the merchandise. The transaction documents submitted indicated that the consultants worked on behalf of the importer. Additionally, the importer assumed responsibility for quality related matters and the consultants were not responsible for the shipping and handling costs. CBP found that the totality of the circumstances indicated that the sales consultants acted as the importer's selling agents. As such, the selling commissions were included in the price actually paid or payable of the imported merchandise.
H189369 dated Feb. 22, 2012.

The importer is the buyer of the environmentally friendly cleaning and personal care products from its related party seller. Subsequent to importation, the importer sold the merchandise to U.S. customers through its independent sales consultants located in the United States. Under this arrangement, the products were shipped by suppliers in various countries to the seller's warehouse in Canada, which, in turn, redistributed goods bound to U.S. customers. The products were delivered either by the consultant to the U.S. customer or the independent sales consultant. CBP found that HRL H189369 was still applicable and the commissions were dutiable selling commissions. Under a second scenario, the importer establishes a warehouse and distribution center in the United States. The importer purchases the products from its overseas supplier in a third country and stores the merchandise in its U.S. warehouse. Once orders from the U.S. customers

are received by the importer, the imported merchandise is shipped from the U.S. warehouse to fulfill these orders. CBP determined that the consultants' commissions are neither part of the price actually paid or payable or additions to the price actually paid or payable as selling commissions, or proceeds of subsequent resale.
H225295 dated July 1, 2013; follow-up to HRL H189369.

The protestants acted on behalf of the foreign seller as importers of record and arranged for payment for the merchandise. The foreign seller established all terms of sale directly with the U.S. buyer and could negotiate directly with the U.S. buyer without employing the protestants. The protestants assumed risk of loss temporarily; however, they did not acquire the merchandise since it was directly delivered to the U.S. buyer. Additionally, the protestants were not responsible for shipping and handling costs. CBP found that the protestants acted as selling agents on behalf of the foreign seller; therefore, their commissions were selling commissions which should be included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. For some of the entries, evidence of actual freight costs was not submitted. Consequently, CBP found that the freight costs may not be deducted for those entries. For the remaining entries, International Freight Forwarding Special Invoices, which were mostly in Chinese, were submitted as evidence of actual freight costs. CBP could not determine to whom these invoices were issued and what the list of charges on the invoices consisted of; accordingly, it was held that no deduction may be made for these charges. CBP held that the only duties to be deducted were those that the protestants actually paid at the time of entry since the information presented on deductions for additional duties was inadequate.
H200463 dated July 23, 2013.

SEQUENTIAL ORDER

INTRODUCTION

Regarding the methods of valuation and the order in which they are used, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(a)(1) states:

In General. - (1) Except as otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, imported merchandise shall be appraised, for the purposes of this Act, on the basis of the following:
(A) The transaction value provided for under subsection (b).
(B) The transaction value of identical merchandise provided for under subsection (c), if the value referred to in subparagraph (A) cannot be determined, or can be determined but cannot be used by reason of subsection (b)(2).
(C) The transaction value of similar merchandise provided for under subsection (c), if the value referred to in subparagraph (B) cannot be determined.
(D) The deductive value provided for under subsection (d), if the value referred to in subparagraph (C) cannot be determined and if the importer does not request alternative valuation under paragraph (2).
(E) The computed value provided for under subsection (e), if the value referred to in subparagraph (D) cannot be determined.
(F) The value provided for under subsection (f), if the value referred to in subparagraph (E) cannot be determined.

The parallel Customs regulation is 19 CFR 152.101(b).

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 4 provides for the sequential order used in the valuation of merchandise.

Interpretative Notes, General Note, Paragraphs 1 through 4, provide for the sequential application of valuation methods.

Headquarters Rulings:

hierarchy of valuation methods

Imported merchandise must be appraised pursuant to transaction value if that value can be determined in accordance with the TAA. There is no option under the TAA to use the deductive value method of appraisement in situations where transaction value can be determined.
542972 dated Jan. 6, 1983.

Appraised value shall be determined by proceeding sequentially through the alternative bases of appraisement to the first such basis that can be determined. These alternative bases, listed in order of precedence for use, are: transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, section 402(c) of the TAA; deductive value, section 402(d); and computed

value, section 402(e).
543581 dated Sep. 3, 1985; 544409 dated Nov. 20, 1989.

If in fact a transaction value or transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is available, then neither Customs nor the importer has the authority to waive or disregard such an appraisement. If transaction value and transaction value of identical or similar merchandise cannot be determined, then the Customs value will be based upon deductive value, unless the importer has elected computed value.
543912 dated Apr. 19, 1988.

544189 dated Aug. 11, 1988 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

544239 dated Nov. 18, 1988 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, sequential order.

There were five entries that failed to report accurately the quantity of entered merchandise. There is no provision in the contract between the seller and the importer defining which party is responsible for shortages and overages. In addition, according to the importer, there was no post entry adjustment in the amount paid to the seller for the additional merchandise. The transaction value of identical or similar method is the most appropriate method for determining the value of the unreported merchandise. Therefore, the value of the unreported merchandise should be based on the transaction value of the sales of reported merchandise between the seller and the importer. In addition, in cases where there is an unexpected overage or shortage, importers should notify Customs pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1499(a)(3) and 19 CFR 141. Furthermore, importers should use one of the available administrative remedies to correct errors in the quantity of merchandise reported at the time of entry.
547978 dated Dec. 11, 2001.

The imported goods are to be appraised under deductive value where there is no sale for exportation and where there is no information on sales of identical or similar merchandise. If the merchandise is not sold before the close of the ninetieth day after importation, it may be appraised under a modified deductive value in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).
548387 dated Feb. 24, 2004.

The imported merchandise may be appraised in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1401(f). Under the circumstances presented, the value of the refurbished disk drives on the importer's books is a reasonable method of valuation under the fallback method. Transaction value is not available because there is no sale. Similarly, there are no sales of similar or identical merchandise. Deductive value is not available because the merchandise is placed in the importer's inventory for distribution to its customers under a warranty replacement program. There is no information upon which to use the computed value method.
W548453 dated Mar. 8, 2005.

A company receives various articles of precious metal from potential sellers, and quotes the price it can offer. If the price is accepted, the company sends a check to the seller. If the price is rejected, the articles are returned. Since the price that the company will pay for the articles will be known within a few days after importation into the U.S., the merchandise maybe appraised under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).
H056445 dated July 24, 2009.

Aircraft parts, their cost and purchase information unknown, are imported after being exported from the United States to be repaired. The importer asked for confirmation that its methodology, which results in the payment of MPF on the actual cost of the repairs, is acceptable to determine the invoice values of unserviceable and repaired aircraft parts using the fallback valuation method. The importer's method reflects the average value of new and used parts of the type being repaired as well as the average repair costs of the parts. As the importer purchases both new and used parts, adding the average purchase price of new and used parts to the actual repair costs is a reasonable appraisement method for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f). However, under the provisions of 19 U.S.C. § 58c(b)(8)(B)(i), payment of MPF is not required for repaired parts entered under subheading 9802.00.50, HTSUS.
H116829 dated Sep. 28, 2010.

Fallback methods of appraisement may be used for R&D materials and materials used in their production that are not inventoried, and are instead expensed as part of the R&D process. Three significant considerations in determining if a formula proposed for use in valuing R&D materials is appropriate are: (1) if a thorough explanation of the proposed formula is provided (supported by detailed financial information from the manufacturer), (2) if the proposed formula or method is specific to the type of material being produced, and is not generalized for all R&D materials, and (3) if the formula is necessary because, under the financial accounting system in place, costs are aggregated over the fiscal year and cannot be determined at the time of importation.
Modified computed value methods are appropriate for chemical compounds, active pharmaceutical ingredients (API), chemical intermediates, finished drug products, placebos, comparators, clinical trial kits and primary containers, and biologic and vaccine materials. A modified transaction value may be used to value inventory movements of third party purchases that may be traced back to the corresponding original invoice and third party samples of API and intermediates. Inventory movements of third party purchases that may not be traced back to their corresponding invoice may be appraised using a detailed formula to arrive at the average cost of the particular material. The cost of extraction is an appropriate method of valuation for animal tissue and fluids. The importer must review the methodologies annually to ensure they are still accurate methods of appraisement. To the extent the costs may be segregated, "blue sky" conceptual research may be excluded from the value of the R&D materials, up to the point at which "lead compounds" are selected for further development. However, the value of this research must be captured in the value of the future commercial product.
H125103 dated Dec. 28, 2010.

H246651 dated Feb. 5, 2014 - <u>See</u> Consignments, transaction value inapplicable.

SOFTWARE

INTRODUCTION

GATT Valuation Agreement:

CCC Technical Committee Commentary 13.1 discusses the valuation of carrier media bearing software for data processing equipment, and states:

1. This commentary examines the question of the valuation of carrier media bearing software for data processing equipment in the specific context of the application of paragraph 2 of the decision adopted by the Committee on Customs Valuation.
2. The principle to be taken into consideration in this respect is that in determining the Customs value of imported carrier media bearing data or instructions, only the cost or value of the carrier medium itself shall be taken into account. The Customs value shall not, therefore include the cost or value of the data or instructions, provided that this is distinguished from the cost or the value of the carrier medium.
3. A problem encountered in applying this decision relates to the provision to distinguish the cost or value of the data or instructions from the cost or value of the carrier medium; sometimes, only one price of the software and the carrier medium is available, at other times, only the price of the carrier medium is invoiced or only cost or value of the data or instructions is known.
4. As there is an option to apply or not to apply paragraph 2 of the decision, countries which choose to apply that decision should interpret this paragraph in the widest possible terms so as not to negate the intention of the decision. Therefore, the expression "distinguish" should be interpreted in such a manner that if only the cost or value of the carrier medium is known the cost or value of the data or instructions should be considered as distinguished.
5. If for any reason an administration considers that a separate declaration of the two costs or values is necessary and only one of the two is available, the second one could be determined by estimation, using reasonable means consistent with the principles and general provisions of the Agreement and of Article VII of the General Agreement. Similar estimation for arriving at separate values can be done in cases where only the total price of the two elements is available. Customs administrations which choose to follow the practice of estimation may find that consultation with the importer is necessary in arriving at a reasonable solution.
6. When at the time of importation the importer is not in a position to furnish sufficient information for this purpose, the provisions of Article 13 may apply [delay of final determination of Customs value].
7. The practice recommended in this commentary is applicable to the valuation for Customs purposes of carrier media bearing software and does not take into account other requirements such as the collection of statistics.

Treasury Decision:

U.S. Valuation of Imported Carrier Media Bearing Data of Instructions for Use in Data Processing Equipment, T.D. 85-124, dated Aug. 7, 1985:

On September 24, 1984, the Committee on Customs Valuation of the GATT decided that the valuation of software imported into the United States is based solely upon the value of the carrier medium itself and does not include a value element for data, instructions, or information components contained on such software.

Annex A- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Committee on Customs Valuation, Decision on the Valuation of Carrier Media Bearing Software for Data Processing Equipment Adopted by the Committee on September 24, 1984:

The Committee on Customs Valuation DECIDES as follows:
1. It is reaffirmed that transaction value is the primary basis of valuation under the Agreement on Implementation of Article VII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (the Agreement) and that its application with regard to data or instructions (software) recorded on carrier media for data processing equipment is fully consistent with the Agreement.
2. Given the unique situation with regard to data or instructions (software) recorded on carrier media for data processing equipment, and that some Parties have sought a different approach, it would also be consistent with the Agreement for those Parties which wish to do so to adopt the following practice:

In determining the customs value of imported carrier media bearing data or instructions, only the cost or value of the carrier medium itself shall be taken into account. The customs value shall not, therefore, include the cost or value of the data or instructions, provided that this is distinguished from the cost or the value of the carrier medium.

For purposes of this Decision, the expression "carrier medium" shall not be taken to include integrated circuits, semiconductors and similar devices or articles incorporating such circuits or devices; the expression “data or instructions” shall not be taken to include sound, cinematic or video recordings.

3. Those Parties adopting the practice referred to in paragraph 2 of this Decision shall notify the Committee of the date of its application.
4. Those Parties adopting the practice in paragraph 2 of this Decision will do so on a most-favoured-nation (m.f.n.) basis, without prejudice to the continued use by any Party of the transaction value practice.

Headquarters Rulings:

The carrier medium of CDs should be valued in accordance with the methods described in section 402 of the TAA. Transaction value is the preferred method of appraisement. Section 402(b) of the TAA defines transaction value as the “price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the U.S.,” plus certain enumerated additions. Assuming that the relationship between the parties does not influence the price

and none of the other prohibitions in 19 CFR 152.103(j) exist, then transaction value would be the appropriate method of valuation for the CDs. The CDs imported containing data or instructions (i.e. software) are subject to duty on the basis of the value of the carrier medium. The price of the data and/or instructions and the value of the carrier medium should be distinguished on the invoice for entry purposes.
547946 dated Nov. 30, 2001.

The importer purchases a yearly subscription that entitles it to the receipt of a fixed number of CD-ROMs. The CD-ROMs contain information that will be used to test automotive electronic systems. The importer's annual subscription fee also includes the periodic importation of additional CD-ROMs. The additional CD-ROMs are used to update the testing system throughout the year. Customs will not evaluate the value of the information stored on the CD-ROMs. The customs value of the imported CD-ROMs is the value of the carrier medium, at the time of entry.
548190 dated Nov. 25, 2002.

H089759 dated Dec. 23, 2011 – See Royalty Payments and License Fees, Price Actually Paid or Payable.

TRANSACTION VALUE

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1) provides for the following:

TRANSACTION VALUE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE- (1) The transaction value of imported merchandise is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise when sold for exportation to the United States, plus amounts equal to-
(A) the packing costs incurred by the buyer with respect to the imported merchandise;
(B) any selling commission incurred by the buyer with respect to the imported merchandise;
(C) the value, apportioned as appropriate, of any assist;
(D) any royalty or license fee related to the imported merchandise that the buyer is required to pay, directly or indirectly, as a condition of the sale of the imported merchandise for exportation to the United States; and
(E) the proceeds of any subsequent resale, disposal, or use of the imported merchandise that accrue, directly or indirectly, to the seller.
The price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise shall be increased by the amounts attributable to the items (and no others) described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) only to the extent that each such amount (i) is not otherwise included in the price actually paid or payable; and (ii) is based on sufficient information. If sufficient information is not available, for any reason, with respect to any amount referred to in the preceding sentence, the transaction value of the imported merchandise concerned shall be treated, for purposes of this section, as one that cannot be determined.

The corresponding Customs regulation is 152.103(b)(1) and (2).

Note: For the restrictions on the use of transaction value, see chapters on RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE, CONDITIONS OR CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH A VALUE CANNOT BE DETERMINED, PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE, and RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS, supra.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Agreement provides that "the customs value of imported goods shall be the transaction value, that is the price actually paid or payable for the goods when sold for export to the country of importation adjusted in accordance with the provisions of Article 8. . . ."

Paragraph l(a) through (d) corresponds with 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(A) which provides for restrictions on the use of transaction value. Paragraph 2(a) through (c) is equivalent to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B), i.e., the use of transaction value by a related buyer and seller.

With respect to the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Paragraphs l(a)(iii) and (1)(b), Paragraphs 2 and 2(b), see chapters on RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF IMPORTED

MERCHANDISE, CONDITIONS OR CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH A VALUE CANNOT BE DETERMINED, and RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS, supra.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 2.1 deals with the Acceptability of a Price Below Prevailing Market Prices for Identical Goods, and states:

1. The question has been asked whether a price lower than prevailing market prices for identical goods can be accepted for the purposes of [transaction value].
2. The Committee considered this question and concluded that the mere fact that a price is lower than prevailing market prices for identical goods should not cause it to be rejected for the purposes of [transaction value] . . . .

Judicial Precedent:

Skaraborg Invest USA v. United States, 9 F.Supp.2d 706 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1998).

The court held that Customs properly appraised the imported machines at $700,000. The importer claimed that the invoice value was the insured value of the machines which included the actual value of the merchandise at $289,051 and the value of the legal fees incurred to claim clear title at $410,949. In addition, the importer claimed that the machines were imported subject to a lease agreement, rendering transaction value inapplicable. The importer further argued that the machines should be appraised pursuant to section 402(f) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (TAA), with the appraised value of $289,051. This value was based upon the written opinion of the machines' manufacturer prepared specifically for the court case. The court agreed with Customs' appraisement and indicated that the clear language in the invoice submitted unequivocally provided that the Customs value of the machines was $700,000. The court stated that the importer did not demonstrate that a lease situation existed, and even if a lease was in existence, there is no authority requiring Customs to resort to a manufacturer's or other expert's appraisal of the merchandise.

Headquarters Rulings:

assists

See chapter on ASSISTS, supra.

condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined

See chapter on CONDITIONS OR CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH A VALUE CANNOT BE DETERMINED, supra.

At the time HQ 547798 was issued, Customs had no indication that insufficient information had been submitted to warrant the issuance of a ruling as per the terms of sections 177.3 and 177.7 of the Customs Regulations. Based on the omission of relevant

facts and supporting documentation in connection with the issuance of HQ 547798, we find that the ruling was *void ab initio* (i.e., null from the beginning). Thus, there remains insufficient facts and evidence to determine whether transaction value is the proper basis of appraisement.
547926 dated Nov. 20, 2001.

The U.S. importer/buyer purchases technology products from its suppliers in China and stores them in a Deutsche Post ("DHL") warehouse, also located in China. The company uses a first in first out ("FIFO") inventory system and imports the technology products into the U.S. on an as needed basis. Prior to importation, the U.S. importer/buyer sends a request to the DHL warehouse with the desired items and quantity. DHL creates a packing list and based on this packing list, the U.S. importer/buyer's supplier and warehouse management company creates a customs invoice, which includes the current market price of the item (the value reported to CBP under the transaction value method of appraisement). The U.S. importer/buyer is unable to isolate the price actually paid or payable for specific units being imported into the U.S. from its DHL warehouse due to the intermingled inventory (making it difficult to assign a specific cost to an individual unit). Therefore, the market value declared was the foreign vendor's unit price at the time of exportation, which may or may not have reflected the price paid for the imported merchandise. In other words, in many instances, the declared values could not be linked to payments. CBP determined that transaction value was not the appropriate method of appraisement in this case because the U.S. importer/buyer's declared values could not be linked to the imported merchandise; thus, the company did not have the necessary evidence to establish that consideration has passed between the parties for the imported merchandise. Additionally, it was not clear that there was a sale for export to the U.S. when the U.S. importer/buyer purchased the merchandise in China and stored the merchandise in the DHL warehouse. However, upon examination of the documents provided in this case, CBP found that the "market value" may serve as an appropriate customs value to appraise SBA's imported merchandise on the basis of modified transaction value of identical or similar merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).
H254798 dated Aug. 18, 2014.

consignments

See chapter on CONSIGNMENTS, supra.

countertrade

See also, chapter on COUNTERTRADE, supra.

Unless barter transactions specify monetary value of the merchandise involved, inherent difficulties in ascertaining a value for such goods precludes a finding of transaction value.
543209 dated Jan. 25, 1984 - See Countertrade, price actually paid or payable.

543400 dated Apr. 16, 1985 - See Countertrade, price actually paid or payable.

543644 dated Nov. 20, 1985 - See Countertrade, price actually paid or payable.

hang tags/labels

Subject to an adjustment for American goods returned, the cost of price tickets and hang tags is a dutiable portion of the transaction value. Thus, hang tangs and labels made in the United States may be eligible for duty-free treatment.
544708 dated Feb. 13, 1992; aff'd by 545154 dated June 3, 1994.

Security tags are manufactured in the U.S. and purchased by the importer

(buyer). The security tags are supplied to the seller by the importer at no charge. The tags are affixed to the merchandise prior to shipment. The tags trigger an alarm if the merchandise is removed from a store without payment. No evidence was submitted to support that the price of the security tags was already included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. The security tags are considered materials used in the placing the merchandise in condition, ready for shipment to the U.S., and are packing costs under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(3). However, as products of the U.S., they are separately classifiable under subheading 9801.00.10, Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.
H028000 dated June 20, 2008.

I
imitations on use of transaction value

In a transaction between unrelated parties, transaction value may be used to appraise merchandise, even though qualification for a duty-free entry provision is a primary factor in setting the price. In addition, the seller's profits and general expenses may be inconsistent with those of other manufacturers. If there are no statutory limitations that preclude the use of transaction value, and there is sufficient information to determine the value of any statutory additions to the price actually paid or payable, then transaction value is applicable.
545063 dated Sep. 8, 1992.

Due to post-importation market condition price adjustments referred to in the sales contract between the parties, and negotiated after importation, as well as post-importation lump-sum payments, there is no firm price actually paid or payable for the merchandise at the time of importation. Therefore, transaction value is inapplicable as a means of appraisement. However, there is a transaction value of identical merchandise available to appraise the merchandise.
544726 dated Nov. 3, 1992.

Transaction value may not be used as a method of appraisement because there is insufficient information to ascertain the price actually paid or payable. Although it appears as though an assist is being provided, there is insufficient information available to accurately value the assist. Accordingly, it is necessary to proceed sequentially through the valuation statute in order to properly appraise the imported merchandise, beginning with the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.
547168 dated Apr. 12, 1999.

In this case, an airline hires a company to install aircraft furnishings. The company that installs the aircraft furnishings serves as the IOR and ultimate consignee. The airline is billed for time, labor, cost of any parts necessary for installation, Customs brokerage fees, delivery costs and U.S. Customs Service duties (if any). The installation company was unable to provide the requested information which would have verified the quantity of the goods received and the price paid for the goods; therefore, the merchandise cannot be appraised using the valuation methods of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, deductive value, or computed value. Accordingly, the merchandise must

be appraised under 19 U.S.C 1401a(f) as a modified transaction value, which uses the prices between the purchasing airline and the supplier. Thus, it appears that the purchasing airline procured the goods with the intent to have them shipped to the U.S. for installation into its airlines.
547604 dated Apr. 10, 2001.

547654 dated Nov. 9, 2001 - See Transaction Value, related party transactions.

547946 dated Nov. 30, 2001 - See Software.

547588 dated Jan. 18, 2002 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

W563485 dated Sep. 10, 2007 - See Related Party Transactions, rejection of transaction value.

H219346 dated June 18, 2014 – See Sale for Exportation, irrevocably destined for exportation to the United States.

packing costs

See chapter on PACKING COSTS, supra.

price actually paid or payable

See also chapter on PRICE ACTUALLY PAID OR PAYABLE, supra.

542476 dated June 10, 1981 (TAA No. 28); partially revoked by 542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59) – See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale; and Transaction Value, sale for exportation to the U.S.

543226 dated Jan. 3, 1984; modifies 542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59) – See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, computed value.

543485 dated Feb. 26, 1985 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.

Transaction value cannot be determined with respect to the merchandise in question because there is insufficient information from which to ascertain the price actually paid or payable. The actual costs for individual parts cannot be determined accurately and supplemental payments, resulting from a reconciliation between estimated and actual costs, are determined on a project rather than individual part basis.
543412 dated Apr. 3, 1985.

In cases where there is no price actually paid or payable for merchandise expressed in

monetary terms, an average of prices charged for similar merchandise by producers in the country of exportation may not be used to represent transaction value.
543400 dated Apr. 16, 1985.

The buyer advances cash amounts to the seller in order for the seller to prepare for the production of cantaloupes. The money is used in land preparation, seed purchase, crop maintenance, harvest, and packing. These advances are treated as being part of the price actually paid or payable. Where the prices and the amount and means of recovering the advances are clear, transaction value is proper in appraising the merchandise.
544375 dated July 16, 1990.

547196 dated Jan. 28, 1999 - See Transportation Costs, foreign-inland freight charges.

547917 dated Nov. 2, 2001 - See Transaction Value, selling commissions.

547612 dated Dec. 27, 2001 - See Duties and Taxes, deduction from transaction value.

The transactions between the Canadian IOR and the unrelated Asian supplier may be appraised under transaction value using the price paid by the Canadian company to the Asian supplier provided that: the transactions between these parties are arms length sales; the merchandise is clearly destined for the U.S. when sold; and there are no other limitations on the use of transaction value.
548644 dated Mar. 9, 2005.

H242894 dated Dec. 4, 2013 – See Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

proceeds of a subsequent resale, i.e., appropriate adjustment

See also chapter on PROCEEDS OF A SUBSEQUENT RESALE, supra.

542729 dated Mar. 29, 1982 - See Proceeds of a Subsequent Resale, addition to the price actually paid or payable.

542746 dated Mar. 30, 1982 - See Proceeds of a Subsequent Resale, addition to the price actually paid or payable.
542701 dated Apr. 28, 1982 (TAA No. 47) - See Proceeds of a Subsequent Resale, transaction value, sufficient information.

542928 dated Jan. 21, 1983 (TAA No. 57) - See Proceeds of a Subsequent Resale, transaction value, sufficient information.

543281 dated Aug. 9, 1984 - See Proceeds of a Subsequent Resale, transaction value, sufficient information..

related party transactions

See chapter on RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS, supra.

546979 dated Aug. 30, 2000 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

547155 dated Mar. 22, 2001 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

For purposes of this ruling request, we are assuming that two *bona fide* sales exist, the first between the middleman and the foreign suppliers and the second between the U.S. importer and the middleman. However, the merchandise is not clearly destined for the United States, in that there is no evidence to refute the possibility that a contingency of diversion may exist. Also, under a cost sharing agreement, the U.S. importer reimburses its sister company in Canada for services associated with the merchandise ordered. Accordingly, the presumption in this matter is that all monies remitted by the importer to its sister company in Canada pursuant to the cost sharing agreement shall constitute part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise. This presumption may be rebutted by evidence that clearly establishes that payments are completely unrelated to the imported merchandise. The imported merchandise should be appraised under transaction value based on the transaction between the U.S. importer and its sister company in Canada, provided the relationship between the parties did not influence the price.
547825 dated July 16, 2001.

547625 dated Nov. 2, 2001 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value determination.

547225 dated Nov. 9, 2001 - See Buying Commissions, control over agent.

The importer imports and distributes chemical products from it related vendors. Because the parties are related, the importer uses a transfer price to report its transaction value to Customs. The importer states that the prices for the imported goods are negotiated between the vendors and it on an annual basis. Although the elements of the proposed transfer price appear to be the same as those in the current transfer price, the proposed price is not fixed or determinable by some formula at the time of importation. Therefore, transaction value is not applicable as a means of appraisement. The merchandise may be appraised under 402(f) of the TAA (19 U.S.C. 1401(a)(f)) using a modified transaction value approach.
547654 dated Nov. 9, 2001.

547231 dated Dec. 16, 2001 - See Deductive Value, related party transactions.

Although the transaction between the related parties constitutes a valid sale for

exportation to the U.S., the documentation submitted by the protestant did not substantiate that the price the manufacturer charged the related non-resident importer for the imported women's sport tee shirts was adequate to ensure the recovery of all costs plus a profit equivalent to the firm's overall profit realized over a representative period of time. The difference in the profit percentages between the manufacturer and the middleman demonstrate that the related party manufacturer did not realize a profit equivalent to Radical's profit over the same period of time. The manufacturer's gross profit was less than the gross profit earned by the related parent company in selling merchandise of the same class or kind. This indicates that the price charged by the seller was not sufficient to recover all costs associated with production of the goods plus a profit equivalent to the parent firm's overall profit over a representative period of time. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to substantiate that the transfer price between the related parties in the "first" sale of the merchandise meets the arm's length requirement of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(B). Thus, we find the merchandise cannot be appraised based on transaction value of the sale between the related manufacturer and non-resident importer. The imported merchandise is to be appraised based on the transaction value in the sale between the Canadian non-resident importer and the U.S. consignee.
H194998 dated July 24, 2014.

A foreign seller sells merchandise to a related importer in the U.S. and through distribution agreements with the importers, retains a right to withdraw and stop the sale of certain merchandise. This restriction enhances the value of the merchandise by allowing the seller to control distribution of its product in stores. As there is a restriction on the disposition or use of the imported merchandise that substantially affects it value, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(2)(i)(III), transaction value cannot be used to appraise the merchandise. In addition, transaction value was precluded as a service fee charged by the seller to the importer included trademark protection which was determined to be part of the price actually paid or payable. Further, due to a clause in the distribution agreement requiring the importer to use certain publicity tools provided by the seller, the portion of the service fee allocated for marketing and advertising support was found to be a condition of sale and thus dutiable. As insufficient information was available to segregate the dutiable portions of the service fee from the non-dutiable, transaction value was precluded. CBP determined that under the circumstances, deductive value should be used. If deductive value could not be used, then a modified deduction value under the fallback method should be used to appraised the merchandise.
H038381 dated Nov. 17, 2014.

restrictions on disposition or use of imported merchandise

See chapter on RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE, supra.

royalty and license fees

See chapter on ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND LICENSE FEES, supra.

547155 dated Mar. 22, 2001 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

The cost of the license fee is included in the negotiated price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. Nothing in the statute or regulations allows for a deduction for an amount representing the license fee where it is already included in the price. Due to the license fees being included in the price actually paid or payable, it is not necessary to also determine whether they could be regarded as additions to the price actually paid or payable, within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(D). Accordingly, the amounts representing the license fees may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
547958 dated July 23, 2001.

547710 dated Dec. 16, 2001 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, price actually paid or payable.

sale for exportation to the United States

See also chapter on SALE FOR EXPORTATION, supra.

542310 dated May 22, 1981 - See Sale for Exportation, timing of sale.

542895 dated Aug. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 51); 544262 dated June 27, 1989 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

Merchandise dutiable under transaction value does not include the value of repairs for in-transit damage made in a third country which merely restore the merchandise to its original condition, even if replacement parts are needed. However, the addition to merchandise of parts in a third country which enhances the value may be sufficient to make the third country the country of exportation, in which transaction value is inapplicable.

542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39); modified by 543737 dated July 21, 1986.

542748 dated Mar. 31, 1982 - See Foreign Trade Zones, valuation.

542791 dated June 10, 1982 - See Sale for Exportation, timing of sale.

The fact that title to merchandise may pass at some time subsequent to its importation into the United States does not preclude a sale for exportation to the United States which may be used to establish transaction value.
542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59); partially revokes 542476 dated June 10, 1981 (TAA No. 28).

542996 dated Mar. 4, 1983 - See Lease Transactions, elimination of transaction value.

543243 dated Apr. 30, 1984 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.

543288 dated Nov. 26, 1984 - See Defective Merchandise, defective parts returned to the U.S.

A U.S. importer purchases oil well tubing from an unrelated manufacturer in Japan. The tubing is shipped to Canada where another unrelated party applies a plastic protective coating to the tubing. The importer makes separate payments to the Japanese manufacturer and to the Canadian company which performs the further processing. The transaction between the importer and the Canadian processor represents a "sale for exportation to the United States." The transaction value is represented by the price paid by the importer to the Canadian processor, plus the value, as an assist, of the tubing furnished without charge by the importer to the Canadian processor. The value of the assist equals the sum of the price paid to the Japanese manufacturer and the transportation and related costs incurred in shipping the merchandise from Japan to the processing site in Canada.
543737 dated July 21, 1986; modifies 542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39).

547594 dated June 27, 2000 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

547844 dated Feb. 15, 2001 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sale.

547155 dated Mar. 22, 2001 - See Royalty Payments and License Fees, related to the imported merchandise and as a condition of the sale.

547825 dated July 16, 2001 - See Transaction Value, related party transactions.

There is insufficient evidence to determine that the imported merchandise was clearly destined for the United States at the time of sale. Transaction value cannot be based on the sale between the middleman and the exporter. Therefore, the transaction value should be based on the sales between the middleman and the importer.
547435 dated Oct. 30, 2001.

The importer, which is also the seller/middleman of the merchandise, took orders from U.S. purchasers and then placed those orders with unrelated suppliers in France. The goods did not meet the Nissho standard of being clearly destined for the United States in a multi-tiered transaction. Therefore, appraisement under transaction value cannot be used based on the transaction between the Canadian firm and the foreign suppliers. Accordingly, the merchandise is subject to appraisement based on the sale between the importer and the middleman.
547901 dated Dec. 7, 2001.

selling commissions

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(1)(B); 19 CFR 152.103(b)(1)(ii); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph l(a)(i); See chapter on SELLING COMMISSIONS, supra.

The importer enters into an agency agreement with the supplier. The importer pays for merchandise shipped to it, plus the costs of transportation and importation into the United States. Further, based on the terms of sale stated on the invoice, the importer may take title to the fabric. However, the mere taking of title to merchandise does not preclude a finding that importer was acting as an agent. Based on the functions of the parties as delineated in the agreement, thimporter acts as a selling agent for the supplier in sales to the customers in the United States. Based on the information submitted, no *bona fide* sale occurs between the importer and supplier. Accordingly, transaction value based on the price actually paid or payable by the U.S. customer is the appropriate basis of appraisement under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b).
547917 dated Nov. 2, 2001.

547225 dated Nov. 9, 2001 - See Buying Commissions, control over agent.

unrelated parties

Under the circumstances of this particular transaction, all parties are clearly unrelated. The material obtained for the imported merchandise was obtained at no cost to the seller. The invoice price to the importer does not reflect any cost for this material. The merchandise should be appraised under transaction value and, because the material was not provided directly or indirectly by the buyer, or any party related to the buyer, the material is not an assist.
545172 dated May 6, 1993.

547844 dated Feb. 15, 2001 - See Sale for Exportation, *bona fide* sales.

TRANSACTION VALUE OF IDENTICAL OR SIMILAR MERCHANDISE

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(c) states the following:

TRANSACTION VALUE OF IDENTICAL MERCHANDISE AND SIMILAR MERCHANDISE.-
(1) The transaction value of identical merchandise, or of similar merchandise, is the transaction value (acceptable as the appraised value for purposes of this Act under subsection (b) but adjusted under paragraph (2) of this subsection) of imported merchandise that is -

(A) with respect to the merchandise being appraised, either identical merchandise or similar merchandise, as the case may be; and

(B) exported to the United States at or about the time that the merchandise being appraised is exported to the United States.

(2) Transaction values determined under this subsection shall be based on sales of identical merchandise or similar merchandise, as the case may be, at the same commercial level and in substantially the same quantity as the sales of the merchandise being appraised. If no such sale is found, sales of identical merchandise or similar merchandise at either a different commercial level or in different quantities, or both, shall be used, but adjusted to take account of any such difference. Any adjustment made under this paragraph shall be based on sufficient information. If in applying this paragraph with respect to any imported merchandise, two or more transaction values for identical merchandise, or for similar merchandise, are determined, such imported merchandise shall be appraised on the basis of the lower or lowest or such values.

The terms "identical merchandise" and "similar merchandise" are defined in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(2) and (4) as follows:

(2) The term "identical merchandise" means -

(A) merchandise that is identical in all respect to, and was produced in the same country and by the same person as, the merchandise being appraised; or

(B) if merchandise meeting the requirements under subparagraph (A) cannot be found (or for purposes of applying subsection (b)(2)(B)(i), [test value for related party transaction] regardless of whether merchandise meeting such requirements can be found), merchandise that is identical in all respects to, and was produced in the same country as, but not produced by the same person as, the merchandise being appraised.

Such term does not include merchandise that incorporates or reflects any engineering, development, artwork, design work, or plan or sketch that- (I) was supplied free or at reduced cost by the buyer of the merchandise for use in connection with the production or the sale for export to the United States of the merchandise; and (II) is not an assist because undertaken within the United States.

(4) The term "similar merchandise" means -

(A) merchandise that- (i) was produced in the same country and by the same person as the merchandise being appraised, (ii) is like the merchandise being appraised in characteristics and components material, and (iii) is commercially interchangeable with the merchandise being appraised; or

(B) if merchandise meeting the requirements under subparagraph (A) cannot be found (or for purposes of applying subsection (b)(2)(B)(i), [test value for related party transaction] regardless of whether merchandise meeting such requirements can be found), merchandise that- (i) was produced in the same country as, but not produced by the same person as, the merchandise being appraised, and (ii) meets the requirement set forth in subparagraph (A) (ii) and (iii).

Such term does not include merchandise that incorporates or reflects any engineering, development, artwork, design work, or plan or sketch that- (I) was supplied free or at reduced cost by the buyer of the merchandise for use in connection with the production or the sale for export to the United States of the merchandise; and (II) is not an assist because undertaken within the United States.

The corresponding Customs regulation is found in 19 CFR 152.104 and it states the following:

(a) General. The transaction value of identical merchandise, or of similar merchandise, is the transaction value (acceptable as the appraised value under [section] 152.103 but adjusted under paragraph (e) of this section) of imported merchandise that is -

(1) With respect to the merchandise being appraised, either identical merchandise, or similar merchandise; and

(2) Exported to the United States at or about the time that the merchandise being appraised is exported to the United States.

(b) Identical merchandise. Minor differences in appearance will not preclude otherwise conforming merchandise from being considered "identical". See [section] 152.102(d).

[Note: 19 CFR 152.102(d) referred to under 19 CFR 152.104(b) is similar to language used in the definitional section of the TAA quoted above, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(2) regarding identical merchandise.]

(c) Similar merchandise. The quality of the merchandise, its reputation, and the existence of a trademark will be factors considered to determine whether merchandise is "similar". See [section] 152.102(i).

[Note: 19 CFR 152.102(i) referred to under 19 CFR 152.104(c) is similar to language used in the definitional section of the TAA quoted above, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(4) regarding similar merchandise.]

(d) Commercial level and quantity. Transaction values determined under this section will be based on sales of identical merchandise, or similar merchandise, at the same commercial level and in substantially the same quantity as the sales of the merchandise being appraised. If no such sale is found, sales of identical merchandise, or similar merchandise, at either a different commercial level or in different quantities, or both, will be used, but adjusted to take account of that difference. Any adjustment made under this section will be based on "sufficient information". See [section] 152.102(j). If in applying this section to any merchandise, two or more transaction values for identical merchandise, or for similar merchandise, are determined, the merchandise will be

appraised on the basis of the lower or lowest of those values.
(e) Adjustments.
(1) Adjustments for identical merchandise, or similar merchandise, because of different commercial levels or quantities, or both, whether leading to an increase or decrease in the value, will be made only on the basis of sufficient information; e.g., valid price lists containing prices referring to different levels or quantities.
(2) Interpretative note. If the imported merchandise being valued consists of a shipment of 10 units and the only identical imported merchandise for which a transaction value exists involved a sale of 500 units, and it is recognized that the seller grants quantity discounts, the required adjustment may be accomplished by resorting to the seller's price list and using that price applicable to a sale of 10 units. This does not require that a sale had to have been made in quantities of 10 as long as the price list had been established as being *bona fide* through sales at other quantities. In the absence of such an objective measure, however, the determination of a customs value under the provisions for transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is not appropriate.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 2 provides for the use of transaction value of identical goods and states:

1. (a) If the customs value of the imported goods cannot be determined under the provisions of Article 1, [transaction value] the customs value shall be the transaction value of identical goods sold for export to the same country of importation and exported at or about the same time as the goods being valued.
(b) In applying this Article, the transaction value of identical goods in a sale at the same commercial level and in substantially the same quantity as the goods being valued shall be used to determine the customs value. Where no such sale is found, the transaction value of identical goods sold at a different commercial level and/or in different quantities, adjusted to take account of differences attributable to commercial level and/or to quantity, shall be used, provided that such adjustments can be made on the basis of demonstrated evidence which clearly establishes the reasonableness and accuracy of the adjustment, whether the adjustment leads to an increase or a decrease in the value.
2. Where the costs and charges referred to in Article 8.2 [cost of transport of the goods to the port or place of importation; loading, unloading and handling charges associated with the transport of the goods to the port or place of importation; and cost of insurance] are included in the transaction value, an adjustment shall be made to take account of significant differences in such costs and charges between the imported goods and the identical goods in question arising from differences in distances and modes of transport.
3. If, in applying this Article, more than one transaction value of identical goods is found, the lowest such value shall be used to determine the customs value of the imported goods.

Article 3 provides for the use of transaction value of similar goods (same language as Article 2).

Article 15, paragraph 2(a), defines identical goods as:

"[I]dentical goods" means goods which are the same in all respects, including physical characteristics, quality and reputation. Minor differences in appearance would not preclude goods otherwise conforming to the definition from being regarded as identical.

Article 15, paragraph 2(b), defines similar goods as:

"[S]imilar goods" means goods which, although not alike in all respects, have like characteristics and like component materials which enable them to perform the same functions and to be commercially interchangeable. The quality of the goods, their reputation and the existence of a trademark are among the factors to be considered in determining whether goods are similar.

Article 15, paragraph 2(c) through (e), provides for the following:

(c) The terms "identical goods" and "similar goods" do not include, as the case may be, goods which incorporate or reflect engineering, development, artwork, design work, and plans and sketches for which no adjustment has been made under Article 8.1(b)(iv) because such elements were undertaken in the country of importation.
(d) Goods shall not be regarded as "identical goods" or "similar goods" unless they were produced in the same country as the goods being valued.
(e) Goods produced by a different person shall be taken into account only when there are no identical goods or similar goods, as the case may be, produced by the same person as the goods being valued.

The Interpretative Notes, Notes to Articles 2 and 3, are similar in language to the Customs regulation regarding transaction value of identical merchandise and similar merchandise, i.e., 19 CFR 152.104(d) and (e).

In addition, CCC Technical Committee Commentary 1.1 provides examples of whether goods are identical or similar in accordance with the Agreement.

CCC Technical Committee Commentary 10.1 discusses and cites examples of situations involving questions of adjustments for different commercial levels and quantities.

Judicial Precedent:

Four Seasons Produce v. United States, 24 I.T.R.D. 1022 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2001).

The court upheld a Customs ruling concerning the valuation of imported merchandise. The case arose from the appraisement of imported asparagus. Because the asparagus was imported on a consignment basis, there was no transaction value available to appraise the asparagus. In accordance with section 402(c)(1)(B), Customs appraised the produce based on the transaction value of "identical or similar merchandise . . . exported

to the United States *at or about the time"* that the importer's merchandise was exported. The issue before the court was Customs' interpretation of the phrase "at or about the time [of export]". Customs interpreted "at the time" of export as being the date of exportation. Customs determined that in the case of perishable produce, "about the time" of export should encompass a time period beginning one week before and extending until one week after the date of exportation. Customs further concluded values on the date of exportation are considered first, but if not available, that comparable values closest to the date of exportation should be preferred over earlier or later values. Customs noted that determinations of the proper timeframe may vary depending on the kind of good and the circumstances of the industry at issue. Also, if several transaction values are provided for the merchandise being appraised on the exact or closest date of exportation, the lowest value for that date should be utilized. The court affirmed Customs' interpretation of the phrase "at or about the time [of exportation]." In this case, the CIT found Customs' reasoning persuasive noting, "[i]n light of Customs' specialized experience in valuing exported merchandise, the thoroughness of Customs' reasoning in interpreting the phrase 'at or about the time,' the rank of the Customs officer who issued the Decision Letter, and Customs' serious consideration of Plaintiff's position as to the meaning of the phrase 'at or about the time,' the court finds that Customs' interpretation, as it applies to the valuation of Plaintiff's merchandise, is persuasive and, therefore, entitled to respect."

Headquarters Rulings:

consignment transactions

542568 dated Nov. 16, 1981; 543112 dated May 10, 1984; 543128 dated June 4, 1984; overruled by 543641 dated Aug. 22, 1986 - See Consignments, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.

543641 dated Aug. 22, 1986; overrules 542568 dated Nov. 16, 1981, 543112 dated May 10, 1984, 543128 dated June 4, 1984. - See Consignments, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.

544469 dated Aug. 16, 1990 - See Consignments, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.

exported to the United States at or about the same time

19 U.S.C. 1401a(c)(1)(B); 19 CFR 152.104(a)(2); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 2, paragraph l(a), and Article 3, paragraph l(a)

Transaction value is inapplicable because the relationship between the parties influences the price of the imported merchandise. The importer submits evidence of liquidated entries from other ports of entry for merchandise that is "identical" to the merchandise being appraised. Assuming the identical merchandise was exported to the United States at or about the same time as the merchandise being appraised, then the importer has

established the existence of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.
543605 dated Mar. 13, 1987; aff'd by 543927 dated May 13, 1987; overruled by T.D. 91-15 dated Mar. 29, 1991, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 25, (1995).

Customs previously ruled that the values at which the entries of imported merchandise had been liquidated were to be taken as representing the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise in the appraisement of merchandise that was exported to the United States at or about the same time. However, Customs has reconsidered this matter because of a question on the use of the value from an entry that, although liquidated, does not meet the conditions of transaction value under section 402(b).
T.D. 91-15, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 25, (1991); overrules 543605 dated Mar. 13, 1987, 543927 dated May 13, 1987.

The terms "at" or "about" included in the "at or about the time of exportation" language of section 402(c) are to be applied in a hierarchical fashion, with resort to values "at" and then "about" the time of exportation. In selecting a transaction value of identical or similar merchandise in accordance with section 402(c), it is appropriate to consider transaction values for merchandise that has been exported "at" the same time as the instant merchandise, that is, by using transaction values exported on the exact date as the merchandise being appraised. If no transaction value is available for merchandise exported on the exact date as the merchandise under appraisement, it is then appropriate to consider transaction values for merchandise exported "about" the same time, that is, by using transaction values for merchandise exported on the date closest to the date of export of the merchandise being appraised. In the case of perishable produce such as asparagus, "about" is construed to mean one week, seven calendar days, before or after the date of exportation of the instant merchandise being appraised, that is, a total of fourteen days.
546217 dated Apr. 8, 1998.

The merchandise should be appraised pursuant to transaction value for identical or similar merchandise. The terms "at" or "about" included in the "at or about the time of exportation," under section 402(c) of the TAA, are applied in a hierarchical fashion, with resort to values "at" and then "about" the time of exportation. In selecting a transaction value of identical or similar merchandise in accordance with section 402(c), it is appropriate to consider transaction values for merchandise that has been exported "at" the same time as the instant merchandise, that is, by using transaction values exported on the exact date as the merchandise being appraised. If no transaction value is available for merchandise exported on the exact date as the merchandise under appraisement, it is then appropriate to consider transaction values for merchandise exported "about" the same time, that is by using transaction values for merchandise exported on the date closest to the date of export of the merchandise being appraised. In the case of perishable produce such as watermelons, "about" is construed to mean one week, seven calendar days, before or after the date of exportation of the instant merchandise being appraised (a total of 14 days).
546999 dated Apr. 12, 1999.

Merchandise was exported to the United States, but upon its arrival the buyer was unable to pay for the merchandise. The duties were also not paid; therefore, the merchandise was placed in the custody of the port director. There was no transfer of title at the time of importation. A different buyer subsequently purchased the merchandise. Transaction value is not applicable as a means of appraisement because there was no completed "sale for exportation" to the United States. At the time of the subsequent purchase, the merchandise was already located in the United States. Transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is the most appropriate method for determining the value of the subject merchandise pursuant to section 402(c) of the TAA.
547850 dated Jan. 12, 2001.

identical or similar merchandise

19 U.S.C. 1401a(h)(2) and (4); 19 CFR 152.102(d) and (i); 19 CFR 152.104(b) and (c); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 15, paragraph 2

Transaction value of identical or similar merchandise refers to a previously accepted and adjusted transaction value of identical and similar merchandise which was exported at or about the same time as the goods being valued. Merchandise is not regarded as identical or similar unless it was produced in the same country as the merchandise being valued. Under no circumstances may imported merchandise be appraised on the basis of the selling price in the United States of merchandise produced in the United States.
543628 dated Nov. 4, 1985.

The imported merchandise was appropriately appraised on the basis of transaction value of similar merchandise. The requirement of section 402(h)(4)(B)(i) of the TAA is met by the fact that both shipments of caviar were produced in the former Soviet Union. The subject caviar was appraised on the basis of the lowest grade of caviar exported from the former Soviet Union and, in this case, the two shipments of caviar are “commercially interchangeable.”
545308 dated Jan. 19, 1995.

Transaction value is eliminated as a method of appraisement because the relationship between the parties influences the price actually paid or payable. The transaction value does not approximate available test values. Therefore, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is proper. If there exist two or more transaction values for similar merchandise exported to the United States at or about the same time as the subject merchandise, then appraisement shall be based on the lower or lowest of such values in accordance with section 402(c)(2) of the TAA.
545638 dated Feb. 13, 1995.

Asparagus is shipped on a consignment basis from Mexico to a U.S. importer. Several other brands from the same Mexican asparagus producer are exported to the United States at or about the same time. These brands are all sold at the same commercial level and in substantially the same quantity as the sale of the merchandise being appraised.

The importer alleges that the other brands are selectively chosen from the top asparagus grown by the producer and that it is super packed using costly U.S. origin wood crates as opposed to Mexican cardboard or plastic. Without adequate documentation or sufficient evidence indicating that the other brands of asparagus possesses different characteristics than the instant asparagus and that the other brands of asparagus are not commercially interchangeable with the instant asparagus, the other brands of asparagus are considered to be "identical or similar" to the merchandise at issue and will serve as the basis of transaction value. There is no legal authority under section 402(c) to make adjustments for any packing costs that may have been included in the value of the asparagus. It would be appropriate to make adjustments only for packing if necessary to account for different commercial levels. If there are two acceptable transaction values under section 402(b), then the merchandise must be appraised based on the lowest of these values.
545755 dated May 18, 1995.

Transaction value is inapplicable because there is insufficient information available to determine the price actually paid or payable. However, the merchandise may be appraised pursuant to the transaction value of similar merchandise under section 402(c) of the TAA. A previously accepted transaction value is available, and is based on a sale from the seller to an unrelated customer which was made at the same commercial level as the instant sale. Although that merchandise was allegedly produced with different components and had different production costs from the subject importations, it is still considered "like the merchandise being appraised in characteristics and component material" pursuant to section 402(h)(4) of the TAA.
546161 dated May 7, 1996.

The merchandise at issue was properly appraised using transaction value of identical or similar merchandise pursuant to section 402(c) of the TAA. The imported wearing apparel was manufactured in Indonesia. The similar merchandise used to appraise the wearing apparel was manufactured in Indonesia and exported to the United States at or about the same time as the wearing apparel at issue. Based on the evidence presented, the information submitted is insufficient to support the claim that the wearing apparel should be appraised at the invoice value between the related seller and the importer.
546536 dated Aug. 29, 1997.

547591 dated Apr. 21, 2000; 547573 dated Apr. 21, 2000; 547628 dated Apr. 21, 2000 - <u>See</u> Consignments, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.

There was insufficient information to base an appraisement on transaction value because the value of the assists was unavailable. Therefore, the appraisement was based on the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise pursuant to information available to Customs. As such, Customs properly appraised the merchandise according to the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.
547738 dated Nov. 13, 2001.

The appraising officer correctly based the appraisement of the imported merchandise on

the transaction value of similar merchandise, after the importer did not provide requested documentation to verify the existence of *bona fide* sales, and did respond to questions about the existence of royalties and license fees. Under the circumstances, transaction value was properly eliminated as a
basis of appraisement.
W548679 dated Apr. 20, 2007.

After receiving an order from a domestic customer, a U.S. buyer instructed its related buying agent located in Hong Kong to place a purchase order for the merchandise with an unrelated Hong Kong seller, DDP Columbus. The Hong Kong seller, in turn, placed an order for the merchandise with a Chinese company (Chinese Seller), FOB Hong Kong. The Chinese seller then subcontracted the order to a Chinese manufacturer. The merchandise was shipped from China by the Chinese manufacturer to the Hong Kong seller in Hong Kong. The Chinese seller, "on behalf of" the Hong Kong seller, then shipped the goods to the U.S. The U.S. buyer, the Hong Kong seller, and the Chinese seller were unrelated. Entry was made by the protestant, located in California, which was characterized as the "alter ego" of the Hong Kong seller. The goods were valued by the importer based upon an alleged FOB Hong Kong transaction between the Chinese seller and the importer. The port reappraised the merchandise using invoices for similar merchandise previously entered for the same consignee, i.e., the U.S. buyer. There was nothing in the record that substantiated a sale between the importer and the Chinese seller, or that indicated that the importer was the agent of the Hong Kong seller. In addition, the importer, which the Hong Kong seller appointed to act as its "alter ego", was not a licensed Customs broker and was only named consignee on the invoice submitted to CBP to facilitate entry. The true consignee was the U.S. buyer. There was no evidence that the importer had a financial interest in the imported goods such that the importer could be considered an "owner" or "purchaser" of the goods. Consequently, the importer had no right to make entry. In addition, the invoice submitted to CBP as part of the entry process detailed a sham transaction. The importer was invoiced as if it was the buyer but it was not. Also, the invoiced values could not be verified. The port was correct, therefore, in not using the value of the sham transaction between the Chinese seller and the importer to appraise the imported merchandise. Further, based on the conflicting documentation presented, a *bona fide* sale between the Chinese seller and the Hong Kong seller could not be proven. Accordingly, the merchandise could not be appraised based on the value of the transaction between the U.S. buyer and the Hong Kong seller, that is, the DDP prices. The port correctly appraised the merchandise using the value of identical or similar goods.
H105275 dated Dec. 21, 2011.

CBP held that over-proof (192 proof) bulk vodka could not be appraised using the Transaction Value of Identical or Similar Merchandise and referencing 80 proof bottled vodka as similar merchandise.
H237458 dated July 11, 2013.

The company imported pharmaceutical products into the U.S. for tolling purposes. The company is the service provider. The owner of the imported product was a related party. Several scenarios were presented, in each the company also purchased and imported

tablets and/or API from a related party at a transfer price approved under an Advance Pricing Agreement ("APA"), though the related party transactions were not at issue. In scenario 1, the related seller was the same party that manufactured the goods imported under the tolling contract, and identical goods were produced by the same producer in the same country as the goods at issue. In scenario 4, the related seller was not the manufacturer of the goods imported under the tolling contract and the sale was a domestic sale. In scenarios 1 and 4, which were substantially similar, there were no sales for exportation to the U.S. In scenario 1, the imported merchandise could be appraised on the basis on the transaction value of identical merchandise. In scenario 4, the imported merchandise could be appraised using computed value or a reasonably adjusted deductive value. In scenario 2, the first related party bought bulk tablets and/or API for exportation to the U.S. from the third related party. The tablets and/or API were shipped to the U.S. to be packaged by the importer company and then sold and shipped to another related party overseas. There were no importations of identical or similar goods. In scenario 3, the first related party bought bulk tablets and/or API for exportation to the U.S. from an unrelated party. The tablets and/or API were shipped to the U.S. to be packaged by the company and then sold by the first related party and shipped to another related party overseas. In both scenarios, the imported merchandise could be appraised using a reasonably adjusted transaction value under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).
H242509 dated Aug. 15, 2013.

related parties

542310 dated May 22, 1981 - See Related Party Transactions, examination of the circumstances of the sale.

sufficient information

19 U.S.C. 1401a(c) (2); 19 CFR 152.104(e)

The importer submitted a copy of the Journal of Commerce Import Statistics in support of its position regarding the applicability of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise. The document shows shipments of the product at issue from the same country of export that arrived in the United States during the time period at issue. However, the evidence does not show the terms of sale, the price, or the method of appraisement for any of the shipments. Therefore, there is a lack of sufficient information to appraise the merchandise pursuant to transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.
544252 dated Dec. 21, 1988.

An importer submits an invoice to Customs, and the invoice was specifically prepared for the foreign government. This invoice is accompanied by a worksheet that adjusts the values to the price actually paid by the importer. The invoice is approximately equal to half of the actual payment made by the importer to the seller. Identical merchandise, shipped from the same region on the same day, is often invoiced at different prices. The submission of this prepared invoice along with the adjusted worksheet that cannot be verified does not provide sufficient information to appraise pursuant to transaction value

of identical or similar merchandise.
544375 dated July 16, 1990.

Transaction value was properly eliminated as a basis of appraisement. However, under section 402(c) of the TAA, there is no authority to adjust the transaction value of similar merchandise in a manner that accounts for differences other than commercial levels or quantities. In addition, there is no authority under section 402(f) to add an arbitrary, albeit reasonable, percentage to the invoice price in reaching an appraised value. Alternatively, appraisement may be based on a method derived from the transaction value of similar merchandise, adjusted in accordance with section 402(f) and 19 CFR 152.107(b).
545999 dated Dec. 12, 1995.

transaction value readily available

In order for transaction value of identical or similar merchandise to be applicable as a means of appraisement, it must be demonstrated that the transaction value upon which the importer is basing the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is fully acceptable under section 402(b) of the TAA.
T.D. 91-15 dated Mar. 29, 1991; <u>overrules</u> 543605 dated Mar. 13, 1987, 543927 dated May 13, 1987.

It must be demonstrated that transaction value is fully acceptable under section 402(b) of the TAA at the time of appraisement of the merchandise under consideration in order to be applied as the transaction value of identical or similar goods under section 402(c). The information necessary for the determination of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise may be made on the basis of information provided by the importer or already available to Customs. In this case, at the time of the importations, two importers of fresh asparagus had established transaction value pursuant to section 402(b). The importer claims that the asparagus should have been appraised pursuant to resale prices, less appropriate deductions. With regard to the application of the transaction value as established by the two other asparagus importers for the merchandise at issue, the importer has not demonstrated either (1) why such values were not fully acceptable under section 402(b) at the time of the appraisement of the subject merchandise; or (2) why such values cannot serve, pursuant to section 402(c), as the basis of the transaction value for the subject importations. The asparagus was appropriately appraised based on the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise.
546151 dated Dec. 6, 1995.

It must be demonstrated that the transaction value of the merchandise under consideration is fully acceptable under section 402(b) of the TAA, in order to be applied as the transaction value of identical or similar goods pursuant to section 402(c). The determination concerning the acceptability of the transaction value may be based on information provided by the importer or information that is available to Customs (citing T.D. 91-15, 25 Cust. B. & Dec. 31 (1991)).
546057 dated Mar. 14, 1996.

548247 dated Mar. 10, 2003 - <u>See</u> Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, waste material.

Automobiles imported into the United States that are purchased pursuant to a program whereby the ultimate purchaser takes delivery abroad and uses the automobile for a specified amount of time in a foreign country prior to exportation to the United States may not be appraised pursuant to transaction value. There is no sale for exportation to the United States with respect to these automobiles. However, if there is a transaction value of identical or similar merchandise available, then it is proper to appraise the automobiles imported pursuant to the program using the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise method. However, it must be demonstrated that the transaction value of the merchandise under consideration is fully acceptable under section 402(b) in order to be applied as the transaction value of the identical or similar goods pursuant to section 402(c).
548371 dated Nov. 19, 2003; <u>aff'g</u> 547197 dated Aug. 22, 2000 (regarding the issue of the acceptability of transaction value.)

two or more values

19 U.S.C. 1401a(c)(2); 19 CFR 152.104(d); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 2, paragraph 3 and Article 3, paragraph 3

If two or more transaction values for identical or similar merchandise are found, the appraisement must be based upon the lowest of such value.
542717 dated Apr. 2, 1982.

TRANSPARENCY

INTRODUCTION

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 12 of the Agreement states:

Laws, regulations, judicial decisions and administrative rulings of general application giving effect to this Agreement shall be published in conformity with Article X of the General Agreement by the country of importation concerned.

Treasury Decision:

T.D. 81-7, dated Jan. 12, 1981:

This document amends the Customs Regulations to enable the Customs Service (Customs) to implement and administer the provisions of Title II of Public Law 96-39, the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, relating to the valuation of imported merchandise for customs purposes.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS

INTRODUCTION

In defining the "price actually paid or payable", the TAA states the following:

The term price actually paid or payable means the total payment (whether direct or indirect, and exclusive of any costs, charges, or expenses incurred for transportation, insurance, and related services incident to the international shipment of the merchandise from the country of exportation to the place of importation in the United States) made, or to be made, for imported merchandise by the buyer to, or for the benefit of, the seller. (emphasis added) 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)(4)(A).

(See also, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)(3)(A)(ii) and (iii) regarding deductive value adjustment for transportation, supra.)

The equivalent Customs regulations regarding the "price actually paid or payable" is 19 CFR 152.102(f). The corresponding regulation with respect to deductive value is 19 CFR 152.105(d)(2) and (3).

In addition, the regulations supplement the TAA in 19 CFR 152.103(a)(5), also known as T.D. 84-235, dated Nov. 29, 1984:

Foreign inland freight and other inland charges incident to the international shipment of merchandise. - (i) Ex-factory sales. If the price actually paid or payable by the buyer to the seller for imported merchandise does not include a charge for foreign inland freight and other charges for services incident to the international shipment of merchandise (an ex-factory price), those charges will not be added to the price.
(ii) Sales others than ex-factory. As a general rule, in those situations where the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise includes a charge for foreign inland freight, whether or not itemized separately on the invoices or other commercial documents, that charge will be part of the transaction value to the extent included in the price. However, charges for foreign inland freight and other services incident to the shipment of the merchandise to the United States may be considered incident to the international shipment of that merchandise within the meaning of [section] 152.102(f) if they are identified separately and they occur after the merchandise has been sold for export to the United States and placed with a carrier for through shipment to the United States.
(iii) Evidence of sale for export and placement for through shipment. A sale for export and placement for through shipment to the United States under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section shall be established by means of a through bill of lading to be presented to the district director. Only in those situations where it clearly would be impossible to ship merchandise on a through bill of lading (e.g., shipments via the seller's own conveyance) will other documentation satisfactory to the district director showing a sale for export to the United States and placement for through shipment to the United States be accepted in lieu of a through bill of lading.
(iv) Erroneous and false information. This regulation shall not be construed as prohibiting

Customs from making appropriate additions to the dutiable value of merchandise in instances where verification reveals that foreign inland freight charges or other charges for services incident to the international shipment of merchandise have been overstated.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 8, paragraph 2, states:

In framing its legislation, each Party shall provide for the inclusion or the exclusion from the customs value, in whole or in part, of the following:
(a) the cost of transport of the imported goods to the port or place of importation;
(b) loading, unloading and handling charges associated with the transport of the imported goods to the port or place of importation; and
(c) the cost of insurance.

In addition, the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable, among other things, states:

The customs value shall not include the following charges or costs, provided that they are distinguished from the price actually paid or payable for the imported goods . . . the cost of transport after importation; . . . .

Judicial Precedent:

All Channel Products v. United States, 16 Ct. Int'l Trade 169 (1992), aff'd, 982 F.2d 513 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case involving foreign-inland freight, the importer had not submitted a through bill of lading to Customs. The court held that the charges in question, foreign inland freight and related charges included in the CIF prices, did not "occur after the merchandise ha[d] been sold for export to the United States and placed with a carrier for through shipment to the United States," as required by 19 CFR 152.103(a)(5)(iii). Therefore, Customs was correct in not deducting foreign-inland freight and related charges from the CIF prices.

The appellate court affirmed, indicating that the application of 19 CFR 152.103(a)(5)(iii) to the transaction did not allow for a deduction for foreign-inland freight.

Cutter & Buck, Inc. v. United States, No. 13-45, slip op. (Ct. Int'l Trade Apr. 3, 2013).

Cutter & Buck ("C&B") challenged CBP's failure to adjust the transaction value by deducting international freight charges. C&B originally intended to import the goods as FOB shipments, and, indeed, the original FOB purchase price was paid, but because they were late, the freight responsibility shifted to the seller via a late delivery clause. However, the terms of sale were not expressly changed from FOB to cost and freight ("CFR"). CBP

denied C&B's claim in HRL 548432 dated May 20, 2004, as there was no evidence to show the shift, and freight costs are separate from a FOB price, but included in a CFR price. The court found that CBP properly rejected C&B's claim for a freight deduction citing 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b), which makes clear that the price the buyer paid for the merchandise must have either directly or indirectly included transportation costs for those costs to be excludable, and absent such evidence, a freight deduction is not available. The court agreed with CBP that while the Incoterms on an invoice are supportive, they are not dispositive, and the circumstances of the transaction must be examined, and C&B was required to present corroborating facts to support its assertions.

Headquarters Notices:

General Notice, Actual Freight and Insurance Deductions, Cust. B. & Dec., Vol. 31, No. 8, Feb. 19, 1997.

The amount to be deducted from the transaction value of imported merchandise for freight, insurance, and other costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise, including foreign inland freight costs, are the actual, as opposed to the estimated, costs. Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1484(a)(1), the importer of record is required, using reasonable care, to make and complete entry by filing with Customs, among other things, the declared value of the merchandise. The importer's declaration of a transaction value excluding an amount for freight/shipment charges based on estimated costs may constitute a failure to exercise reasonable care.

Headquarters Rulings:

deductive value

The proper amount to be deducted for appraisement purposes pursuant to deductive value is the actual cost of the transportation. An airway bill submitted in this case serves as evidence of the actual costs of transportation.
544236 dated Oct. 31, 1988.

estimated freight costs versus actual

Where shipments are made on a C & F basis, the actual expenses for ocean freight as opposed to estimated charges are deducted to establish the dutiable value.
542206 dated Mar. 23, 1981.

It is the actual transportation costs that are to be deducted from a CIF price in determining transaction value. In determining the deduction for duties which are "currently payable," the actual rate at the time of liquidation must be used.
542467 dated Aug. 13, 1981; modified by 542874 dated Aug. 27, 1982 - See also Duties and Taxes, deduction from transaction value.

The proper amount to be deducted pursuant to deductive value is the actual costs of the

transportation. An airway bill submitted in this case serves as sufficient evidence of the actual costs of transportation.
544236 dated Oct. 31, 1988.

In determining the cost of international transportation or freight, Customs looks to documentation from the freight company, as opposed to documentation between the buyer and seller which often contains estimated freight costs or charges. Documentation from the freight company is required because the actual cost for freight, and not the estimated charges, is the amount that is excluded from the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value.
545201 dated Jan. 27, 1995.

The international shipping charges paid by the importer to a buying agent for actual shipping costs incurred are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise. It is in the discretion of the appraising officer to require evidence of the actual shipping charges incurred to verify that the buying agent is not receiving payments in addition to those described.
545422 dated Mar. 13, 1995.

A related party buyer purchases merchandise from its parent on a FOB basis, freight prepaid. The seller invoices the buyer a fixed price and deducts estimated expenses for freight charges. The price does not change if these estimated costs are ultimately different from the actual cost. The seller subsequently receives freight rebates from certain carriers. Regardless of the statutory exemption for freight costs, if payments are made to the seller for merchandise sold for export, even though not for the value of the goods themselves, they are part of the price actually paid or payable. Accordingly, if the buyer of imported merchandise pays the seller more than the actual cost of prepaid freight charges, the overpayment is part of the “total” payment for the imported merchandise and is, therefore, part of the dutiable value of the merchandise.
545349 dated Mar. 24, 1995.

In determining the cost of international transportation or freight, Customs looks to documentation from the freight company, as opposed to the documentation between the buyer and seller which often contains estimated transportation costs or charges. Customs requires documentation from the freight company because the actual cost for the freight, and not the estimated charges, is the amount to be excluded from the price actually paid or payable.
546111 dated Mar. 1, 1996; 546273 dated July 25, 1996.

Freight costs are included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. The actual freight costs, not the estimated freight costs, are to be excluded from the price actually paid or payable in determining transaction value. No documentation from the importer, such as a contract between the seller and shipping company, or an invoice from the shipping company and confirmation of payment of the actual freight cost, has been submitted. If documentation is available which establishes the actual freight costs, then these costs should be deducted from the invoice price in

determining transaction value.
546226 dated Mar. 25, 1996.

The documentation presented was insufficient to establish the actual costs of the international shipment, and only actual expenses incurred for transportation, insurance, etc. are permissible exclusions from transaction value. In addition, Customs does not have the legal authority to reduce the importer's current duty liability to account for prior duty overpayments that were not protested by the importer. In this case, the liquidation of the merchandise is deemed final and conclusive, in that over 90 days passed since notice of liquidation of the entries issued in the compliance assessment and the importer did not file a protest pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1514.
547037 dated July 12, 1999.

H200463 dated July 23, 2013 – See, Selling Commissions, Addition to Price Actually Paid or Payable.

foreign-inland freight charges

19 CFR 152.103(a)(5), T.D. 84-235, dated Nov. 29, 1984; GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 8, paragraph 2

If the buyer's total payment to the seller includes charges for foreign inland freight, then these charges form part of the price actually paid or payable.
542101 dated Mar. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 1); 542231 dated Mar. 26, 1981; 542546 dated Aug. 14, 1981.

In this transaction, the seller's price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise includes an amount for foreign inland freight. Foreign inland freight charges are dutiable under transaction value, unless the merchandise was purchased on an ex-factory basis.
542561 dated Aug. 25, 1981.

Where foreign inland freight charges are paid by the buyer to a third party who is unrelated to the seller and where those charges are not remitted by the third party to the seller, then the charges are not included in the dutiable value of the merchandise.
543141 dated Oct. 19, 1983.

Insufficient evidence was submitted to establish that the foreign inland freight charges are non-dutiable charges. A "through bill of lading" issued by a carrier or forwarder, which indicates that one carrier or forwarder was in sole control of the shipment from the place of manufacture through the interior point of port of exportation, is required.
543534 dated June 3, 1985.

A through bill of lading has not been made available because two parties who issue two separate documents are responsible for portions of the shipment of the goods from the point or place of manufacture to the port of importation in the United States. Accordingly, the foreign inland freight charges are not deductible from the price actually paid or

payable.
543585 dated Aug. 26, 1985.

In sales other than ex-factory, where the price includes a charge for foreign inland freight, that cost will be part of transaction value to the extent included in the price. However, charges for foreign inland freight may be considered incident to the international shipment of the merchandise and, therefore, non-dutiable if: (1) these charges are identified separately; (2) they occur after the merchandise has been sold for export to the United States; and (3) the merchandise is placed with a carrier for through shipment to the United States.
543687 dated May 6, 1986.

Foreign inland freight is not dutiable where such charges are identified separately, and they occur after the merchandise has been sold for export to the United States and placed with a carrier for through shipment to the United States. A through bill of lading must be presented to Customs.
543744 dated July 30, 1986; 544003 dated Jan. 21, 1988; 544393 dated Nov. 3, 1989; 544374 dated Nov. 6, 1989; 544373 dated Feb. 21, 1990; 544204 dated Feb. 23, 1990; 544400 dated Feb. 23, 1990.

Insufficient evidence was submitted to establish through shipment from the point of manufacture to the port of importation in the United States for purposes of excluding foreign inland freight from transaction value.
543801 dated Jan. 8, 1987.

The "shipping charges" identified by the protesting party as foreign-inland freight charges were properly included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise. The sale for exportation was based upon an FOB price rather than an ex-factory price, as alleged. No through bill of lading was furnished.
544875 dated Mar. 2, 1992.

Although separately itemized, foreign inland freight charges and related brokerage fees are part of the transaction value of the merchandise, unless an appropriate through bill of lading is presented to Customs pursuant to 19 CFR 152.103(a)(5).
544881 dated Mar. 8, 1993.

The foreign inland freight charges shown on the seller's invoices are properly included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. There is insufficient evidence that the merchandise was purchased on an ex-factory basis, and Customs has not been provided with either a through bill of lading or documentation of shipment by a single carrier or forwarder.
545223 dated Sep. 3, 1993.

The transaction in this case is a CIF sale and is governed by 19 CFR 152.103(a)(5)(ii) and (iii) regarding foreign inland freight. The importer has not submitted sufficient documentation indicating through shipment from the point of manufacture to the United

States. The foreign inland freight charges may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable.
545128 dated Sep. 9, 1993.

The foreign inland freight charges were properly included in the transaction value of the imported merchandise because the sale for exportation was based on a C&F price, and not an ex-factory price. In addition, the importer did not furnish a through bill of lading.
545592 dated Sep. 15, 1994.

In situations where the price actually paid or payable for imported merchandise includes a charge for foreign inland freight, whether or not itemized separately on the invoices or other commercial documents, that charge will be part of the transaction value to the extent included in the price. However, charges for foreign inland freight and other services incident to the shipment of the merchandise to the United States may be considered incident to the international shipment of that merchandise if: (1) they are identified separately; (2) they occur after the merchandise has been sold for export to the United States; and (3) they are placed with a carrier for through shipment to the United States. A sale for export and placement for through shipment to the United States shall be established by means of a through bill of lading presented to the port director. In this case, a through bill of lading was not presented to Customs. Therefore, the inland freight charges may not be considered incident to the international shipment of the merchandise and are part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
546803 dated Feb. 25, 1998.

A through bill of lading was presented to establish that the goods were sold for export and placed with a carrier for through shipment to the United States pursuant to 19 CFR 152.103(a)(5). As long as the documentation is consistent with its representative through bill of lading, the foreign inland freight costs can be excluded from the transaction value, as transportation costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise from the country of exportation.
547196 dated Jan. 28, 1999.

The amounts for freight forwarder commissions, when paid entirely to, and retained by, a separate party that is related to the seller/shipper, may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable as international transportation or shipment costs. However, in cases where such compensation inures to the benefit of the seller, those remitted amounts must be taken into account in determining the transaction value. In this case, the amounts for foreign inland freight and loading may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable as international transportation or shipment costs. In all cases, such deductions would be permissible assuming the appropriate documentation is presented.
547074 dated Sep. 17, 1999.

In this case, a through bill of lading was not presented to Customs. Although the importer claims that the freight was provided by its suppliers as an accommodation, the fact remains that the merchandise was off-loaded in Nogales, Sonora, Mexico. Therefore, the subject inland freight charges may not be considered incident to the international

shipment of the merchandise. Consequently, the subject inland freight charges are part of the price actually paid or payable of the subject merchandise.
547714 dated Nov. 7, 2001.

In cases where the seller provides inland transportation via its own conveyance, rather than by a hired carrier, it is necessary to present documentary support in the specific case for consideration by the appropriate port director. No documentation was provided from the seller to evidence the actual costs it incurred for foreign inland freight. Therefore, the foreign inland freight charges may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable.
W563617 dated Sep. 14, 2007.

Importer utilizes a freight forwarder to assist with a variety of origin related services. The charges for the services are included in the invoice price as part of the price of the merchandise. Importer provided documentation from a sample transaction for illustrative purposes. The documentation consisted of a purchase order from the importer to the seller for certain footwear, a commercial invoice (indicating FOB port of export term of sale) and a packing list from the seller to the importer, a bill of lading issued by the freight forwarder, a freight invoice from the freight forwarder to the seller, and invoices from a shipping company to the seller for foreign inland transportation services. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by the freight forwarder may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transaction as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise: terminal fee charged by the carrier for entering the terminal, handling charges by the freight forwarder to process the shipment, documentation fee for issuing the bill of lading and/or the freight cargo receipt, and container seal fee charged by the freight forwarder for issuing a container seal. However, the CFS charges for receiving, unloading, storing and packing cargo into containers may not be deducted if the CFS is not located within the port limits. Similarly, the CY monitoring fee may not be deducted if the CY is not located within the port limits. Additionally, the foreign inland freight charges should be included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise since there is no evidence of through shipment from the factory to the U.S.
H237182 dated Apr. 16, 2013.

The importer purchased merchandise on a Free Carrier "FCA Supplier" basis where the importer took title and risk of loss at the supplier's premises when the carrier arrived to pick up the goods. The importer contracted with related freight services companies that used local unrelated freight providers to transport the goods from the supplier's premises to a consolidation point ("CP"), and from the CP to the foreign port of export for shipment to the US. CBP found that since there was no evidence of through shipment from the factory to the U.S., no deduction may be made for foreign inland freight charges.
H189076 dated June 26, 2013.

freight and related charges incurred in transporting assists

19 CFR 152.103(d)(1) and (2)

Freight paid by a U.S. buyer in sending components to its related overseas assembler is not an assist, and does not form part of transaction value.
543003 dated Feb. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 58); rev'd by 543096 dated June 21, 1983 (TAA No. 63).

Freight and related transportation charges paid by a buyer in connection with shipments of material to a foreign assembler are assists.
543096 dated June 21, 1983 (TAA No. 63); rev'g 543003 dated Feb. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 58).

544243 dated Oct. 24, 1988; 544256 dated Nov. 15, 1988 - See Assists, transportation costs.

Defective watches are returned to the U.S. importer for repair. The defective watches are then exported from the United States to the importer's related party in the Philippines for repair and return. The watches are then repaired and then sold back to the importer at prices that cover the cost of repairs plus a mark-up. Under these circumstances, the defective watches acquired by the importer and sent to the related party for repair are considered assists. The value attributed to the assists in this case is equal to the costs incurred in transporting the watches
to the related party's plant.
544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989.

544323 dated Mar. 8, 1990 - See Assists, transportation costs.

international freight deduction

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (4) (A); 19 CFR 152.102(f)

Freight charges that are incurred by the buyer for the benefit of the seller, prior to the exportation of the merchandise, are not considered international freight charges for Customs purposes. International freight charges are those charges that are incurred after the merchandise leaves the country of exportation for the United States.
542231 dated Mar. 26, 1981.

Loading charges included in a FOB invoice price are part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise and are, therefore, dutiable under transaction value.
542554 dated July 29, 1981; rev'd by 543518 dated Sep. 3, 1985.

A shipment of merchandise to be transported via ocean freight was not ready in time. Rather than avoid cancellation of the order, the seller shipped the merchandise via air freight at a higher cost. The proper deduction from the price actually paid or payable is the full cost of the international freight, i.e., the cost of the air freight.
542780 dated June 3, 1982.

Freight charges to the U.S. port of exportation are regarded as part of the cost or value

of U.S. components for purposes of determining a partial exemption from duty. No deduction is made for the cost of transportation from the U.S. port of exportation to the assembler's plant, and such charges are part of the dutiable value of the assembled article.
542832 dated Sep. 22, 1982 (TAA No. 53).

542933 dated Oct. 13, 1982 - See Rebates Subsequent to Importation, price renegotiation.

Loading charges are not considered to be included in the costs, charges, or expenses incurred for transportation, insurance, and related services incident to the international shipment of the merchandise.
543141 dated Oct. 19, 1983; rev'd by 543518 dated Sep. 3, 1985.

The seller of imported merchandise agrees to effect a refund to the buyer based upon the difference between air and sea freight. This refund occurs after the merchandise is imported to the United States. The refund is disregarded in determining the price actually paid or payable in that it is effected after the date of importation.
543246 dated Jan. 9, 1984.

Loading charges included in either a FOB price or a CIF price are part of the price actually paid or payable and are dutiable under transaction value. Moreover, as the stowing of merchandise is an integral part of the process of loading merchandise, stowage charges are considered as part of the expense of loading merchandise.
543270 dated Oct. 24, 1984; rev'd by 543518 dated Sep. 3, 1985.

Warehousing and storage charges are not considered to be "incidental to the international shipment of the merchandise." These charges are incurred before the international shipment commences.
543501 dated May 2, 1985.

The loading of merchandise onto a vessel destined for the United States and the stowing of that merchandise once it is aboard the vessel are "services incident to the international shipment of the merchandise from the country of exportation to the place of importation in the United States." The loading and stowage charges included in the invoice price between a buyer and seller are not part of the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise and, therefore, are not dutiable under transaction value.
543518 dated Sep. 3, 1985; rev'g 543270 dated Oct. 24, 1984; 542554 dated July 29, 1981, and 543141 dated Oct. 19, 1983.

The proper deduction from transaction value for freight charges is the amount charged from the port of exportation; here, the shipping terms are FOB Hamburg, to the United States. Although the instant merchandise is manufactured in Czechoslovakia, the evidence indicates that the sale for export to the United States was not between the importer and the Czechoslovakian manufacturer.
543643 dated Sep. 24, 1986.

A party related to the exporter handles all transportation requirements with respect to the merchandise imported on a duty-paid basis. The related party prepares all necessary documentation, and is subsequently billed by the trucking company. The related party is responsible for payment. The exporter reimburses this related party for the transportation costs, and the exporter also pays a fee for the service. The costs incurred by the exporter and paid to the related party are not dutiable provided that there is proper evidence relating to sales for export, placement for through shipment, and the reasonableness of the fee that can be provided to Customs.
543799 dated Oct. 10, 1986; aff'd by 544152 Dec. 27, 1988.

The merchandise in question is sold to the importer, placed on feeder barges in Norway, and transported to Antwerp, Belgium, where it is loaded onto a vessel and then transported to the United States. The transportation costs of the merchandise after it is exported from Norway are considered to be non-dutiable as international shipment costs within the meaning of section 402(b)(1) of the TAA.
544685 dated July 30, 1991.

The buyer and seller agreed to a price for imported merchandise pursuant to an initial contract. Subsequently, they entered into a late delivery agreement whereby the delivery terms would change to C&F by air for goods shipped fifteen days later than the agreed upon completion date. Although it was entered into prior to exportation, the late delivery agreement does not support the finding that the price actually paid or payable was ever changed. It would, therefore, be inappropriate to make an adjustment for freight charges since because charges do not appear to have been reflected in the price for the merchandise.
544646 dated Dec. 23, 1991.

When the price of imported merchandise is renegotiated prior to the exportation of the merchandise, and there is no change in the delivery terms, the renegotiated price becomes the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise. When the price is renegotiated prior to exportation of the merchandise, and the delivery terms are changed from FOB to C & F. The C & F price, which includes freight charges, less the international freight charge included therein, is the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise.
544911 dated Apr. 6, 1993.

The importer contracts with various sellers for the purchase of wearing apparel. Delivery dates are specified with a provision made for late delivery. If the seller fails to make delivery within a specified time, then the seller is obligated to ship the merchandise by air and to assume the cost of the air freight in excess of the sea freight which the importer would have paid had the merchandise been shipped by ocean on an FOB basis. Even though the parties enter into the agreement prior to the exportation of the goods, no adjustment for freight charges can be made to transaction value because there is insufficient evidence to support a finding that the freight charges are included in the price actually paid or payable. The late delivery agreement makes no reference to a reduction in the price actually paid or payable should the goods be late. If the original purchase

order contained a provision acknowledging that the price actually paid or payable is reduced in the event of a late shipment, then it is possible that the reduced amount paid would represent transaction value.
545121 dated Jan. 31, 1994.

The importer purchases wearing apparel from a seller in Hong Kong. The articles are manufactured in China. An amount for freight charges in shipping the merchandise from China to Hong Kong is presented. The merchandise is subsequently exported from Hong Kong to the United States. No evidence has been submitted to indicate that the merchandise was destined for the United States at the time of original shipment from China. Hong Kong is the exporting country and the transportation charges incurred prior to the time the merchandise was exported from Hong Kong may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable.
545096 dated May 31, 1994.

The importer claims that the price of imported merchandise was renegotiated prior to the exportation of merchandise, and the delivery terms were changed from FOB to C&F, and the freight charges were included in the C&F renegotiated invoice price. Were this the actual case, then the price actually paid or payable is thus determined by the C&F price, less the international freight charges. In this case, however, the actual transaction appears to have occurred on a FOB basis and, notwithstanding the attempted change of delivery terms on the purchase orders, the buyer paid for the freight costs.
545257 dated July 6, 1994.

For international freight charges, the amount to be deducted from the entered value of imported merchandise is the actual cost of such freight. In this case, the freight costs submitted by the importer based upon 49% of the total freight costs are estimates and do not reflect actual costs. The importer has submitted only the freight consolidator invoices, and has failed to submit documentation regarding the actual costs charged by the shipper.
545579 dated Sep. 14, 1994.

The actual costs of freight and brokerage fees should be excluded in determining the transaction value of imported merchandise. In this case, the terms of sale are "delivered duty paid" and include freight and brokerage fees. The price actually paid or payable should be adjusted so as to exclude the actual costs of transportation and related services incident to the international shipment of the imported merchandise.
545173 dated Sep. 19, 1994.

The seller of imported merchandise failed to meet production shipping schedules and, in order to compensate the buyer, the seller agreed to take responsibility for freight costs and ship the merchandise by air freight. The transaction was originally arranged on a FOB basis, but was subsequently changed to C & F prior to exportation. The importer initially submitted invoices indicating the transaction terms as FOB, but claims a clerical mistake occurred. A second set of invoices was submitted indicating the terms to be C & F, along with two order confirmations prepared by the seller. The change in shipping terms is supported by the documentation. The importer did not directly or indirectly pay

for, assume, or reimburse the seller for any portion of the freight. The international freight costs should be deducted from the price actually paid or payable to arrive at the transaction value for the imported merchandise.
545625 dated Nov. 4, 1994.

The importer claims that the value of the subject shipments was overstated by an amount erroneously characterized on the invoices as freight collect charges, instead of as freight prepaid charges. However, insufficient evidence has been submitted to substantiate its claim that the international freight charges were included in the invoice price. It is incumbent upon the importer to submit evidence that supports its claim for a lower entered value and to request for duty refund. The merchandise was properly appraised and the importer is not entitled to a freight adjustment in the appraised value.
545590 dated Nov. 20, 1994.

The importer has submitted sufficient documentation indicating that the freight costs in question were paid. These records consisted of freight orders, invoices for loading charges, and bank statements. The records demonstrate that funds were transferred to pay the shipping line for the freight costs involved in transporting the merchandise. Therefore, the actual freight costs should be excluded in determining the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545494 dated Dec. 9, 1994.

Pursuant to section 402(b)(4)(A) of the TAA, the cost of international transportation is to be excluded from the price actually paid or payable. However, in determining the cost of the international transportation or freight, documentation from the freight company is considered, rather than documentation between the buyer and seller which often contains estimated freight costs. Customs requires documentation from the freight company because the actual cost for the freight, and not the estimated charges, is the amount that is excluded from the price actually paid or payable. In this case, the importer has provided proper documentation establishing the actual freight and unloading costs to be excluded. Therefore, the actual costs for freight and unloading are deducted in determining the transaction value.
546029 dated Dec. 12, 1995.

The terms of sale indicated on the invoice are “Free Delivered Duty Paid” to the U.S. purchaser of imported merchandise. The seller fulfills its obligation to deliver when the goods have been made available at the named place in the country of importation. The actual charges incurred for international freight and insurance are listed on the invoice and should be deducted from the price actually paid or payable. In addition, the U.S. duties are also to be deducted, because the terms of sale include the U.S. duties.
546037 dated Jan. 31, 1996.

The importer purchased wearing apparel from unrelated suppliers, and the terms of sale were FOB Port of Origin. In the situation where the supplier could not meet the required delivery date and the importer needed the merchandise, both parties agreed to air transportation where the importer paid what would have been the sea freight cost and the

supplier paid the additional air freight cost. Prior to exportation, the parties intended to change the terms of sale to C&F Port of Destination. The importer's letter of credit included a clause to cover late production, a statement that if the merchandise was accepted late the terms of sale would change, and a notation indicating payment for the high priced air transportation. If a price reduction clause is inserted in the original purchase order, supply or sales agreement, or other such document closely tied to the purchase and sale, then Customs could find the C&F Port of Destination invoice price to represent a reduction in the price, and to appropriately represent transaction value. However, merely providing the language in the letter of credit or altering the terms of sale on a commercial invoice does not suffice as evidence of a price reduction. Therefore, an adjustment to the price for the actual costs of the international air as opposed to ocean freight is inappropriate.
546422 dated May 7, 1997.

In order to deduct international freight charges, insurance, U.S. duty, brokerage charges, and U.S. freight, these costs must first be included in the price actually paid or payable. From the evidence submitted, it is unclear as to what was included in the price the importer paid for the merchandise. No purchase orders, supply agreements, or contracts were submitted as evidence of the parties' contractual arrangement. No deduction from the invoice price should be made for international freight from Malaysia to the United States, insurance, U.S. duty, brokerage charges, and U.S. freight in determining the price actually paid or payable.
546363 dated July 15, 1997.

The consolidated charges and survey fees do not constitute costs incident to the international shipment of the merchandise to the United States. The charges cover the following activities: receiving of cargo from inland transport vehicle by receiving authority; placement into secure compound; provision of secure compound by port authority; movement from secure compound to alongside vessel prior to loading; labeling and tallying cargo; payment of port authority goods dues; and documentation costs for bill of lading preparation and customs presentation. It appears as if the fees at issue are for services conducted before the loading and stowing of the merchandise. In addition, a through bill of lading has not been presented to Customs. As such, fees paid for foreign inland freight and other fees relating to storage at the port and other incidental services are dutiable.
547026 dated July 31, 1998.

Despatch and demurrage payment amounts at the loading port are to be taken into account when determining the amount of non-dutiable actual international freight costs paid in connection with the importation. The despatch and demurrage amounts at issue are associated with the cost of actual freight involved in moving the cargo to the United States, and they constitute part of the actual freight costs.
546868 dated Aug. 19, 1998.

A written agreement between the buyer and seller provided that in the event of late shipment, the shipping terms were to be considered C&F, rather than FOB While the

purchase order called for a FOB price, the commercial invoice shows the shipping terms as C&F. Based upon the written agreement, the purchaser order, and the commercial invoice, it is clear that the parties changed the shipping terms from FOB to C&F. Because freight charges are included in the C&F price, the change in shipping terms reduces the price actually paid or payable by the amount of the international freight paid by the seller.
547069 dated Nov. 16, 1998.

A documentation fee is assessed on cargo originating from Japan and exported by sea or air to the United States. A bill of lading is provided to Customs and it identifies the actual amount of the documentation charges incurred as part of the international transportation of the imported merchandise. In this case, the documents presented represent the actual amount of the charge, at the time of the importation of the merchandise; however, Customs may request additional documents, such as an invoice from the seller and any contracts that may exist between the buyer and seller which have provisions regarding freight charges. If the additional documentation is provided, and assuming the payments are made by the shipping company and not to or through the seller or a party related to the seller, then the documentation charges incurred in connection with the international transportation of the imported merchandise should not be included in the transaction value of the merchandise.
547302 dated Mar. 29, 1999.

The terminal handling charges that the buyer pays to the seller includes the services of inspecting, weighing, and loading containers which have already been delivered to the dock. These terminal handling charges are costs incident to the international shipment of the merchandise. As such, they are excluded from the price actually paid or payable as costs incident to the international shipment of the merchandise pursuant to section 402(b)(4)(A) of the TAA.
547146 dated May 14, 1999.

547074 dated Sep. 17, 1999 - <u>See</u> Transportation Costs, foreign-inland freight.

No deduction can be made to the price paid or payable of the imported merchandise for the actual costs of air freight where the seller paid for the air freight due to late delivery, since there is no evidence that there was a change in the terms of sale from FOB to CFR (cost and freight).
548432 dated May 20, 2004.

The claimed international freight costs may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable as insufficient evidence exists to establish that they are the actual costs. No bills or invoices from the carrier or freight forwarded have been submitted. CBP looks to information from the freight company, as opposed to documentation between the buyer and the seller, when determining actual freight charges.
548519 dated Sep. 20, 2004.

The importer currently purchases merchandise from its overseas suppliers on an FOB foreign port basis. It anticipates that some of its future transactions will be conducted on

a C&F or CIF U.S. port basis. For such transactions, the amounts for international freight and other charges, such as fuel surcharges, security charges, and handling fees, will be clearly itemized on the commercial documentation. The actual freight costs and other charges, if appropriately documented, are to be excluded from the price actually paid or payable as international transportation costs.
H004683 dated Apr. 12, 2007.

Sufficient evidence was not presented to show that the international freight costs were included in the price paid by the buyer to the seller of the imported ball bearings. Accordingly no deduction may be made for international freight costs. While the sea waybill and international carrier's invoice were presented to show actual freight costs, the documents do not show the party that paid the freight costs.
H023812 dated Apr. 4, 2008.

No evidence has been presented from the carrier or the freight forwarder regarding the actual freight charges incurred by the shipper in transporting the merchandise from China to the United States. CBP has always looked to documentation from the freight company when determining the actual freight charges. Because the international freight forwarder's special invoices were not prepared by the freight company that transported the merchandise and they have not been adequately explained, they are not sufficiently reliable to substantiate the amount of the payment that was actually made to the freight company for the purposes of transporting the imported merchandise internationally. Similarly, the invoices for the insurance costs were not prepared by the insurance company that insured the cargo, and no evidence was presented to establish the amount actually paid for insuring the imported merchandise. Consequently, the international freight and insurance costs may not be deducted from the price actually paid or payable.
H060455 dated Oct. 7, 2009.

Importer imports automobile manufacturing materials from its parent company in Japan. In some instances, the itemized freight and insurance expenses may not be the actual costs paid to the carrier or the insurance company, since at the time the particular transaction is entered into, the actual (as opposed to estimated) costs for freight and insurance are not known. Importer has issued instructions to its customs brokers, based on the guidance in the "Proper Deductions of Freight and Other Costs from Customs Value," Informed Compliance Publication (ICP), to deduct the itemized freight and insurance expenses from the invoice price only where the broker has proof of the actual freight and insurance charges in the form of a rated bill of lading from the carrier and an insurance premium debit note, both made out to the shipper, the parent corporation. CBP held that international freight and insurance costs that are not itemized on the invoice may be deducted from the price actually paid or payable when the importer is able to provide an attachment with sufficient proof of such charges at the time of entry and where the commercial invoice specifies the nature of the transaction.
H131675 dated May 19, 2011.

The importer imports consumer products from a variety of countries. The majority of shipments are transported via ocean carrier and the terms of sale are FOB, port of export. For these shipments, the forwarders facilitate all supplier/vendor communication, cargo handling, and a variety of other origin related services. Some examples of the services that are contained in the ultimate invoice paid by importer include: carrier agent booking fee, carrier bill of lading, CFS fee, foreign customs clearance fee, CY monitoring fee, documentation fee for issuing the FCR or HBL, foreign inland freight in the country of export, fees charged by the carrier for equipment management, fee for handling LCL cargo, port construction fee, port security charge, supply chain security fee, terminal handling charge, and the wharfage charge. When supported by necessary documentation, with the exception of the foreign inland freight charges, these charges may be excluded from the transaction value as costs incident to the international shipping of the merchandise. Since the shipments are FOB, port of export, and the submitted documentation does not establish through shipment from the factory to the U.S., no deduction may be made for foreign inland freight charges and the foreign inland freight charges should be included in the price actually paid or payable.
H167112 dated Oct. 11, 2011.

Importer utilizes a third party logistics provider to assist with a variety of origin related services. The charges for the services are included in the invoice price as part of the price of the merchandise. Importer provided documentation from sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consisted of purchase orders from the importer to the sellers for certain home improvement products, commercial invoices (indicating FOB port of export terms of sale) and packing lists from the sellers to the importer, waybills issued by the carriers, freight and transportation summary statements, and freight invoices from the third party logistics provider to the sellers/manufacturers. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by the third party logistics provider may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise with respect to the sample transactions as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise: CBL issuance fee, CY monitoring fee, CFS receiving charge, port construction charge, port security charge, and terminal handling charge. However, foreign inland freight charges should be included in the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise since there is no evidence of through shipment from the factory to the U.S.
H232355 dated Nov. 20, 2012.

The importer sources products from various sellers around the world and utilizes the services of third party logistics providers to assist with a variety of origin related services to facilitate the handling of the cargo. The charges for the services are included in the invoice price as part of the price of the merchandise. The importer provided documentation from sample transactions for illustrative purposes. The documentation consisted of purchase orders from the importer to the sellers for certain apparel, commercial invoices (indicating FOB port of export terms of sale) and packing lists from the sellers to the importer, waybills issued by the carriers and forwarder certificates of receipt issued by the third party logistics providers to the sellers. CBP found that based on the information presented, the following fees charged by the third party logistics providers may be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported

merchandise with respect to the sample transactions as costs incident to the international shipment of merchandise: terminal handling charge, CFS receiving charge, bill of lading charge, AMS fee, and AMS amendment fee. However, CBP found that late document charge, late come charge, late AMS/ISF fee, the diversion/administration fees, and agent handling fees may not be excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
H229700 dated Jan. 30, 2013.

U.S. inland freight and insurance, as well as international freight and insurance, would be deductible for purposes of deductive value; however, for international freight and insurance to be properly deductible, it requires a through-bill of lading for the entire deductible amount. Broker fees would also be deductible as transportation costs, but only if such referred to U.S. brokers and not foreign brokers.
H258738 dated Feb. 20, 2015.

The importer sources production of wearing apparel throughout the world and imports the apparel into the U.S. The foreign vendors will arrange and pay freight forwarders to transport merchandise, and the charges will be included in the foreign vendors' invoice price to the importer under standard FCA/FOB terms. Of the services provided, airline documentation/AWB/BOL fee, AMS recording fee (U.S. DOCS fee), CFS fee, document/FCR fee, port entry/security fee, customs clearance/declaration fee, inspection fee, equipment management fee (equipment interchange receipt, GOH fee), seal fee, container loading fee, handling fee, magnetic inspection fee, terminal/toll fee, CY administration fee, ORC fee (ORC/THC fee), U.S. manifest surcharge, telex release, customs examination fee, amendment fee, booking fee, commodity inspection fee, wharfage fee, LCL admin fees/CFS-CFS administration, and unloading fee are incident to the international shipment of the merchandise. Therefore, they are excluded from the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise. However, the CFS fees for receiving or unloading cargo into containers, equipment management fee, container loading fee, magnetic inspection fee, LCL admin fees/CFS-CFS administration fee, and unloading fee may not be deducted if the container is not located within the port limits. The trucking fee may not be excluded from the price actually paid or payable in a FCA/FOB transaction, unless a through bill of lading (or other satisfactory documentation establishing through shipment) from the foreign factory to the U.S. is provided. Lastly, the repackaging fee, charged by the vendor for repackaging when packaging is not compliant with the importer's guidelines, is considered a packing cost and included in the price actually paid or payable.
H249096 dated Mar. 17, 2015.

post-importation transportation

19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) (3)(A)(ii); 19 CFR 152.103(i)(1)(ii); GATT Valuation Agreement, Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 1, Price actually paid or payable

543059 dated May 5, 1983 (TAA No. 62)- <u>See</u> Post-Importation Charges, post-importation services.

Transaction value of imported merchandise does not include any reasonable cost or charge that is incurred for the transportation of the merchandise after its importation into the United States.
543267 dated Mar. 16, 1984.

The buyer pays a handling charge to a subsidiary of the seller. The handling charge is paid for the following duties: processing purchase orders, selecting a customs broker, arranging for the unloading of the vessel and delivery of the merchandise to the inland carrier, preparing delivery instructions for the end-users in the United States, and processing insurance claims for damage incurred during transportation and unlading of the merchandise. While this fee is for services *related* to the post-importation transportation of the merchandise, it is not for the actual cost of the transportation itself. This fee is not deductible under section 402(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the TAA, which allows for a post-importation transportation cost deduction. Accordingly, the fee is part of the price actually paid or payable for the imported merchandise.
544332 dated Nov. 19, 1990.

The transaction value of merchandise does not include reasonable costs incurred for post-importation transportation of the merchandise that is identified separately from the price actually paid or payable. However, in this case, inadequate evidence is submitted and it is unclear whether the invoiced amount is for foreign inland freight or for post-importation freight costs. Because sufficient evidence is not available to make the adjustment, no adjustment is made to the transaction value for these costs.
544501 dated Oct. 18, 1991.

Chemicals are shipped from Canada to U.S. purchasers by rail in tank cars operated by the seller under a lease agreement. The seller charges the purchasers for extended possession of the tank cars. The purchasers are allowed a certain number of free days. Subsequent to the expiration of the time frame, the seller charges the buyer on a per day basis. The additional charge reflecting the lease cost of the rail cars for days beyond the free period pertains to transportation related charges incurred after importation of the merchandise. These charges are separately identified from the price actually paid or payable, they are incurred in the U.S. after importation, and they are not for the imported merchandise. Accordingly, the charges are not part of the transaction value of the imported merchandise.
545554 dated June 30, 1994.

Transportation charges to the U.S. port of exportation, while part of the appraised value of assembled merchandise, are not included in the dutiable value. As set forth in 19 CFR 10.17, in situations where no purchase of fabricated components is made, the value of the components to be subtracted from the full value of the assembled merchandise is the value of components at the time of their shipment for exportation, FOB, U.S. port of exportation or point of border crossing. In this case, the value of the components does not include separately identified U.S. handling and documentation charges. These charges, while part of the transportation costs making up the appraised value of the

merchandise, accrue to the value of the U.S. components to be subtracted from the value of the assembled article for purposes of determining dutiable value.
545789 dated Apr. 19, 1995.

The subject merchandise was imported pursuant to a turn-key contract negotiated by the importer; the related "Foreign Manufacturer"; and the U.S. customer. The contract price included the international shipment, domestic shipment, insurance, customs entry and duties, taxes and fees, post-importation services for installation of the merchandise at the U.S. customer's facility, the cost of equipment purchased in the U.S., as well as the costs of training the U.S. customer's personnel in the use and maintenance of the customized good. Subsequent to W546858 dated June 2, 2000, where it was determined that the importer performed as an agent of the Foreign Manufacturer and payments made to the importer were properly treated as selling commissions, the importer established new customs procedures to make adjustments to the entered value of the subject merchandise for the value of the nondutiable charges ("NDCs"). Under these procedures, the importer uses estimated amounts for the NDCs at the time of importation, flags those entries, and later submits the actual amounts with a reconciliation entry. Prior to the implementation of these procedures, however, the Importer had two entries on which the importer did not deduct any of its NDCs. CBP found that the information provided substantiates the importer's claimed deductions for nondutiable charges. Regarding freight and insurance costs, the importer provided a spreadsheet that identifies the actual international and U.S. domestic freight and insurance charges that should be deducted from the price. The charges claimed for freight and insurance correspond to actual amounts contained in the freight and insurance invoices prepared by the ocean freight company for the subject merchandise. Furthermore, counsel properly itemized the charges for post-importation services and domestically-sourced equipment that may be deducted from the U.S. customer's price. Because the subject merchandise was imported in multiple shipments, the importer apportioned the deductions for these charges based on the ratio of a particular shipment to the overall contract value. The revised spreadsheets entitled "Classifications for Customs Entry Form 7501" applied the revised apportioned rate to the contract value by line item to determine the net Customs value. Counsel provided invoices to substantiate the claimed charges for post-importation services and domestically-sourced materials.
W563598 dated Dec. 6, 2006.

vessel loading charges

Vessel loading charges are incurred by the buyer of imported merchandise in ex-factory sales and in C&F foreign port sales. With regard to the ex-factory sales, no freight costs or costs associated with freight costs are included in the price actually paid or payable and there exists no authority to add such costs to the price. Therefore, the vessel loading charges incurred in the ex-factory sales are not dutiable. Regarding the vessel loading charges incurred in association with the C&F foreign port sales, such charges are paid to a third party (other than the seller) through an agent. Consequently, they cannot be considered to be part of the price actually paid or payable. This determination is based upon the facts as presented. That is, that the third party to which such charges are paid,

is unrelated to the seller and no part of such charges inure to the benefit of the seller.
545075 dated Dec. 23, 1992.

TREATMENT

548065 dated Sep. 6, 2002; aff'g 547108 dated Mar. 28, 2000 - See Related Party Transactions, transfer prices.

USED MERCHANDISE

INTRODUCTION

Headquarters Rulings:

depreciation allowed for used merchandise

19 U.S.C. 1401a(f); 19 CFR 152.107

542557 dated Aug. 11, 1981 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, used merchandise.

542962 dated Dec. 29, 1982 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.

The value of imported used motor vehicles should reflect reasonable depreciation for the period the vehicle was used prior to importation, as reflected by all credible evidence available.
543210 dated Apr. 11, 1984.

Appraised value of imported used merchandise should be determined by adjusting downward the article's purchase price to reflect reasonable depreciation for the period that the article was used abroad. However, this method is valid only if the value resulting from its use approximates the actual market value of the article at the time of its exportation to the United States.
543265 dated July 2, 1985; 543970 dated Mar. 13, 1989.

548211 dated July 2, 2003 - See Repairs, repairs in the U.S.

elimination of transaction value

542791 dated June 10, 1982 - See Sale for Exportation, timing of sale.

546020 dated Apr. 17, 1996 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, used merchandise.

546149 dated May 29, 1996 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, previously established transaction value, reasonably adjusted.

The imported merchandise consists of two models of defective telephone answering systems that were sent to the United States by a distributor in Canada. The defective equipment was shipped to a dismantling facility in the United States. Transaction value is not applicable because there is no sale for exportation to the United States. The merchandise should be appraised pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA based upon the salvage value of the parts. The charges associated with dismantlement in the United States should not be added to the appraised value of the goods.
545690 dated May 31, 1996 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined,

defective merchandise.

The imported merchandise was purchased in Lithuania in November of 1992 by the importer and entered temporarily under bond into the United States in January 1993. It was then exported for sale to Canada. However, the Canadian sale was not finalized and the merchandise was returned to the United States, where it was entered for consumption in August 1993. Transaction value is not applicable in appraising the merchandise because there was no sale for exportation to the United States. Based upon the available evidence, the merchandise cannot be appraised on the basis of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, deductive value, or computed value. Accordingly, the merchandise should be appraised in accordance with section 402(f) of the TAA based on the transaction value of similar merchandise adjusted for the country of production.
546092 dated Sep. 16, 1996.

546941 dated Aug. 11, 1999 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, used merchandise.

A vehicle is purchased from a foreign manufacturer for export to the United States; however, the vehicle is not exported immediately to the United States, but rather it is used overseas. The buyer and seller developed a program to provide *bona fide* retail customers an opportunity to drive their vehicle in Europe before shipment to the United States and to tour the vehicle production facilities. The only time limit in the program is when the U.S. customer must return the vehicle to the factory within twelve months of delivery to receive free shipment. Also, the only penalty for non-compliance with the program is the possible removal of buyer from the program, and no penalty is imposed on the U.S. customer if the vehicle is not exported to the United States. Thus, based on the evidence submitted, the transactions between the buyer and foreign seller do not involve goods that are destined for export to the United States such that a sale for exportation exists. Therefore, the price between buyer and the foreign seller is not an acceptable transaction value.
547197 dated Aug. 22, 2000; aff'd by 548371 dated Nov. 19, 2003.

548371 dated Nov. 19, 2003; aff'g
547197 dated Aug. 22, 2000 (regarding the issue of the acceptability of transaction value.) – See Transaction Value of Identical or Similar Merchandise, transaction value readily available

Mobile phones and accessories are sent to Mexico for repair and are then returned to the United States for distribution to customers in need of replacement phones. The repair facility charges the importer a flat rate for its repair services, and lump-sum payments are made every two weeks. It is not possible to tie the payments to the repair of specific phones. The refurbished phones may be appraised under the fallback valuation method, using either book values or price quotes by reputable U.S. resellers of refurbished phones.
W548618 dated Nov. 23, 2005.

The importer imports used aircraft parts that had been previously exported for repair or rebuilding. The aircraft parts are properly appraised under the fallback valuation method, using a value based on the export value declared when the article was sent for repair. The export value was derived from the original cost of the part, or alternatively, from the cost of an identical or similar new part, adjusted downwards to account for the estimated repair cost. The entered value declared upon importation would be the export value plus the actual cost of repairs. The entered value might also reflect upwards or downwards adjustments for changes in the price of new parts.
H010504 dated Aug. 22, 2007.

In this internal advice, dealing with imported goods that were used abroad and without sale when entering the United States, fallback was the appropriate valuation method, but there were further questions as to whether straight-line depreciation could be used in appraising the imported good, and whether the documents were sufficient to support the declared values under the proposed methodology. With regard to the first issue, it was held that a seven year straight line depreciation was a reasonable adjustment to the values derived from 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b)-(e) under the fallback method, provided the depreciation was applied in accordance with GAAP and approximated the actual value of the imports at the time of their exportation to the U.S. With regard to the second issue, the submitted documents with respect to one of the imported goods were sufficient because they showed the original acquisition cost and purchase date for the items, which permitted calculation of the value per the proposed valuation methodology. With respect to the other imported goods, the submitted documents were sufficient because they showed the current list price of the good as verified by the good's manufacturer, and thus permitted calculation of the value per the proposed valuation methodology.
H259584 dated July 7, 2015.

waste material

A Canadian exporter ships a certain waste product to the importer and pays the U.S. importer a fee for disposal of the waste. Transaction value, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, deductive value and computed value are all inapplicable as a means of appraisement. The remaining method that must necessarily be utilized is valuation pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA.
543904 dated Mar. 20, 1987.

The imported merchandise at issue consists of sixty-seven entries of hazardous and non-hazardous waste material. The importer contends that the imported waste has no commercial value in its condition as imported, and that appraising the waste on the basis of a disposal fee paid to the "seller" is unreasonable. Customs appraised the waste based upon the disposal fee, and such was the only available information that can be quantitatively documented. Customs used all reasonable ways and means in appraising the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f), appropriately considered all of the evidence made available and used "all reasonable ways and means in his power" to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise.

547061 dated Mar. 19, 1999.

A U.S. corporation, whose subsidiaries provide services throughout North America, contracts with domestic and foreign customers for the disposal of domestic and imported waste in the United States. A disposal fee is charged for these services. This payment is an amount agreed upon by the parties to the transaction and it represents the consideration for which the U.S. corporation is willing to accept and process the imported waster. As such, the basis for determining the value of the waste is the disposal fee. It is the only available information that can be quantitatively documented. Customs employed reasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f) of the TAA, appraised the imported waste based on the disposal fee. Under this fallback method of appraisement, Customs appropriately considered all the evidence made available and used all reasonable ways and means to appraise the imported waste at issue.
547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999; aff'g 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994.

547142 dated May 12, 1999 - See Foreign Trade Zones, valuation.

Insufficient evidence was submitted to establish that Customs employed unreasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f) of the TAA, appraised the imported waste based on the disposal fee. Under this "fallback" method of appraisement, the Customs officer appropriately considered all the evidence made available and used "all reasonable ways and means in his power" to appraise the imported waste at issue. The basis for determining that value, the disposal fee, is the only available information that can be quantitatively documented. In addition, the payment is an amount agreed upon by the two parties to the transaction and it represents the consideration for which the importer is willing to accept and process the imported waste.
547416 dated June 2, 2000; aff'g 547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999, and 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994.

Krypton entering the United States for purposes of recycling should be appraised under the fallback method using the fee paid to take possession. Customs has previously found that for waste being imported to be disposed of, for which a fee was paid to the U.S. company responsible for disposing of the waste, the fee being paid for disposal was an appropriate value for the waste. This result is not affected by the potential for the Krypton to gain commercial value after importation through recycling as it does not hold that value at the time of entry.
H130310 dated Nov. 18, 2010.

VALUE IF OTHER VALUES CANNOT BE DETERMINED

INTRODUCTION

19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) states:

VALUE IF OTHER VALUES CANNOT BE DETERMINED OR USED.-
(1) If the value of imported merchandise cannot be determined, or otherwise used for the purposes of this Act, under subsections (b) through (e), the merchandise shall be appraised for purposes of this Act on the basis of a value that is derived from the methods set forth in such subsections, with such methods being reasonably adjusted to the extent necessary to arrive at a value.
(2) Imported merchandise may not be appraised, for purposes of this Act, on the basis of -

(A) the selling price in the United States of merchandise produced in the United States;
(B) a system that provides for the appraisement of imported merchandise at the higher of two alternative values;
(C) the price of merchandise in the domestic market of the country of exportation;
(D) a cost of production, other than a value determined under subsection (e) for merchandise that is identical merchandise or similar merchandise to the merchandise being appraised;
(E) the price of merchandise for export to a country other than the United States;
(F) minimum values for appraisement; or
(G) arbitrary or fictitious values.

This paragraph shall not apply with respect to ascertainment, determination, or estimation of foreign market value or United States price under title VII.

In 19 CFR 152.107, the regulations state:

(a) Reasonable adjustments. If the value of imported merchandise cannot be determined or otherwise used for the purposes of this subpart, the imported merchandise will be appraised on the basis of a value derived from the methods set forth in [sections] 152.103 through 152.106, reasonably adjusted to the extent necessary to arrive at a value. Only information available in the United States will be used.
(b) Identical merchandise or similar merchandise. The requirement that identical merchandise, or similar merchandise, should be exported at or about the same time of exportation as the merchandise being appraised may be interpreted flexibly. Identical merchandise, or similar merchandise, produced in any country other than the country of exportation or production of the merchandise being appraised may be the basis for customs valuation. Customs values of identical
merchandise, or similar merchandise, already determined on the basis of deductive value or computed value may be used.
(c) Deductive value. The "90 days" requirement for the sale of merchandise referred to in [section] 152.105(c) may be administered flexibly.

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 7, paragraph 1, provides for the following:

If the customs value of the imported goods cannot be determined under the provisions of Article 1 to 6, inclusive, the customs value shall be determined using reasonable means consistent with the principles and general provisions of this Agreement and of Article VII of the General Agreement and on the basis of data available in the country of importation.

Article 7, paragraph 2, lists methods of valuation which are prohibited. These are similar to those cited in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)(2)(A) through (G).

In addition, Article 7, paragraph 3, states:

If he so requests, the importer shall be informed in writing of the customs value determined under the provisions of this Article and the method used to determine such value.

Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 7, corresponds with the Customs regulations, 19 CFR 152.107. Value if other values cannot be determined or used.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 12.2 states:

1. When applying Article 7, is it necessary to follow the hierarchical order with respect to the methods of valuation in Articles 1 to 6?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:
There is no provision in the Agreement that specifically provides that the hierarchical order of Articles 1 to 6 should be followed when Article 7 is applied. However, with the principles and general provisions of the Agreement and this indicates that where reasonably possible, the hierarchical order should be followed. Thus where several acceptable methods can be used to determine Customs value under Article 7, the hierarchy should be maintained.

Headquarters Rulings:

computed value

There is no transaction value for certain foreign made components purchased as part of a system which also includes domestically manufactured components, and where there is no basis on which the price for the foreign components can be quantified. In the absence of alternative bases of valuation, a method of valuation derived from computed value may be used to value the foreign components pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA. **543226 dated Jan. 3, 1984; modifies 542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59).**

The importer's proposed method of appraising the merchandise on the basis of the "declaration value" pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA is not appropriate. The proposed

"declaration value" represents the average cost of the products and is calculated by allocating gross costs to all such items by means of simple averaging. While the "declaration value" is an attempt at some form of modified computed value, section 402(f)(2)(D) of the TAA unambiguously prohibits using a cost of production, other than a value determined under section 402(e) for merchandise that is identical or similar to that being appraised. The importer's "declaration value," which is not determined in accordance with section 402(e), is therefore unacceptable under section 402(f). The imported merchandise should be appraised using all other ways and means consistent with sections 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) and 1500.
546112 dated July 5, 1996.

Based on the information provided, the appropriate basis of appraisement is the fallback method pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA, value if other values cannot be determined. The appraising officer made reasonable adjustments to the computed value method, e.g., in determining packing costs, in determining the appraised value of the merchandise under section 402(f). Adjustments made to the cost of materials, including the disallowance of duty free treatment under heading 9802 and the denial of the insurance claim, were proper.
545611 dated Jan. 2, 2001- <u>See</u> <u>also</u> Computed Value, elements of computed value.

The pharmaceutical company's internal research and development processes are complex, involving numerous phases that occur both domestically and abroad. The company has five research facilities worldwide that produce research active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs). The research APIs are used for further research only and their value is unknown at the time of entry into the United States. With respect to imported research APIs, no sale occurs from one of the company's foreign facilities to the United States facility, nor are these APIs resold in the United States. When the product is imported into the United States, its research and development value must be declared to customs. Transaction value and deductive value are inapplicable because the research APIs are not subject to a sale. The transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is inapplicable because no such merchandise exists. Additionally, computed value is unavailable because the cost of the materials, processing, profit, and general expenses are unknown at the time of entry. Based on the information presented, we conclude that it is reasonable to accept the importer's proposal regarding the appraisement of APIs under section 402(f) of the TAA. The importer may use a modified computed value based on a weighted average value of the APIs instead of the actual computed value.
548164 dated Sep. 20, 2002.

The National Marrow Donor Program imports human blood products from foreign medical facilities. The blood products are not imported pursuant to any sales agreement, as it is illegal to buy and sell human organs and tissue, including blood products, under U.S. law. Therefore, transaction value cannot be used. For this same reason, appraisement cannot be based on the methods set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(c), (d), and (e). However, the foreign medical facility collects, and the importer pays for, the costs of extraction and international shipping. The blood products may be appraised pursuant to 19 U.S.C.

1401a(f) using the best evidence available, which is the fee paid to the foreign medical facility for the cost of the extraction procedures. Expenses related to the international shipment of the blood products may be deducted from the entered value of the merchandise to the extent they are included in the amount paid to the foreign medical facilities.

563461 dated May 18, 2006.

The importer obtains used auto parts for remanufacturing from retailers and warehouse distributors by providing a refund of a deposit the consumers paid when the parts were originally purchased. The importer significantly inflates the value of the used auto parts in order to provide consumers with an incentive to return the used parts. The importer consigns the parts to foreign remanufacturers, who remanufacture the parts and return them to the importer for sale to distributors and retailers. The importer pays the remanufacturer for its processing costs and any required replacement parts or components. Transaction value is inapplicable as the remanufactured parts are not sold for exportation to the United States, and because the remanufacturing operations are outside the scope of 19 CFR 152.103(a)(3). Deductive value cannot be ascertained in a timely manner because of the possibility of a price adjustment for the value of the returned parts. Because the exporter is a remanufacturer selling a service rather than a producer selling actual merchandise, computed value cannot be used, as it would be inappropriate to use profit and general expense data based on sales of merchandise. Applying the fallback method, we find that a method of appraisement derived from the computed value method reasonably adjusted is appropriate to determine the value of the remanufactured auto parts. Such a method would include the cost or value of the used alternators and starters, including the cost of shipping these materials to the remanufacturers, the value of any assists, and the cost of packing the remanufactured auto parts for shipment to United States. In addition, CBP agrees that the value of the recovered auto parts used to produce the remanufactured parts should be determined according to the estimated actual cost of acquisition, in accordance with the “fair market value” method prescribed in IRS Revenue Ruling 2003-20, 2003-6 CB445.

W548697 dated June 13, 2006.

Auctioneer seeks to value items imported for auction at the insured price. Reconciliation is used to change the entered. The items imported for sale at auction may be appraised under the deductive value method when sold within 90 days of importation. Articles sold more than 90 days after importation may be appraised under the fallback method using a modified deductive value. Those items imported for sale at auction, but which are ultimately not sold, may be appraised under the fallback method using the mean value proposed by Sotheby’s.

H085036 dated Dec. 18, 2009.

A port requested the proper valuation method for appraising merchandise imported into the United States either for repair or after being repaired abroad, and not subject to a sale. CBP determined that for importer repaired merchandise, either deductive value (19 U.S.C. 1401a(d)) or the fallback method (19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)) may be used. The importer had a division which sold refurbished equipment, including repaired equipment, and sales

of such merchandise might be used under the deductive method to ascertain a value for identical or similar imported repaired merchandise. For merchandise imported for repair in the U.S., CBP recognized that the fallback method would be the appropriate method of appraisement.

H019710 dated Dec. 18, 2009.

The imported merchandise consists of bioscience products, which are imported pursuant to licensing agreements with unrelated vendors. Under the terms of the agreements, the importer is required to pay royalties on each sale of the imported products in the United States. In some cases, the importer also pays a fixed sum to the vendors within a specified time after importation. Transaction value is ruled out as a method of appraisement, because the products are imported on consignment. There are no previously accepted transaction values of identical or similar merchandise. Deductive value is eliminated as an appraisement method, because some of the imported items are never sold or are sold only years after importation, resulting in either no or delayed payment of the royalties. As the importer and vendors are unrelated, there is no available information with respect to the computed value of the imported bioscience products. Accordingly, they are appraised under the fallback method, using an approach that allocates royalty and fixed sum payments to entries made during the calendar year.

H083960 dated Sep. 10, 2010.

The Importer manufactures and markets electric motors in North America. Company Y has manufacturing operations in China and Mexico. Electric motors are produced in both countries and imported to the United States. After importation, the Chinese-origin electric motors may require inspection or repair. Thus, rather than ship the Chinese-origin electric motors back to China for repair

or inspection, the Importer ships the motors to its manufacturing facilities in Mexico. The repair and/or inspection of the Chinese-origin electric motors is done at one of the company's wholly owned subsidiary companies in Mexico. The groups of motors are kept separate by part numbers and country of origin, but are otherwise commingled. CBP determined that due to the inapplicability of other methods of appraisement, the Chinese-origin electric motors that are returned to the United States from Mexico after inspection and/or repair should be appraised using the fallback method of appraisement under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) on the basis of the Chinese manufacturer's standard costs.
H102516 dated Sep. 16, 2010.

If there are no importations of identical or similar merchandise on which to base appraisement, the fertilizer products imported from Canada may be appraised using a modified version of computed value under the fallback method set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f). The use of the Moving Average Inventory Value is an acceptable method of determining the cost of the fertilizer products that are commingled provided that it can be substantiated that the products shipped from various warehouses are, in fact, commingled before being imported and that the actual costs of producing the products in the different production facilities can be verified. It would be acceptable to use the average costs in determining the modified computed value of the imported fertilizers provided that in the normal course of its business the producer uses averages in its commercial accounts to keep track of its material costs and the processing expenses and its accounting procedures are consistent with generally accepted accounting principles of Canada. Although it may be convenient, there is no authority to report valuation information solely on an annual basis. Under CBP regulations at 19 CFR 141.90(c), the importer must report a value for merchandise to CBP with the entry when it is imported into the U.S. If the necessary information to determine a value is not available at the time of importation, it may be appropriate to use Reconciliation procedures.
H170395 dated June 15, 2011.

defective merchandise

543123 dated Dec. 20, 1983 - See Deductive Value, superdeductive value.

544377 dated Sep. 1, 1989 - See Repairs, repairs in the U.S.

The imported merchandise consists of two models of defective telephone answering systems, which were sent to the United States by a distributor in Canada. The defective equipment was shipped to a dismantling facility in the United States. Transaction value is not applicable because there is no sale for exportation to the United States. The merchandise should be appraised pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA based upon the salvage value of the parts. The charges associated with dismantlement in the United States should not be added to the appraised value of the goods.
545690 dated May 31, 1996.

548211 dated July 2, 2003 - See Repairs, repairs in the U.S.

foreign trade zone

543396 dated Aug. 23, 1984 - <u>See</u> Foreign Trade Zones, valuation.

547142 dated May 12, 1999 - <u>See</u> Foreign Trade Zones, valuation.

previously established transaction value, reasonably adjusted

Transaction value may not be used to appraise merchandise imported pursuant to a lease agreement with an option to buy. In the absence of an alternative basis of appraisement, a value may be based upon transaction value, reasonably adjusted to arrive at a value.
542996 dated Mar. 4, 1983.

545112 dated June 7, 1993 - <u>See</u> Lease Transactions, elimination of transaction value.

Transaction value is eliminated because the components are imported on consignment. In addition, the alternative bases of appraisement, i.e., 19 U.S.C. 1401a(c)-(e), are not applicable. Under section 402(f), the imported components should be appraised under transaction value established by a formula negotiated between the parties. The formula is set forth in an agreement between the parties and is fixed prior to exportation.
544845 dated Nov. 9, 1993.

545069 dated Dec. 23, 1993 - <u>See</u> Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, 19 U.S.C. 1500.

The imported merchandise should be appraised in accordance with section 402(f) of the TAA, pursuant to which the imported components should be appraised under a modified transaction value method based upon the price determined under the pricing arrangement negotiated between the parties. In this case, the components are consigned to the importer so they cannot be appraised pursuant to transaction value.
545313 dated Jan. 31, 1995; <u>clarified</u> <u>by</u> 545840 dated Aug. 11, 1995 (additional information presented).

The merchandise in this case is not sold for exportation to the United States; therefore, transaction value is not applicable as a means of appraisement. Similarly, there is no transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, deductive value, or computed value available. The merchandise may be appraised pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA, a value if other values cannot be determined. The section 402(f) appraisement may be derived from a modified transaction value, i.e., the value at which the importer is invoiced based upon estimates of the price to be charged by the unrelated manufacturers to the middleman (related to the importer).
546149 dated May 29, 1996.

546442 dated Mar. 23, 1999 - <u>See</u> Deductive Value, resale in the U.S.

546953 dated May 5, 1999 - See Related Party Transactions, rejection of transaction value.

547604 dated Apr. 10, 2001 - See Transaction Value, limitations on use of transaction value.

548111 dated Aug. 23, 2001 - See Value If Other Value Cannot Be Determined, 19 U.S.C. 1500.

When Customs cannot apply transaction value and the sequential methods of appraisement, the fallback method is the appropriate method. In this case, the goods were appraised under the fallback method on the basis of reasonable adjustments to transaction value of similar merchandise because Customs had a previously accepted value for the product in question. It was a previously accepted value because it was information already available to and verified by Customs, and was for a similar quantity, from the same country of exportation, and exported during the same season; however, it was not exported at or about the same time as the product at issue (14 days before or after the date of exportation of perishable products). Nonetheless, the product at issue had a longer shelf life, and thus it was reasonable to adjust "the about the time of exportation" to 30 days.
H255619 dated Jan. 16, 2015; H257520 dated Jan. 16, 2015.

returned merchandise

Under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), the statute provides for an appraisal of the imported merchandise on the basis of a value that is derived from 1401a(b)-(e), with such methods being reasonably adjusted to the extent necessary to arrive at a value. The merchandise in this case may be appraised under section 402(f) of the TAA, using repair charges calculated by the application of a specific formula. The formula provided by the importer takes into account the originally discounted price to related parties and also the depreciation on returned products.
547877 dated Jan. 23, 2002.

H242509 dated Aug. 15, 2013 – See Transaction Value of Identical or Similar Merchandise, identical or similar merchandise.

sequential order

19 U.S.C. 1401a(a); 19 CFR 152.101(b)(1) through (6); GATT Valuation Agreement, Article 4

Prior to resorting to a section 402(f) appraisement, it is necessary to proceed sequentially through the statutorily enumerated appraisement methods. If it becomes necessary to appraise pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA, the value should be based, to the greatest extent possible, on a previously determined value.
544239 dated Nov. 18, 1988.

Bicycle parts were imported from 1985-1987 and appraised pursuant to transaction value. The importer was unable to sell the merchandise in the United States and returned the merchandise to the exporter. The exporter refused the merchandise and subsequently returned it to the importer in September 1991. Upon re-importation of the bicycle parts, the importer consigned the parts to a bicycle shop and finally sold the merchandise. Transaction value is inapplicable upon re-importation because there is no sale transaction. No identical or similar merchandise is imported into the United States. Likewise, neither deductive nor computed value is available as a means of appraisement. The bicycle parts may properly be appraised based on a value derived pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA by means of an independent appraiser.
545141 dated Apr. 15, 1994.

The protestant has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that Customs employed unreasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f), appropriately considered all the evidence made available and used "all reasonable ways and means in his power" to appraise the merchandise.
545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994; aff'd by 547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999.

The first time a value is attributed to the merchandise prior to sale in the United States at auction is when the auctioneer/marketing agent negotiates at arm's length a "reserve price" with the consignor. The reserve price is the confidential threshold price, below which the consignor will not sell. In addition, the reserve price is the only mutually accepted value which reflects both the seller's and the auctioneer's assessment of the item's current market value, and is the only price at which the seller is obligated to sell the merchandise at auction. The negotiated reserve price of each item reflects judgments from both a professional appraiser (either an independent appraiser or one employed by the auctioneer) and the seller. Therefore, the reserve price is acceptable as a method of appraisement set forth in section 402(f) of the TAA for merchandise imported into the U.S. for auction.
547381 dated Mar. 14, 2000.

547416 dated June 2, 2000; aff'g 547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999, and 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994 - See Used Merchandise, waste material.

548247 dated Mar. 10, 2003 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, waste material.

The importer, through its supplier and independent warehouse contracts, operates a just-in-time inventory management program whereby inventory management warehouses are located near the importer's various manufacturing facilities. The program is designed to assure adequate supplies of product that are readily available to the importer. The importer does not take title, nor does it become obligated to pay for the product until it is withdrawn from the warehouse. The commercial invoice price is not the agreed upon

price, and the price is not known until the merchandise is withdrawn from the warehouse. There is no sale for exportation to the United States upon which to base a transaction value. With respect to the use of deductive value, merchandise is appraised on the basis of the price at which it is sold in the United States in its condition as imported and in the greatest aggregate quantity either at or about the time of importation, or before the close of the 90th day after the date of importation. This price is subject to certain enumerated deductions. For any specific entry, the importer is not able to provide the price for merchandise when it is withdrawn and the price for the sales that take place in the greatest aggregate quantity. The merchandise cannot be appraised under the deductive value method. The imported merchandise should be appraised pursuant to section 402(f), value if other values cannot be determined. In this case, the commercial invoice price is acceptable under a section 402(f) appraisement.
548236 dated Mar. 27, 2003.

A factory located in Germany is the parent company to the importer and designer, both located in the United States. The factory intends to contract with the designer to design and engineer items that the factory subsequently produces and sells worldwide, including to the importer. The imported merchandise is a prototype that is actually produced in the United States, exported to Germany, then re-imported and consigned to the importer in the United States. Based upon the circumstances, a modified transaction value pursuant to section 402(f) is appropriate in appraising the merchandise.
548276 dated Apr. 29, 2003.

In determining the dutiable value of hard disk drives which were refurbished overseas and not subject to a sale between the involved parties, CBP determined that the book values (representing the value of the fully refurbished product, with transportation and the company's U.S. overhead costs included) presented a reasonable appraisement method for the imported merchandise under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) (the "fallback" method).
W548453 dated Mar. 8, 2005.

The imported merchandise, which is consigned, may be appraised pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) if other values cannot be determined. The requester may use the commercial invoice as a reasonably adjusted value where the consigned merchandise is withdrawn from warehouse within a relatively short time after entry such that, most of the time, the price on the commercial invoice will be the same as the price paid on withdrawal from the warehouse. In addition, the unit price on the commercial invoice should match the unit price paid to the suppliers for the most recent withdrawal from warehouse of the same merchandise.
548574 dated Mar. 17, 2005.

The importer, a branch office of a U.K.-based publishing company, acquires books from other branch offices located in other countries. The books may not be appraised under transaction value because there is no sale, but only a transfer, of books from one branch to another. The books are appraised under the fallback method using a list price less a discount. The discounted price takes into account manufacturing costs, general expenses, overhead and profit.

548698 dated Oct. 4, 2005.

Imported goods returned to the U.S. for repair and then returned to the U.S. or the foreign buyer valued based on the cost of producing the good (material, labor, overhead and profit) and then subtracting the average historical cost of repair percentage, which reflects the goods potential repair costs and depreciation, is an acceptable basis of appraisement under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).

563407 dated Apr. 13, 2006.

The use of the fallback method, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), if other values cannot be determined, is acceptable as a means of appraising the imported R&D materials. Based on the facts presented, the blood, serum, plasma, and tissue samples may be appraised, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), on the basis of the time taken to extract, prepare, and package the sample for export, in addition to the costs of any packaging and materials employed in the process. GSK's proposals to use modified computed values, as described in this ruling, for the other R&D materials that it imports are acceptable under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f). GSK may exclude from the values of the imported materials the costs of research performed prior to the selection of the lead compounds and the development costs associated with optimizing production of the APIs and other materials for commercial production of the finished drug products, where GSK can sufficiently segregate these costs. GSK is to include these costs in the value of the imported materials, in instances where the costs cannot be segregated.

H011276 dated February 4, 2008.

In a related party transaction, where the related parties are unable or unwilling to provide sufficient information to determine the acceptability of the transaction value, transaction value cannot be used. If the party is also unable or unwilling to prove the type or quality of the item, which may affect the ability to determine if other merchandise is identical or similar, CBP may use a modified transaction value of identical or similar merchandise under the fallback method, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f). CBP may value the merchandise at issue by using another entry from the same exporter, exported from the same country at or around the time of the entry at issue, and entered under the same HTSUS subheading.

H127536 dated Dec 28, 2010.

When using an inventory management method in which goods are imported under a pro-forma invoice for inventory for future use in manufacturing a new article, and are not sold from the foreign seller to the U.S. manufacturer until pulled from inventory in the U.S., a fallback method of appraisement at the pro-forma invoice price plus any statutory additions under the transaction value is appropriate. The pro-forma invoice price is the current negotiated price between the foreign seller and the U.S. manufacturer, and is renegotiated quarterly, and as such would be the same price actually paid for any part pulled from inventory that same day. The parts are imported into a warehouse in the U.S. owned by the U.S. manufacturer, but are not sold from the foreign company to the U.S. manufacturer until they are pulled from inventory, typically 60-90 days later. Due to the nature of the industry and the parts being imported, the price stays the same or goes

down the majority of the time. However, should the price increase, the company is required to report such price increases to CBP.
H125115 dated Apr. 6, 2011.

Because insufficient evidence was presented to show that the transactions between the related parties were settled in an arm's length manner and that the price paid for the imported merchandise was not influenced by relationship of the parties, transaction value was an unacceptable basis of valuation. As the value of imported merchandise could not be determined under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(b) through 1401a(e), a proposed method of the appraising the imported merchandise using a modified version of deductive value under the fallback method of valuation provided for in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f) would be acceptable even though a significant amount of the imported merchandise may not have been sold in the U.S. within 90 days of its importation. The proposed method of allocation of costs and expenses involved for selling and distributing the imported merchandise constitute acceptable deductions from the resale price of the merchandise as provided for in 19 CFR 152.105(d)(1).
H144042 dated Oct. 30, 2013.

H254798 dated Aug. 18, 2014 – See Transaction Value, condition or consideration for which a value cannot be determined.

used merchandise

Current U.S. silver prices along with consideration of an appraisal in the exporting country may be used to value a silver service dating back to at least World War I.
542557 dated Aug. 11, 1981.

542962 dated Dec. 29, 1982 - See Sale for Exportation, transaction value eliminated due to lack of sale.

543210 dated Apr. 11, 1984 - See Used Merchandise, depreciation allowed for used merchandise.

543265 dated July 2, 1985; 543970 dated Mar. 13, 1989 - See Used Merchandise, depreciation allowed for used merchandise.

Cellular telephones are imported into the United States on a temporary basis pursuant to a rental agreement between a company and its customers. The imported telephones are subject to multiple leases and may be imported into the United States on numerous occasions. Transaction value is inapplicable because the merchandise is not sold for exportation to the United States. There is no transaction value of identical or similar merchandise available upon which to appraise the merchandise. Similarly, neither deductive nor computed value is proper in this case. Pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA, the transaction value method can be reasonably adjusted to permit the rental value of the equipment over its full economic life to be used as the basis of appraised value.
546020 dated Apr. 17, 1996.

546092 dated Sep. 16, 1996 - See Used Merchandise, elimination of transaction value.

547061 dated Mar. 19, 1999 - See Used Merchandise, waste material.

547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999; aff'g 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994 - See Used Merchandise, waste material.

Based upon the available evidence, the merchandise cannot be appraised on the basis of transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, deductive value, or computed value. The goods ordered by Canadian customers and which are returned to the U.S. seller for refund or credit should be appraised on the amount of the refund or credit extended by the importer to the Canadian customers who are returning the merchandise. This is a reasonably adjusted transaction value pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA.
546941 dated August 11, 1999.

Transaction value is not available as a basis of appraisement for the imported used goods to be repaired in the U.S. The imported used aircraft parts were appraised on the basis of the fallback method pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).
The imported used aircraft parts could be appraised based on the formula proposed by the U.S. manufacturer that uses the current list price reflecting the cost of a new article, and represents the cost of producing the article (material, labor and overhead plus profit), and then has two deductions: one deduction for the repair cost and one deduction for the depreciation, calculated on a yearly basis.
563470 dated June 12, 2006.

Facility imports aerospace parts for overhaul, repair or testing. As imported parts are not imported pursuant to a sale, transaction value cannot be used. The importer sought valuation based upon the fallback method, 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f). CBP agreed that the other methods of valuation could not be used and agreed to the importer's suggestion of using the World List Price, that is, the current price of a part in new condition, and deducting the average cost of repair based on the previous year's costs. CBP disagreed with the importer's suggestion to also deduct 40% from the World List Price based on the importer's experience of what customers would be willing to pay to have a part repaired. Instead, CBP agreed to a deduction for depreciation based upon information provided by the owner of the part regarding the date of manufacture and method of depreciation.
H167495 dated June 28, 2011.

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f), using the standard replacement cost of the raw materials of the used parts formed into their shape as a pre-finished component and applying a factor of 0.5 to account for the value of the repair as a basis of appraisement, is reasonable and acceptable using the Fallback method.
H229800 dated July 16, 2013.

The importer imported new and used aircraft parts on consignment, and therefore no sale occurs at the time of importation. Aftermarket parts frequently undergo repair to extend the useful life of the part. The method of appraisement under the fallback method was approved as it took account of the marketability, fair market value of the part if new, and repair cost, and appropriate documentation was submitted including a SAP screen print, a sales invoice for the part at issue, Inventory Locator System data, a repair order for the same part, and the applicable entry summary.
H249191 dated Feb. 3, 2014.

A used refurbished part can be appraised using a fallback method using the value of the refurbished part and a reasonable deduction for the repair.
H251594 dated Sep. 22, 2014.

waste material

543904 dated Mar. 20, 1987 - See Used Merchandise, waste material.

The protestant has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that Customs employed unreasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f), appropriately considered all of the evidence made available and used "all reasonable ways and means in his power" to appraise the merchandise.
545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994; aff'd by 547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999.

547061 dated Mar. 19, 1999 - See Used Merchandise, waste material.

A U.S. corporation, whose subsidiaries provide services through North America, contracts with domestic and foreign customers for the disposal of domestic and imported waste in the United States. A disposal fee is charged for these services. This payment is an amount agreed upon by the parties to the transaction and represents the consideration for which the U.S. corporation is willing to accept and process the imported waster. As such, the basis for determining the value of the waste is the disposal fee. It is the only available information that can be quantitatively documented. Customs employed reasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f) of the TAA, appraised the imported waste based on the disposal fee. Under this fallback method of appraisement, Customs appropriately considered all the evidence made available and used all reasonable ways and means to appraise the imported waste at issue.
547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999; aff'g 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994.

547142 dated May 12, 1999 - See Foreign Trade Zones, valuation.

547416 dated June 2, 2000; aff'g 547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999, and 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994 - See Used Merchandise, waste material.

Raw components and parts are shipped from a related party assembler in Mexico to the importer in the United States. The components are not sold to the importer, but rather, an internal accounting procedure occurs that takes the product of the assembler's account and a corresponding entry is made indicating the acquisition of the raw components or part. There is no transaction value available for appraising the raw components and parts. In addition, the other methods of appraisement are not available. In addition, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise is unavailable as well. In order to satisfy the requirements of section 402(c), it must be demonstrated that a transaction value of the merchandise under consideration is fully acceptable under section 402(b). Basing the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise on the transaction between the assembler in Mexico and a supplier in Mexico is not in accordance with section 402(c). The merchandise is properly appraised using section 402(f), value if other values cannot be determined. The invoice values between the Mexican assembler and suppliers coupled with accounting entries between the assembler and importer for the same merchandise is appropriate using a section 402(f) appraisement. In addition, when the Mexican assembler manufactures products for the importer, there is a certain amount of scrap material that results from the manufacturing operations. Some of the scrap material is disposed of or is sold in Mexico; however, on occasion, scrap material is shipped to the importer. Again, the proper method of appraising the scrap material is section 402(f), value if other values cannot be determined. It appears as though a modified transaction value of identical or similar merchandise may be available, i.e., using the market price that is available for either identical or similar scrap materials.
548247 dated Mar. 10, 2003.

Contaminated soil is imported for disposal at a waste site in Idaho. The soil has not been sold and has no commercial value. The soil is properly appraised under the fallback appraisement method based on the disposal fee paid to the operator of the disposal site.
H019073 dated Nov. 2, 2007.

The imported scrap material should be valued using the fallback method based on the value of the precious metal obtained after the processing is performed in U.S. as determined by its price on a metals market, such as the New York Mercantile Exchange, on the day of entry multiplied by the weight of precious metal obtained as shown in the final settlement between the importer and its customer. In addition, in determining the final Customs value of the scrap material, the processing fee that the importer charges its customers for recovering the precious metals from the imported scrap material may be deducted from the value of precious metal. In rare instances where the cost of processing the scrap materials exceeds the value of the precious metals obtained, because the imported merchandise has no real commercial value at the time it is imported, the imported scrap material should be appraised based on the cost of the fees that the importer charges its customer to do the processing to recover the precious metal.
H251593 dated Sep. 22, 2014.

The importer, an aviation-service company, shipped certain parts to an affiliate in Canada. If those parts were determined to be unrepairable, it sent them either to Montreal to be sold for scrap metal or back to headquarters in the U.S. The importer proposed to value the parts returned to the U.S. under the "fallback method" by developing an average ratio of the value of a working part to its value as scrap metal as determined by the per-pound price that the scrap company pays in Montreal. This method is not acceptable because "the price of merchandise in the domestic market of the country of exportation" cannot form the basis of a "fallback method" appraisal under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)(2)(C) and the method does not focus on the particular parts that are actually returned to the U.S.
H235016 dated June 9, 2015.

19 U.S.C. § 1500

Based upon the circumstances presented, the appraising officer used reasonable ways and means to determine the appropriate value for the imported merchandise. Transaction value could not be used to appraise the merchandise because the price actually paid or payable could not be ascertained. That is, the total number of checks written by the buyer to the foreign suppliers did not correlate with the invoices submitted. Therefore, utilizing an appraisement method in accordance with 402(f) of the TAA and the authority provided for in section 500, the import specialist ascertained the price actually paid or payable for the merchandise in accordance with the amount indicated by the checks written.
545069 dated Dec. 23, 1993.

The protestant has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that Customs employed unreasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f), appropriately considered all the evidence made available and used "all reasonable ways and means in his power" to appraise the merchandise.
545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994; <u>aff'd</u> <u>by</u> 547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999.

The importer has not provided sufficient evidence to indicate that Customs unreasonably ascertained the value of the merchandise by using a price applicable to importations of ninety bunches of cilantro per crate. Under the authority of section 500 of the TAA, the appraising officer appropriately considered all the evidence made available by the importer and used "all reasonable ways and means in his power" to appraise the merchandise.
545735 dated Jan. 31, 1995.

The importer protests Customs' appraisement of the merchandise based on the declared value as shown on the foreign seller's invoices. The importer claims that the declared value was based upon provisional or estimated pricing information, and that the final price will not be known until after the equipment is installed. However, no evidence has been presented to substantiate the importer's claim. The appraising officer had no choice but to rely upon the invoiced prices. Under the authority of section 500 of the TAA, the

merchandise was correctly appraised.
545861 dated May 26, 1995.

Customs appraised the imported merchandise based upon the declared value as shown on the foreign seller's invoices. The importer indicated that it would subsequently present a reconciliation package to demonstrate that the seller adjusts the prices for the merchandise. The importer has failed to provide the information. Because no evidence has been presented to indicate that the appraisement of the imported merchandise was incorrectly determined, the Customs officer properly appraised the imported merchandise based upon the seller's invoices.
545949 dated Aug. 24, 1995.

The importer claims that the entered value of imported merchandise was overstated and requests an adjustment. In order for Customs to properly assess the merits of a claim, sufficient evidence must be provided. The importer has failed to submit any evidence whatsoever that supports its claim for a lower entered value. The Customs officer correctly appraised the imported merchandise.
546053 dated Nov. 7, 1995.

Transaction value is not applicable because the relationship between the parties influences the price actually paid or payable. In addition, neither transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, deductive value, nor computed value is available as a means of appraisement. The merchandise is appraised pursuant to section 402(f) of the TAA. Additional payments made by the buyer to the seller are included in a modified transaction value pursuant to section 402(f). The additional payments should be prorated over all of the appropriate entries and not applied as lump sum amounts on the two protested entries at issue. Accordingly, duty should be collected on the entries to which the payments may pertain but, by reason of liquidation, are no longer at issue. The method of apportionment must be reasonable and in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
546430 dated Jan. 6, 1997.

547061 dated Mar. 19, 1999 - <u>See</u> Used Merchandise, waste material.

547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999; <u>aff'g</u> 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994 - <u>See</u> Used Merchandise, waste material.

Insufficient evidence was submitted to establish that Customs employed unreasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f) of the TAA, appraised the imported waste based on the disposal fee. Under this "fallback" method of appraisement, Customs appropriately considered all of the evidence made available and used "all reasonable ways and means in his power" to appraise the imported waste at issue. The basis for determining that value, the disposal fee, is the only available information that can be quantitatively documented. In addition, the payment is an amount agreed upon by the two parties to

the transaction and represents the consideration for which the importer is willing to accept and process the imported waste.
547416 dated June 2, 2000; aff'g 547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999, and 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994.

The importer is unable to identify the price paid or payable for a specific import of the product at the time of entry. Additionally, the importer is unable to tie to a given entry the cost of the material it supplies and the assist with which it is supplied. In light of these circumstances, the importer uses published price indicators to value both the assist or importer-purchased material and the service provided. Although the importer's method is reasonable, the port prefers an alternative method where the appraisement of the imported merchandise is based on an average of the previous year's price of services invoiced in that year for all of the importer's product entered into the United States. Because the importer enters into long-term contracts, typically lasting several years, this method more closely approximates prices for services provided by the importer, rather than published market prices of the most recent contracts signed. Under both methods, the valuation of the assist is the same, using published prices. The port's proposed method is acceptable under 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f)(1), the fallback method, and it trumps the importer's current methodology.
548111 dated Aug. 23, 2001.

The importer provides a lump sum value for the imported merchandise. Under proper classification, certain components of the merchandise must be separately appraised. Transaction value is therefore inapplicable because the importer did not provide sufficient documentation for the value of certain component parts. Alternatively, the goods may be appraised under a modified transaction value approach. In this case, under a modified transaction value approach, the import specialist used reasonable ways and means to appraise the relevant component.
548167 dated Aug. 14, 2002.

The port questioned the validity of the invoiced values of garments and issued Requests for Information to the importer seeking documents supporting the merchandise values stated on the invoices. The importer failed to respond to the requests and, consequently, the entries were rate advanced. Protestant, the importer's surety, questioned CBP's method of appraisement. The port did not have sufficient information to apply a method of appraisement other than the fallback method on the basis of reasonable adjustments to the transaction value of similar merchandise as provided for in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(c). In addition, samples of the merchandise were not provided to CBP and the port's repeated attempts to contact the importer to substantiate the values claimed were unsuccessful. Specifically, the port used the available data on merchandise classified in the same subheading and imported from the same countries at or about the same time as the merchandise being appraised. The figures arrived at accounted for differences in the component materials, characteristics, and commercial interchangeability of the goods that could not otherwise be ascertained. The port's valuation was found to be reasonable.
H119455 dated Feb. 16, 2011.

H233019 dated Nov. 14, 2013 – See Deductive Value, resale in the United States.

VERIFICATION

INTRODUCTION

GATT Valuation Agreement:

Article 17 of the Agreement states:

Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as restricting or calling into question the rights of customs administrations to satisfy themselves as to the truth or accuracy of any statement, document or declaration presented for customs valuation purposes.

In addition, with regard to computed value, Article 6, Paragraph 2, states:

No Party may require or compel any person not resident in its own territory to produce for examination, or to allow access to, any account or other record for the purposes of determining a computed value. However, information supplied by the producer of the goods for the purposes of determining the customs value under the provisions of this Article may be verified in another country by the authorities of the country of importation with the agreement of the producer and provided they give sufficient advance notice to the government of the country in question and the latter does not object to the investigation.

In the Interpretative Notes, Note to Article 6, Paragraph 1, states:

As a general rule, customs value is determined under this Agreement on the basis of information readily available in the country of importation. In order to determine a computed value, however, it may be necessary to examine the costs of producing the goods being valued and other information which has to be obtained from outside the country of importation. Furthermore, in most cases the producer of the goods will be outside the jurisdiction of the authorities of the country of importation. The use of the computed value method will generally be limited to those cases where the buyer and seller are related, and the producer is prepared to supply to the authorities of the country of importation the necessary costings and to provide facilities for any subsequent verification which may be necessary.

CCC Technical Committee Advisory Opinion 10.1 states:

1. Does the Agreement require Customs administrations to rely on fraudulent documentation?
2. The Technical Committee on Customs Valuation expressed the following view:

Imported goods have to be valued under the Agreement on the basis of actual facts. Therefore any documentation which contained false information as to the facts would be contrary to the intention of the Agreement. In this respect it is noted that Article 17 of the Agreement and paragraph 7 of the Protocol underline the right of Customs administrations to satisfy themselves as to the truth and accuracy of any statement,

document or declaration presented to them for Customs valuation purposes. It follows that an administration cannot be required to rely on fraudulent documentation. Further, should documentation prove to be fraudulent subsequent to the determination of a Customs value, invalidation of that value would be a matter for national legislation.

Headquarters Rulings:

insufficient evidence

The merchandise was properly appraised using the invoice price. In view of the importer's inability to provide Customs with a correct breakdown of the claimed non-dutiable charges or to furnish any other evidence to substantiate the claims, the refund request must be denied.
545395 dated Sep. 30, 1993.

The importer has the burden of proving the validity of information on entry documents and the veracity of a transaction in question in order to properly appraise merchandise. In order for Customs to properly assess the merits of a claim, sufficient evidence must be provided. In this case, the importer neither submitted adequate records to warrant Customs granting the request for a duty refund, nor has the importer adequately explained how the documents relate to or prove the claim.
545138 dated Oct. 19, 1993.

19 U.S.C. § 1500

Entries were submitted which included documentation containing invoice notations: "No commercial value" and/or "Value for Customs purposes only." The notations were not accompanied by further explanation about the transactions. The import specialist requested further information from the importer concerning the pricing of the imported merchandise. The limited documentation submitted failed to establish the price actually paid or payable for certain entries. No thorough explanation of pricing was provided. 19 U.S.C. 1500 authorizes the appraising officer to weigh the nature of the evidence in appraising the merchandise under the constraints of section 402.
544824 dated May 4, 1993.

545069 dated Dec. 23, 1993 - See Value If Other Values Cannot Be Determined, 19 U.S.C. 1500.

Transaction value was rejected as a means of appraisement because the importer was unable to provide any proof of payment for the imported merchandise. No checks, money orders, evidence of wire transfers, bank records, or bookkeeping records were presented. No actual receipts from the seller were submitted. The only documentation presented consisted of letters allegedly written from the seller indicating the price of the imported merchandise. It was reasonable for the appraising officer to conclude that these letters were not a reliable indicator of the price of the imported merchandise. Accordingly, it was proper for the appraising officer to reject transaction value as the method of appraising

the merchandise.
546122 dated Jan. 11, 1996.

Importers are required to file such documentation as is necessary to enable Customs to assess properly the duties on the imported merchandise. The importer has the burden of proving the validity of information on entry documents and the veracity of a transaction in question, in order to properly appraise the merchandise. In this case, the importer was unable to provide information to establish a valid transaction value. In addition, transaction value of identical or similar merchandise, deductive value, and computed value could not be established, so the merchandise was appraised pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).
546824 dated Nov. 4, 1998.

Insufficient evidence was submitted to establish that Customs employed unreasonable ways and means to ascertain the value of the imported merchandise. The appraising officer, under authority of section 500 and by utilizing a method of appraisement in accordance with section 402(f) of the TAA, appraised the imported waste based on the disposal fee. Under this fallback method of appraisement, Customs appropriately considered all of the evidence made available and used reasonable ways and means to appraise the imported waste at issue. The basis for determining that value, the disposal fee, is the only available information that can be quantitatively documented.
547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999; aff'g 545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994.

547368 dated June 28, 2000 - See Price Actually Paid or Payable, invoice price.

At the time of entry, the importer presented invoices from the buyer to the seller representing the sale of the merchandise. Appraisement was based on the invoices as sufficient evidence to establish the transaction value of the merchandise. No other objective evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the prices shown on the invoices do not accurately reflect the prices actually paid or payable. In fact, the invoices carry a statement attesting to the accuracy of the information. The merchandise was properly appraised using the transaction value method of appraisement.
548234 dated Jan. 15, 2003.

Because there was no sale for export to the U.S., the port determined that the merchandise could not be appraised using transaction value. Accordingly, the port attempted to obtain information from the importer regarding the price at which the goods contained in the shipment were eventually sold to customers in the U.S. To obtain the necessary value information, the port issued a Customs Form 28 (CF 28) Request for Information, and also had a face-to-face meeting with the importer. Due to the importer's lack of cooperation, these efforts proved to be unsuccessful, and thus the port was unable to obtain the necessary information to determine the value of the merchandise from the importer. As a result of the importer's lack of cooperation, in appraising the imported merchandise, the value of the imported children's apparel may be determined under the fallback method provided for in section 402(f) of the TAA, by using all reasonable ways and means, so long as the method used is not specifically precluded under section

402(f)(2)(D) of the TAA. Under the circumstances present, the method the Port used in appraising the merchandise through first identifying U.S. businesses that sold the Protestant's product lines during the applicable time period, and then obtaining prices listed on copies of the sales invoices from the protestant to their U.S. customers in transactions of merchandise comparable to merchandise contained in the shipment under protest was an acceptable method of appraisement. Therefore, this approach constitutes a valid application of a modified version of the transaction value of identical or similar merchandise under the fallback method set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1401a(f).
H235529 dated May 8, 2014.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The U.S. Customs and Border Protection's home page on the Internet's World Wide Web, provides the trade community with current, relevant information regarding Customs operations and items of special interest. The site posts information -- which includes proposed regulations, news releases, Customs publications and notices, etc. -- that can be searched, read on-line, printed or downloaded to your personal computer. The web site was established as a trade-friendly mechanism to assist the importing and exporting community. The web site contains the most current electronic versions of, or links to:

- Customs Regulations and statutes
- Federal Register and public information notices
- The Customs Bulletin and Decisions
- Binding Rulings
- Publications including-
  Importing Into the U.S.
- Other Informed Compliance Publications in the "*What Every Member of the Trade Community Should Know About:…"* series
- *Customs Valuation Encyclopedia*
- Video Tape availability and ordering information
- Information for small businesses

The web site links to the home pages of many other agencies whose importing or exporting regulations Customs helps to enforce. Finally, Customs web site contains a wealth of information of interest to a broader public than the trade community -- to international travelers, for example.

The U.S. Customs and Border Protection's web address is http://www.cbp.gov.

The information provided in this publication is for informational purposes only. Summaries of rulings are not substitutes for the rulings themselves. Recognizing that many complicated factors may be involved in customs issues, an importer may wish to obtain a ruling under Customs Regulations, 19 CFR Part 177, or obtain advice from an expert (such as a licensed customs broker, attorney or consultant) who specializes in Customs matters. Reliance solely on the general information in this publication may not be considered reasonable care.

Additional information may also be obtained from Customs ports of entry.

“Your Comments are Important”

The Small Business and Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and 10 regional Fairness Boards were established to receive comments from small businesses about federal agency enforcement activities and rate each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on the enforcement actions of U.S. Customs & Border Protection (CBP) & Border Protection (CBP), call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247).

REPORT SMUGGLING 1-800-BE-ALERT

Visit our Internet web site: http://www.cbp.gov/

TABLE OF CITATIONS
Headquarters Rulings

071374 dated Sep. 27, 1983 434
223727 dated Apr. 5, 1993 297
542095 dated June 24, 1980 169
542101 dated Mar. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 1) 515
542106 dated May 15, 1980 (TAA No. 2) 22
542122 dated Sep. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 4) 22, 40, 43
542139 dated Oct. 15, 1980 (TAA No. 9). 40, 98
542141 dated Sep. 29, 1980 (TAA No. 7) 70, 76, 78
542144 dated Feb. 4, 1981 (TAA No. 16) 26, 43
542146 dated Nov. 25, 1980 (TAA No. 12); 30
542150 dated Jan. 6, 1981 (TAA No. 14) 299
542152 dated Dec. 4, 1980 (TAA No. 13). 30
542166 dated Feb. 12, 1981 (TAA No. 17). 29, 206
542169 dated Sep. 18, 1980 (TAA No. 6) 299, 301
542176 dated May 19, 1981 70
542181 dated Oct. 15, 1980 262
542187 dated Nov. 7, 1980 (TAA No. 11) 49, 285
542206 dated Mar. 23, 1981 ..... **513**
542220 dated Dec. 24, 1980 (TAA No. 15). 30
542231 dated Mar. 26, 1981 ..... **515**, **519**
542261 dated Mar. 11, 1981 (TAA No. 19) 321
542267 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 22). 132, 135
542275 dated June 11, 1981 (TAA No. 31) 203, 312
542302 dated Feb. 27, 1981 ..... 18, 28, 40, 54, 191
542302 dated Feb. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 18) 18, 28, 40, 54, 191
542310 dated May 22, 1981 ..... 321, 349, 428, 438, **495**, **507**
542315 dated May 13, 1981 (TAA No. 25) 352
542324 dated June 22, 1981 (TAA No. 33) 31, 50, 54, 56
542325 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 23). 30, 99, 104, 192
542355 dated Apr. 3, 1981 (TAA No. 21). 50
542356 dated Apr. 13, 1981 (TAA No. 24) 28, 56, 191
542357 dated Mar. 31, 1981 76
542358 dated June 4, 1981 ..... 70, 76
542360 dated June 10, 1981 (TAA No. 29) 375
542361 dated July 14, 1981 ..... 18, 29, 191
542362 dated Mar. 18, 1981 70
542367 dated June 18, 1981. ..... 26, 30
542372 dated Mar. 3, 1981 231
542377 dated June 16, 1981 (TAA No. 32). 31
542401 dated May 21, 1981 ..... 172, 246
542412 dated Mar. 27, 1983 (TAA No. 20) 22, 26
542416 dated July 31, 1981 428
542419 dated June 2, 1981 30
542439 dated June 12, 1981 ..... 134, 172
542442 dated June 11, 1981 301
542446 dated July 23, 1981 (TAA No. 37). 31
542451 dated June 4, 1981 (TAA No. 27) 173, 238
542467 dated Aug. 13, 1981 ..... 173, **513**
542476 dated June 10, 1981 ..... 410, 439, **491**, **495**
542477 dated July 27, 1981 ..... 28, 56, 191
542491 dated June 9, 1981 231
542493 dated Aug. 12, 1981 ..... **474**
542498 dated June 16, 1981. ..... 31, 54
542512 dated July 21, 1981 (TAA No. 36). 173
542516 dated Oct. 7, 1981 (TAA No. 39) 46, 154, 262, 357, 409, 435, 439, 495, 496
542519 dated July 21, 1981 (TAA No. 35). 19, 191
542521 dated Oct. 7, 1981. 31
542524 dated July 15, 1981 (TAA No. 34). 173
542546 dated Aug. 14, 1981 ..... **515**
542554 dated July 29, 1981 ..... **519**, **520**
542557 dated Aug. 11, 1981 ..... **533**, **548**
542558 dated Nov. 10, 1981 300
542559 dated Aug. 18, 1981 ..... 163, 274
542561 dated Aug. 25, 1981 ..... **515**
542566 dated Nov. 18, 1981 231
542568 dated Nov. 16, 1981 ..... 119, 411, 439, **502**
542573 dated Nov. 6, 1981 300
542580 dated Nov. 4, 1981 ..... 349, 352
542591 dated Sep. 18, 1981 54
542611 dated Sep. 22, 1981 ..... 214, 239, 266
542613 dated Nov. 11, 1981 (TAA No. 42) 278
542621 dated Jan. 4, 1982. 73
542622 dated Dec. 30, 1981 286
542625 dated Jan. 18, 1982. 31
542627 dated Dec. 17, 1981 (TAA No. 43). 204
542658 dated Jan. 12, 1982 (TAA No. 44) 99, 192
542662 dated Feb. 16,1982 76
542666 dated Jan. 26, 1982 (TAA No. 45). 204
542667 dated Mar. 5, 1982. 56
542671 dated Mar. 15, 1982 ..... 183, 306
542673 dated June 10, 1982 410
542675 dated July 20, 1982 352
542676 dated Dec. 7, 1981 309
542679 dated Jan. 11, 1982 74
542690 dated Jan. 28, 1982 54
542696 dated Feb. 22, 1982 (TAA No. 46). 44
542699 dated Mar. 10, 1982 ..... 155, 356
542701 dated Apr. 28, 1982 ..... 183, 290, 294, **492**
542703 dated Aug. 25, 1982 (TAA No. 50) 204, 281
542717 dated Apr. 2, 1982 ..... 296, **509**
542729 dated Mar. 29, 1982 ..... 290, 294, **492**
542731 dated Feb. 26, 1982 309
542741 dated Mar. 30, 1982 ..... 166, 274
542746 dated Mar. 30, 1982 ..... 290, **492**
542747 dated June 3, 1982 112
542748 dated Mar. 31, 1982 ..... 179, **495**
542756 dated May 13, 1982 74
542762 dated Jan. 14, 1983 ..... 40, 54
542765 dated Apr. 20, 1982. ..... 100, 115, 134, 140, 195
542769 dated June 30, 1982. 31
542774 dated June 14, 1982 ..... 31, 49, 285
542780 dated June 3, 1982 ..... **519**
542781 dated Mar. 24, 1982 74
542785 dated Apr. 29, 1982 70
542791 dated June 10, 1982 ..... 438, 439, **495**, **533**

542792 dated Mar. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 61)....321, 349, 350
542797 dated May 19, 1982 (TAA No. 48).....312, 321
542798 dated Feb. 10, 1983 300
542803 dated Dec. 30, 1982 301
542804 dated July 12, 1982.....286
542807 dated May 17, 1982.....74
542812 dated July 19, 1982.....29, 50, 246
542818 dated May 27, 1982.....375
542831 dated Sep. 21, 1982 (TAA No. 52) 247, 281
542832 dated Sep. 22, 1982 (TAA No. 53) 520
542834 dated July 20, 1982 (TAA No. 49).....231, 234
542842 dated June 18, 1982 375
542849 dated Aug. 6, 1982......104, 193, 207
542857 dated July 14, 1982......201
542868 dated July 29, 1982.....349
542869 dated Oct. 13, 1982......204
542873 dated July 20, 1982 (TAA No. 44, Supp. No. 1) 99, 192
542874 dated Aug. 27, 1982.....173, **513**
542876 dated Aug. 6, 1982.....309
542879 dated Nov. 3, 1982 290
542891 dated Sep. 14, 1982. 31
542895 dated Aug. 27, 1981 (TAA No. 51)...410, 439, 495
542897 dated Aug. 16, 1982.....234
542900 dated Dec. 9, 1982 (TAA No. 56).....291, 374, 375
542905 dated Jan. 28, 1983.....247
542911 dated Sep. 16, 1982 309
542912 dated June 28, 1983 78
542917 dated Sep. 17, 1982 309
542919 dated Oct. 8, 1982 74
542924 dated Nov. 17, 1982 74
542926 dated Jan. 21, 1983.....374, 375, 376
542928 dated Jan. 21, 1983 (TAA No. 57)....294, 434, 492
542930 dated Mar. 4, 1983 (TAA No. 59).....410, 439, 491, 495, 538
542933 dated Oct. 13, 1982.....282, 312, **520**
542936 dated Nov. 12, 1982 (TAA No. 54). 31
542946 dated Jan. 27, 1983.....49, 280, 285
542948 dated Nov. 29, 1982 (TAA No. 55). 26, 32, 45, 56
542957 dated Nov. 26, 1982.....234
542959 dated Nov. 24, 1981.....312
542962 dated Dec. 29, 1982 .....439, **533**, **548**
542972 dated Jan. 6, 1983.....195, **479**
542975 dated Mar. 9, 1983 (TAA No. 60)......189, 198, 263
542983 dated Dec. 29, 1982 309
542984 dated Apr. 8, 1983.....198, 202, 271
542992 dated May 16, 1983.....435
542994 dated Apr. 26, 1983.....112
542996 dated Mar. 4, 1983.....217, **495**, **543**
543003 dated Feb. 25, 1983 (TAA No. 58).41, 53, 519
543004 dated Mar. 16, 1983 309
543014 dated Feb. 15, 1983 .....282, 312
543016 dated Mar. 18, 1983 411
543023 dated Mar. 17, 1983 .....70, 204
543026 dated Mar. 17, 1983 234
543031 dated Apr. 12, 1983......103, 104, 193, 207
543048 dated June 17, 1983..... 179
543053 dated July 11, 1983 ..... 78, **474**
543059 dated May 5, 1983..... 241, 282, **528**
543061 dated May 4, 1983..... 154, 312
543062 dated Nov. 8, 1983..... 376
543064 dated June 1, 1983...... 32, 54
543065 dated June 20, 1983...... 133
543066 dated July 25, 1983. 112
543070 dated July 28, 1983 376
543076 dated Sep. 6, 1983...... 104
543079 dated Sep. 20, 1983..... 352
543088 dated June 28, 1983..... 90, 247
543089 dated June 20, 1984.....124, 184, 186, 307
543091 dated Sep. 29, 1983...... 152
543092 dated Apr. 10, 1984 74
543093 dated Apr. 30, 1984 ..... 24, 25, 45, 47
543094 dated Mar. 30, 1984 ..... 124, 186
543095 dated Jan. 5, 1984 ..... 179, 193
543095 dated Jan. 5, 1984. 179
543096 dated June 21, 1983 (TAA No. 63)41, 53, 519
543098 dated Dec. 1, 1983..... 434
543106 dated June 29, 1983...... 152
543107 dated Oct. 14, 1983 239
543112 dated May 10, 1984 ..... 119, **502**
543117 dated Sep. 2, 1983..... 262
543118 dated July 29, 1983 263
543123 dated Dec. 20, 1983.....140, 152, 355, **542**
543128 dated June 4, 1984 ..... 115, 119, **502**
543141 dated Oct. 19, 1983 ..... **515**, **520**
543142 dated May 7, 1984..... 155, 357
543144 dated Nov. 17, 1983..... 321, 349, 350
543148 dated June 26, 1985...... 76
543152 dated June 6, 1984...... 199
543153 dated May 1, 1984..... 193, 352
543155 dated Dec. 13, 1983..... 157, 364
543159 dated May 7, 1984. ..... 104, 157, 207
543161 dated Jan. 3, 1984 ..... 173, 239
543166 dated Jan. 6, 1984. 104
543171 dated June 20, 1984..... 76
543180 dated July 17, 1984 ..... 155, 357
543183 dated July 17, 1984 247
543185 dated Sep. 13, 1984..... 55, 74, 235
543189 dated Oct. 19, 1983 ..... 183, 307
543191 dated Jan. 31, 1984 124
543192 dated Oct. 24, 1983 376
543197 dated May 23, 1984 179
543208 dated Dec. 28, 1983...... 78
543209 dated Jan. 25, 1984 ..... 122, **488**
543210 dated Apr. 11, 1984 ..... **533**, **548**
543212 dated May 7, 1984..... 352
543226 dated Jan. 3, 1984 ..... **491**, **538**
543233 dated Aug. 9, 1984. ..... 28, 191
543236 dated Sep. 12, 1984..... 309
543239 dated Jan. 24, 1984...... 104
543240 dated Aug. 10, 1984. 152
543243 dated Apr. 30, 1984 ..... 115, 440, **496**
543246 dated Jan. 9, 1984 ..... 309, 312, **520**
543249 dated June 11, 1984..... 74
543252 dated Mar. 30, 1984..... 124, 186
543257 dated Sep. 26, 1984..... 348
543263 dated Sep. 5, 1985..... 173, 239
543265 dated July 2, 1985 ..... **533**, **548**

543266 dated May 1, 1984 234
543267 dated Mar. 16, 1984 ..... 241, **529**
543268 dated Dec. 14, 1984. ..... 103, 105
543270 dated Oct. 24, 1984 ..... **520**
543272 dated Apr. 26, 1985 ..... 32, 321
543276 dated May 15, 1984. ..... 105, 123, 192
543277 dated Apr. 30, 1984 ..... 282, 313
543278 dated Oct. 31, 1984 ..... 50, 56
543281 dated Aug. 9, 1984 ..... 295, **492**
543285 dated Mar. 20, 1984 ..... 184, 307
543288 dated Nov. 26, 1984 ..... 152, 355, 411, 440, **496**
543292 dated Apr. 19, 1985 70
543293 dated Jan. 15, 1985 ..... 29, 92, 197, 198, 272
543294 dated May 15, 1984 303
543295 dated Jan. 15, 1985. 91
543302 dated Nov. 1, 1984 ..... 163, 274
543305 dated Dec. 27, 1984. 78
543319 dated Jan. 17, 1985 169
543324 dated Aug. 8, 1984 ..... 29, 32, 197, 271
543330 dated May 23, 1984. 76
543331 dated June 14, 1984 ..... 214, 239, 266
543352 dated Mar. 30, 1984 ..... 184, 189, 307
543358 dated Sep. 13, 1984 ..... 112, 299, 309
543365 dated Nov. 1, 1984 ..... 43, 263, 276, 280
543370 dated Sep. 18, 1984 376
543376 dated Nov. 13, 1984 ..... 29, 32, 271
543378 dated Nov. 20, 1984 321
543382 dated Nov. 14, 1984 ..... 300, 301
543386 dated July 23, 1984 78
543387 dated Sep. 7, 1984 281
543391 dated Feb. 18, 1987. ..... 99, 180
543396 dated Aug. 23, 1984 ..... 179, **543**
543398 dated Aug. 27, 1984 ..... 24, 45
543399 dated Apr. 11, 1985 291
543400 dated Apr. 16, 1985 ..... 122, **488**, **492**
543403 dated Sep. 24, 1984 115
543405 dated June 21, 1985. ..... 41, 50
543407 dated Dec. 14, 1984 ..... 45, 56, 434
543412 dated Apr. 3, 1985 ..... **491**
543417 dated Feb. 11, 1985 376
543421 dated Feb. 25, 1985 376
543425 dated Sep. 28, 1984 320
543426 dated Mar. 15, 1985 ..... 198, 271
543428 dated Apr. 26, 1985 278
543435 dated Jan. 15, 1985 310
543436 dated Dec. 14, 1984. ..... 32, 55
543437 dated May 17, 1985. 124
543439 dated May 6, 1985 29
543440 dated May 13, 1985 74
543445 dated Oct. 23, 1985 ..... 91, 92, 247
543446 dated Apr. 2, 1986 ..... 286, 410, 411
543446 dated Aug. 12, 1985 ..... 286, 410, 411
543447 dated Feb. 5, 1985 78
543450 dated June 25, 1985. ..... 28, 191
543456 dated Nov. 6, 1985. 92
543457 dated Apr. 9, 1985 ..... 282, 313
543461 dated Mar. 1, 1985 74
543485 dated Feb. 26, 1985 ..... 411, 440, **491**
543492 dated Feb. 20, 1985 411
543496 dated Mar. 3, 1987 ..... 76, 79
543497 dated June 25, 1985 376
543498 dated Apr. 15, 1985 434
543500 dated Apr. 9, 1985 301
543501 dated May 2, 1985 ..... 287, **520**
543502 dated June 11, 1985. ..... 99, 105
543508 dated Feb. 18, 1986 76
543511 dated May 29, 1986 ..... 352, 412
543512 dated Apr. 9, 1985 281
543518 dated Sep. 3, 1985 ..... **519**, **520**
543519 dated Sep. 5, 1985 321
543526 dated Sep. 17, 1985 278
543529 dated Oct. 7, 1985 ..... 374, 375, 376
543531 dated Apr. 30, 1985 204
543534 dated June 3, 1985 ..... **515**
543537 dated Feb. 14, 1986 ..... 153, 154, 163, 310, 313
543538 dated July 31, 1985. 158
543540 dated June 12, 1985 301
543544 dated Nov. 26, 1985 411
543545 dated June 3, 1985 434
543546 dated June 7, 1985 350
543551 dated Aug. 27, 1985 281
543556 dated Aug. 23, 1985 ..... 41, 51
543557 dated Oct. 2, 1985. 173
543566 dated July 10, 1986 78
543567 dated Jan. 17, 1986 ..... 214, 239, 266
543568 dated May 30, 1986 ..... 321, 349, 350
543569 dated July 16, 1985 ..... 280, 287
543574 dated Mar. 24, 1986 ..... 29, 92, 197, 198, 272
543576 dated Mar. 3, 1986. 105
543577 dated Aug. 26, 1985 376
543581 dated Sep. 3, 1985 ..... 411, 440, **480**
543584 dated Aug. 30, 1985 ..... 32, 41, 198, 272
543585 dated Aug. 26, 1985 ..... **516**
543595 dated Apr. 17, 1986. 199
543605 dated Mar. 13, 1987 ..... **503**, **508**
543609 dated Oct. 7, 1985 ..... 154, 313
543611 dated Sep. 6, 1985 ..... 299, 309
543615 dated Dec. 4, 1985 ..... 348, 411
543616 dated Oct. 1, 1985 ..... 74, 301
543617 dated June 8, 1987 377
543619 dated Oct. 23, 1985 ..... 41, 45, 56
543622 dated June 23, 1986 287
543623 dated Nov. 4, 1985 ..... 25, 45, 47
543624 dated Aug. 26, 1987 434
543625 dated Feb. 4, 1986 ..... 76, 78
543628 dated Nov. 4, 1985 ..... **504**
543630 dated Oct. 8, 1985 286
543631 dated June 8, 1987 ..... 22, 44
543632 dated Oct. 22, 1985 74
543633 dated July 7, 1987 412
543636 dated Mar. 30, 1987. 79
543637 dated Dec. 2, 1985 ..... 152, 193, 355
543641 dated Aug. 22, 1986 ..... 119, 411, 439, **502**
543643 dated Sep. 24, 1986 ..... **520**
543644 dated Nov. 20, 1985 ..... 122, **489**
543645 dated Feb. 17, 1987 ..... 49, 285
543655 dated Dec. 13, 1985 301
543659 dated Mar. 12, 1986 299
543662 dated Jan. 7, 1986 ..... 167, 274, 306
543664 dated Oct. 21, 1987 278
543673 dated Feb. 4, 1986 434
543687 dated May 6, 1986 ..... 434, **516**
543694 dated Mar. 20, 1986 ..... 299, 309
543698 dated June 11, 1986 ..... 276, 286, 411, 412

543708 dated Apr. 21, 1988.....352, 412, **474**
543710 dated June 3, 1986.....434
543715 dated June 13, 1986 300
543721 dated Apr. 11, 1986.....434
543726 dated Aug. 25, 1986.....434
543731 dated May 1, 1986......211
543737 dated July 21, 198646, 154, 262, 357, 409, 435, 439, **495**, **496**
543744 dated July 30, 1986.....**516**
543746 dated May 22, 1986.....434
543765 dated Aug. 8, 1986......205
543766 dated Sep. 30, 1986 .....154, 199
543768 dated July 23, 1986.....281
543769 dated Oct. 8, 1986......140
543770 dated Feb. 10, 1987 .....91, 247
543771 dated July 11, 1986.....199, 272
543772 dated July 11, 1986.....154, 199, 272
543773 dated Aug. 28, 1986.....374, 375, 377
543774 dated June 4, 1987.....**474**
543776 dated Oct. 21, 1987.....434
543786 dated Sep. 15, 1986 433
543789 dated Feb. 17, 1987 433
543792 dated Aug. 14, 1986.....211
543799 dated Oct. 10, 1986.....**521**
543801 dated Jan. 8, 1987.....**516**
543804 dated Sep. 30, 1986 436
543806 dated Mar. 12, 1987 .....19, 191, 322
543809 dated Nov. 5, 1987 211
543812 dated Apr. 20, 1987.....92, 247
543817 dated Mar. 20, 1987 231
543820 dated Dec. 22, 1986 .....44, 105
543821 dated Oct. 29, 1986.....74
543825 dated July 7, 1987.....211
543827 dated Mar. 9, 1987.....202
543830 dated Nov. 7, 1986 .....154, 155, 199
543831 dated Jan. 25, 1988..... 24, 25, 45, 47, 56, 434
543834 dated Aug. 18, 1987.....74
543837 dated Feb. 18, 1987 74
543842 dated Nov. 10, 1986.....286
543850 dated June 20, 1988 352
543851 dated Apr. 13, 1987......32
543857 dated Feb. 18, 1987 .....105, 192
543857 dated Feb. 18, 1987. 105
543859 dated Mar. 13, 1987 26
543861 dated July 7, 1987.....434
543868 dated Mar. 5, 1987.....438
543876 dated July 22, 1988.....412
543877 dated Mar. 17, 1987 .....42, 44, 199
543881 dated Dec. 3, 1987. 112
543882 dated Mar. 13, 1987 ..... 29, 91, 198, 247, 272
543889 dated May 12, 1987.....51, 57
543890 dated Aug. 18, 1987.....377
543891 dated May 2, 1988......105
543904 dated Mar. 20, 1987 .....**535**, **550**
543908 dated Apr. 19, 1988.....211
543911 dated Nov. 1, 1988 .....74, 434
543912 dated Apr. 19, 1988.....100, 134, 195, **480**
543913 dated Feb. 22, 1988 300
543917 dated Aug. 27, 1987.....184, 307
543921 dated May 5, 1987.....434
543924 dated May 29, 1987.....24, 90, 247
543927 dated May 13, 1987.....**503**, **508**
543940 dated Nov. 4, 1987..... 184, 307
543941 dated Aug. 27, 1987 350
543943 dated Dec. 8, 1987...... 25, 57
543951 dated Sep. 23, 1987...... 198
543957 dated Nov. 5, 1987..... 350
543963 dated Sep. 11, 1987..... 173, 174, 266
543967 dated Dec. 17, 1987...... 29, 198
543970 dated Mar. 13, 1989..... **533**, **548**
543971 dated July 22, 1987 ..... 46, 262, 410
543983 dated Dec. 2, 1987.....29, 184, 198, 272, 307
543984 dated Feb. 22, 1988..... 322, 348
543985 dated Feb. 1, 1988 235
543990 dated Mar. 25, 1988..... 74
543992 dated Sep. 10, 1987..... 44
544003 dated Jan. 21, 1988 ..... **516**
544005 dated Aug. 16, 1988 ..... 239, 266
544008 dated Aug. 17, 1988 74
544016 dated June 22, 1988..... 301
544026 dated Oct. 20, 1987. 76
544029 dated Dec. 2, 1987..... 74
544031 dated Jan. 19, 1988 ..... 91, 247
544035 dated Nov. 23, 1987..... 49, 285
544040 dated Nov. 8, 1988...... 51
544047 dated Mar. 8, 1988 377
544049 dated Jan. 19, 1988 348
544060 dated Jan. 30, 1988 22
544061 dated May 27, 1988 ..... 322, 377
544066 dated Dec. 15, 1987..... 309
544082 dated Sep. 19, 1988..... 46, 204, 248
544083 dated Aug. 16, 1988 ..... 40, 55
544088 dated Mar. 25, 1988..... 32, 78
544098 dated June 10, 1988..... 44
544102 dated Aug. 16, 1988 ..... 374, 375, 378
544105 dated Mar. 25, 1988..... 377
544110 dated Apr. 26, 1990 ..... 74, 300, **474**
544116 dated Apr. 19, 1988 ..... **474**
544119 dated May 25, 1988 74
544121 dated June 24, 1988..... 91, 247
544125 dated Aug. 11, 1988 286
544126 dated Aug. 17, 1988 ..... 40, 44, 55
544129 dated Aug. 31, 1988 378
544143 dated July 5, 1988 ..... 264, 280, 281
544147 dated July 5, 1988 ..... 51, 57
544152 Dec. 27, 1988 ..... **521**
544155 dated Dec. 16, 1988..... 204
544156 dated June 3, 1988..... 231
544176 dated July 27, 1988 411
544177 dated Sep. 19, 1988..... **474**
544181 dated June 23, 1989..... 436
544189 dated Aug. 11, 1988 ..... 322, **480**
544190 dated Sep. 26, 1988..... 53
544192 dated June 16, 1989..... 26, 33, 51
544194 dated May 23, 1988 ..... 19, 30, 191
544198 dated Aug. 29, 1988. 169
544201 dated Dec. 12, 1988..... 41, 53
544204 dated Feb. 23, 1990 ..... **516**
544205 dated Dec. 12, 1988..... 91, 92, 167, 247
544220 dated Jan. 22, 1990 300
544221 dated June 3, 1991..... 300
544230 dated Dec. 22, 1988..... 231
544234 dated Jan. 24, 1989 74
544235 dated Nov. 25, 1988..... 248

544236 dated Oct. 31, 1988.....140, **513**, **514**
544238 dated Oct. 24, 1988......19
544239 dated Nov. 18, 1988.....349, **480**, **544**
544241 dated Jan. 12, 1989...22, 23, 53, 155, 355, 357, **519**
544243 dated Oct. 24, 1988.....28, 53, 191, **519**
544244 dated June 16, 1989.....74
544245 dated Apr. 5, 1989.....301
544247 dated Feb. 28, 1989.....239, 266
544250 dated July 26, 1991.....178
544252 dated Dec. 21, 1988.....**507**
544256 dated Nov. 15, 1988.....28, 53, 191, **519**
544258 dated Feb. 1, 1989.....76
544261 dated Feb. 28, 1989.....40, 44, 54, 55
544262 dated June 27, 1989.....313, 410, 439, **495**
544264 dated Feb. 24, 1989.....264
544276 dated Oct. 24, 1989.....264
544279 dated Sep. 13, 1989.....434
544280 dated Feb. 2, 1989.....434
544283 dated Feb. 23, 1989.....434
544284 dated Jan. 26, 1989.....434
544286 dated Feb. 2, 1989.....434
544288 dated Aug. 25, 1989.....434
544289 dated Nov. 6, 1989.....434
544294 dated July 7, 1989.....236
544300 dated Feb. 17, 1989.....374, 378
544304 dated Mar. 20, 1989.....78
544313 dated Jan. 22, 1990.....434, 435
544314 dated Apr. 15, 1991.....79, 435
544315 dated May 30, 1989.....22, 40, 42, 49, 55, 285
544317 dated Apr. 24, 1990.....184, 307
544321 dated May 16, 1989.....204
544323 dated Mar. 8, 1990.....26, 27, 43, 44, 54, **519**
544332 dated Nov. 19, 1990.....241, 282, **529**
544334 dated June 27, 1989.....206
544335 dated Feb. 7, 1990.....74, 76
544337 dated Apr. 9, 1990......19, 33, 192
544338 dated Sep. 13, 1989.....74
544340 dated Sep. 11, 1990.....92, 248
544345 dated July 30, 1990.....300
544351 dated Oct. 29, 1990.....378
544352 dated July 12, 1990.....412, 440
544353 dated Oct. 24, 1989.....22, 44
544364 dated Oct. 9, 1990.....184, 308
544368 dated Oct. 9, 1990.....156, 357
544370 dated Oct. 9, 1990.....156, 357
544371 dated June 11, 1990.....147, 163, 274
544372 dated June 7, 1990.....286
544373 dated Feb. 21, 1990.....**516**
544374 dated Nov. 6, 1989.....**516**
544375 dated July 16, 1990.....**492**, **508**
544377 dated Sep. 1, 1989.....152, 355, **542**
544381 dated Nov. 25, 1991.....48, 272, 379
544382 dated Oct. 9, 1990.....434, **474**
544383 dated Jan. 18, 1991.....435
544388 dated July 13, 1990.....300
544393 dated Nov. 3, 1989.....**516**
544394 dated Oct. 9, 1990.....156, 357
544395 dated Nov. 2, 1990.....206
544396 dated May 14, 1990.....74, 76, 264
544400 dated Feb. 23, 1990.....**516**
544409 dated Nov. 20, 1989.....350
544417 dated Apr. 10, 1991.....413, 435
544419 dated July 12, 1990.....74
544420 dated July 8, 1991.....378
544421 dated Apr. 3, 1990.....40, 43, 44
544423 dated June 3, 1991.....27, 57, 79, 80, 280
544426 dated June 8, 1990.....70, 74
544431 dated Mar. 8, 1990.....74, 76
544432 dated Jan. 17, 1990.....212
544436 dated Feb. 4, 1991 291, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378
544450 dated Nov. 5, 1990.....434
544452 dated Sep. 11, 1990.....74
544453 dated Mar. 8, 1990.....313
544455 dated Mar. 14, 1995.....351
544459 dated May 30, 1991......33, 57
544464 dated Apr. 30, 1991......186
544465 dated Mar. 12, 1990.....434
544469 dated Aug. 16, 1990.....119, 136, **502**
544472 dated July 30, 1990.....74, 300
544480 dated Sep. 21, 1990.....40, 54
544481 dated May 8, 1991......46, 98, 99, 106
544482 dated Aug. 30, 1990.....197, 264
544484 dated Jan. 31, 1991.....48
544491 dated Oct. 29, 1990......112
544493 dated June 3, 1991......46
544494 dated June 28, 1993......19
544501 dated Oct. 18, 1991.....241, **529**
544508 dated June 19, 1990.....40, 42, 49, 55, 285
544510 dated Jan. 9, 1992......63
544512 dated Dec. 20, 1990......74
544516 dated Jan. 9, 1991.....47, 90
544525 dated Jan. 31, 1991.....48
544544 dated Nov. 1, 1991.....442
544547 dated Aug. 30, 1990.....322
544572 dated Aug. 5, 1991.....178
544574 dated Nov. 14, 1990.....156, 357
544575 dated Jan. 31, 1991.....79, 378
544579 dated Sep. 30, 1993.....442
544580 dated Mar. 1, 1991......206
544581 dated Feb. 25, 1991.....212
544584 dated Dec. 9, 1992......64
544585 dated Jan. 29, 1991.....300
544595 dated Mar. 8, 1991.....434, 435
544605 dated Mar. 15, 1991......101
544608 dated Sep. 21, 1992.....413, **475**
544609 dated Aug. 12, 1991......33
544610 dated Dec. 23, 1991.....71, 205, 300
544611 dated July 29, 1991.....379
544615 dated Sep. 11, 1991.....241, 248, 310
544616 dated Apr. 15, 1991......105, 109
544620 dated Dec. 23, 1991.....112, 282
544621 dated Apr. 22, 1991......33
544628 dated Mar. 11, 1992.....167, 261, 282
544633 dated Aug. 2, 1991.....442
544634 dated June 20, 1991......79
544635 dated May 24, 1991.....132, 141
544638 dated July 1, 1991.....261
544640 dated Apr. 26, 1991.....248
544642 dated June 24, 1991.....47
544644 dated Sep. 29, 1993.....249
544645 dated July 16, 1991.....282, 313
544646 dated Dec. 23, 1991.....282, **521**
544654 dated Dec. 23, 1991.....248

544655 dated June 13, 1991. ..... 25, 51
544656 dated June 19, 1991 ..... 375, 378
544658 dated Mar. 26, 1991 412
544659 dated July 3, 1991 ..... 414, 442
544661 dated June 28, 1991 413
544662 dated Mar. 18, 1994 ..... 25, 47, 232, 350
544666 dated Apr. 5, 1993. ..... 122, 188
544667 dated July 30, 1991 236
544668 dated July 15, 1991. 71
544669 dated Aug. 15, 1991. 63
544670 dated July 16, 1992 435
544676 dated July 24, 1991. 63
544681 dated July 29, 1991 276
544684 dated July 31, 1992 280
544685 dated July 30, 1991 ..... **521**
544686 dated Aug. 31, 1994 ..... 323, 324, 351
544689 dated Sep. 26, 1991 90
544690 dated Aug. 5, 1991 248
544693 dated Sep. 10, 1991 239
544694 dated Feb. 14, 1995 ..... 178, 272
544707 dated July 16, 1991 185
544708 dated Feb. 13, 1992 ..... 232, 234, **489**
544711 dated Dec. 23, 1994 445
544713 dated Dec. 2, 1992 ..... 342, 351
544714 dated Mar. 3, 1992 445
544722 dated June 4, 1991 ..... 173, 174, 266
544726 dated Nov. 3, 1992 ..... **490**
544727 dated Dec. 4, 1991 379
544736 dated Aug. 26, 1992. 106
544739 dated Jan. 21, 1992. 125
544742 dated June 6, 1995 382
544746 dated Nov. 12, 1991 296
544754 dated Oct. 24, 1991 125
544758 dated Feb. 21, 1992 ..... 25, 46, 47, 249, 280
544759 dated Dec. 13, 1991 322
544762 dated Jan. 17, 1992 ..... 147, 261
544764 dated Jan. 6, 1994 250
544772 dated Oct. 8, 1992 436
544773 dated Apr. 3, 1992 212
544775 dated Apr. 3, 1992 413
544781 dated Mar. 4, 1994 ..... 80, 380
544784 dated Aug. 10, 1992. 139
544787 dated Feb. 20, 1992 248
544791 dated Mar. 11, 1992. 162
544793 dated Feb. 16, 1995 ..... 414, 442
544794 dated July 17, 1992. 63
544800 dated May 17, 1994 380
544806 dated Aug. 10, 1992 ..... 132, 140
544809 dated June 1, 1994 322
544812 dated Mar. 3, 1994 ..... 185, 276, 342
544815 dated May 8, 1997 ..... 42, 320, 365
544818 dated Apr. 1, 1993 180
544820 dated Oct. 18, 1991 ..... 241, 248, 310
544824 dated May 4, 1993 ..... **557**
544835 dated June 15, 1994 444
544840 dated Sep. 29, 1994 185
544841 dated Jan. 17, 1992 ..... 147, 261
544843 dated Oct. 31, 1994 ..... 27, 80
544844 dated Oct. 15, 1992. 51
544845 dated Nov. 9, 1993 ..... **543**
544847 dated Sep. 3, 1993 213
544852 dated Sep. 30, 1994 413
544856 dated Dec. 13, 1991 ..... 112, 299, 309
544857 dated Dec. 13, 1991 ..... 50, 56
544858 dated Dec. 13, 1991 ..... 18, 29, 191
544859 dated Dec. 13, 1991 303
544863 dated Sep. 29, 1994. 107
544866 dated Sep. 29, 1993 301
544867 dated Dec. 15, 1993 ..... 48, 310
544874 dated Oct. 22, 1993. 47
544875 dated Mar. 2, 1992 ..... **516**
544876 dated Sep. 3, 1993. 47
544879 dated Apr. 3, 1992 ..... 147, 261
544881 dated Mar. 8, 1993 ..... **516**
544884 dated Apr. 15, 1992 249
544887 dated Oct. 2, 1992 69
544895 dated July 22, 1992. 63
544907 dated Apr. 13, 1992 ..... **475**
544911 dated Apr. 6, 1993 ..... 212, 282, **521**
544923 dated Feb. 22, 1994 379
544933 dated July 30, 1992. 63
544940 dated May 13, 1992. 125
544944 dated May 26, 1992 308
544945 dated June 30, 1995. 82
544949 dated Mar. 17, 1993 ..... 413, 442, **475**
544950 dated May 28, 1992 379
544957 dated Apr. 7, 1995 414
544965 dated Feb. 22, 1994. 79
544970 dated Oct. 20, 1993 209
544971 dated Oct. 20, 1993 250
544972 dated Oct. 20, 1993. 48
544973 dated Jan. 11, 1993 ..... 147, 428
544976 dated Mar. 17, 1993. ..... 27, 68
544978 dated Apr. 27, 1995 ..... 381, 392
544982 dated Aug. 23, 1995 385
544986 dated Mar. 21, 1994. 153
544987 dated July 18, 1994 277
544991 dated Sep. 13, 1995 386
544993 dated Oct. 9, 1992 231
545012 dated Oct. 13, 1992. 71
545013 dated Oct. 8, 1992 261
545017 dated Aug. 19, 1994 ..... **536**, **545**, **549**, **550**, **552**, **553**, **554**, **558**
545031 dated June 30, 1993. 19
545032 dated Dec. 14, 1993 276
545035 dated Aug. 23, 1995 385
545036 dated Dec. 14, 1993. 64
545038 dated Feb. 17, 1993. 71
545061 dated Nov. 4, 1992 249
545063 dated Sep. 8, 1992 ..... **490**
545069 dated Dec. 23, 1993 ..... **543**, **552**, **557**
545071 dated June 28, 1995 383
545075 dated Dec. 23, 1992 ..... 64, **531**
545086 dated Apr. 1, 1993. 57
545087 dated Dec. 7, 1993 349
545088 dated Feb. 14, 1995 107
545094 dated Apr. 1, 1993 209
545096 dated May 31, 1994 ..... **522**
545100 dated Mar. 2, 1993. 72
545105 dated Nov. 9, 1993 ..... 413, **475**
545110 dated Mar. 11, 1994 250
545112 dated June 7, 1993 ..... 217, **543**
545114 dated Sep. 30, 1993 379
545117 dated Oct. 30, 1992. 44

545121 dated Jan. 31, 1994.....312, **522**
545128 dated Sep. 9, 1993 .....**517**
545129 dated Mar. 6, 1995.....81, 446
545135 dated Aug. 27, 1993......25
545136 dated Apr. 28, 1995.....414
545137 dated May 21, 1993.....429
545138 dated Oct. 19, 1993.....**557**
545140 dated Aug. 24, 1993......72
545141 dated Apr. 15, 1994.....**545**
545144 dated Jan. 19, 1994.....443
545147 dated Nov. 4, 1994 .....52, 251
545150 dated Feb. 24, 1994 380
545153 dated Dec. 21, 1993 250
545154 dated June 3, 1994.....232, 234, **489**
545161 dated Apr. 7, 1994......106
545170 dated Oct. 27, 1994......41, 49
545172 dated May 6, 1993 .....48, **497**
545173 dated Sep. 19, 1994 .....**522**
545174 dated Sep. 7, 1994. 77
545175 dated Jan. 4, 1995......91
545176 dated June 28, 1993 64
545177 dated June 28, 1993 64
545187 dated Feb. 14, 1995. 133
545192 dated Jan. 4, 1995......148
545194 dated Sep. 13, 1995 .....273, 386, 391, 394
545199 dated Dec. 22, 1994. 99
545201 dated Jan. 27, 1995.....**514**
545223 dated Sep. 3, 1993 .....**516**
545224 dated Sep. 19, 1994 .....169, 172, 236
545231 dated Nov. 5, 1993. 148
545239 dated June 30, 1993 .....212, 249
545253 dated Aug. 10, 1994.....80
545254 dated Nov. 22, 1994 445
545255 dated Aug. 10, 1994.....80
545256 dated Jan. 10, 1995......34
545257 dated July 6, 1994.....283, **522**
545262 dated Mar. 11, 1994 443
545264 dated Aug. 12, 1994.....250
545265 dated Mar. 4, 1994.....443
545266 dated June 30, 1993. .....27, 68
545271 dated Mar. 4, 1994.....443
545272 dated Aug. 17, 1995.....351, 448
545274 dated Mar. 9, 1995.....342, 351
545277 dated June 14, 1993. 207
545278 dated Apr. 7, 1994.....254
545279 dated Nov. 30, 1994......27, 33
545289 dated Sep. 29, 1994 308
545296 dated Aug. 16, 1993......72
545297 dated May 31, 1994.....55
545304 dated Jan. 4, 1994......174
545307 dated Feb. 3, 1995.....291, 381
545308 dated Jan. 19, 1995.....**504**
545312 dated Mar. 18, 1994 381
545313 dated Jan. 31, 1995.....**543**
545320 dated Feb. 28, 1995 252
545321 dated June 30, 1995 383
545331 dated Jan. 19, 1996.....388
545336 dated Nov. 23, 1994......52
545341 dated Aug. 3, 1994......33
545349 dated Mar. 24, 1995 .....252, **514**
545360 dated May 31, 1994.....444
545361 dated July 20, 1995.....292, 384
545362 dated May 31, 1994. 69
545368 dated July 6, 1995 448
545369 dated July 25, 1994 ..... 322, 351
545370 dated Mar. 4, 1994 380
545376 dated July 29, 1994 ..... **475**
545377 dated Nov. 10, 1994..... 445
545379 dated July 7, 1995 383
545380 dated Mar. 30, 1995 381
545381 dated May 4, 1998..... 392
545384 dated Nov. 23, 1993. 106
545387 dated Feb. 27, 1995...... 72
545388 dated Oct. 21, 1994 ..... 185, 308
545395 dated Sep. 30, 1993..... **557**
545405 dated Feb. 1, 1994...... 109
545416 dated Dec. 10, 1993..... 213
545417 dated May 27, 1994. ..... 47, 175
545418 dated June 30, 1995..... 383
545419 dated Nov. 30, 1995..... 292, 387
545420 dated May 31, 1995. 82
545421 dated Aug. 3, 1994. 64
545422 dated Mar. 13, 1995..... 81, **514**
545423 dated Mar. 17, 1994...... 80
545434 dated May 31, 1994 444
545447 dated May 12, 1994 444
545456 dated Oct. 21, 1994 251
545462 dated Aug. 9, 1994. 30
545465 dated Apr. 6, 1994. 69
545466 dated June 29, 1994..... 80
545474 dated Aug. 25, 1995 449
545477 dated Nov. 22, 1994. 113
545481 dated Sep. 14, 1994..... 139, 319
545486 dated July 14, 1995 384
545490 dated Aug. 31, 1994 251
545494 dated Dec. 9, 1994..... **523**
545499 dated Oct. 13, 1994 445
545500 dated Mar. 24, 1995..... 252
545504 dated May 4, 1995..... 291
545505 dated Aug. 9, 1994 277
545506 dated Nov. 30, 1995..... 351, 416
545508 dated Jan. 20, 1995 446
545510 dated Jan. 7, 1994 310
545518 dated Aug. 17, 1995 415
545519 dated June 30, 1994..... 70, 78
545522 dated Apr. 26, 1995 414
545526 dated Nov. 30, 1995..... 365
545528 dated Aug. 3, 1995 384
545532 dated Sep. 14, 1994..... 185, 283, 310
545534 dated May 15, 1995. 148
545536 dated Sep. 21, 1995..... 364, 386
545542 dated Dec. 9, 1994..... 413
545550 dated Sep. 13, 1995..... 83, 262
545554 dated June 30, 1994..... **529**
545560 dated Oct. 14, 1994 445
545564 dated Aug. 8, 1995. 71
545570 dated Apr. 21, 1994...... 55
545571 dated Apr. 28, 1995 414
545574 dated Oct. 12, 1994. 125
545577 dated Jan. 4, 1995 107
545578 dated Sep. 13, 1994...... 175
545579 dated Sep. 14, 1994..... **522**
545590 dated Nov. 20, 1994..... **523**
545592 dated Sep. 15, 1994..... **517**

545595 dated Apr. 26, 1995....446
545601 dated Oct. 13, 1994.....80
545603 dated Mar. 10, 1995....446
545604 dated Mar. 10, 1995....446
545606 dated Nov. 30, 1994.....205
545609 dated Aug. 11, 1995.....188
545611 dated Jan. 2, 2001....102, 236, **539**
545611 dated Jan. 2, 2001.....108
545612 dated May 25, 1995....382, 447
545613 dated May 31, 1994.....153
545618 dated Aug. 23, 1996.....185
545621 dated Sep. 19, 1994....320
545622 dated Apr. 28, 1994....185, 276, 342
545624 dated Oct. 25, 1994.....80
545625 dated Nov. 4, 1994....**523**
545626 dated Feb. 28, 1996.....34
545627 dated Sep. 13, 1995....83, 449
545628 dated July 29, 1994....213, 283
545635 dated Nov. 29, 1994....222
545638 dated Feb. 13, 1995....323, **504**
545645 dated Apr. 11, 1995....446
545648 dated Aug. 31, 1994....444
545657 dated May 5, 1995....447
545658 dated Feb. 3, 1995.....148
545659 dated Oct. 25, 1995.....164
545660 dated Feb. 10, 1995.....81
545661 dated Mar. 3, 1995.....81
545662 dated Feb. 20, 1998....293
545663 dated July 14, 1995....252
545669 dated Nov. 17, 1994....323
545675 dated Apr. 28, 1995....223
545676 dated Jan. 20, 1995....218
545677 dated June 30, 1995....222, 224
545679 dated June 23, 1995.....100
545680 dated July 31, 1995....224
545690 dated May 31, 1996....**533**, **542**
545693 dated Sep. 29, 1994....222
545705 dated Jan. 27, 1995....414
545708 dated May 25, 1995.....82
545709 dated May 12, 1995....447
545710 dated Oct. 30, 1998....393
545714 dated Nov. 9, 1994....445
545715 dated Nov. 8, 1994.....81
545716 dated Jan. 31, 1995....278
545721 dated Feb. 27, 1995.....179
545724 dated Nov. 30, 1994....251
545728 dated Nov. 30, 1995....387
545731 dated Feb. 3, 1995....240
545735 dated Jan. 31, 1995....**552**
545737 dated Aug. 11, 1994....287
545744 dated Jan. 19, 1995.....81
545752 dated Apr. 1, 1996....389
545753 dated Mar. 8, 1996....49, 253, 353
545755 dated May 18, 1995....**505**
545759 dated Aug. 11, 1995.....83
545761 dated Nov. 15, 1994....219
545777 dated Sep. 1, 1995....386
545778 dated Sep. 1, 1995....386
545784 dated June 6, 1995....382
545789 dated Apr. 19, 1995....**530**
545800 dated June 28, 1996.....324
545804 dated Feb. 27, 1996....450
545813 dated Sep. 11, 1996....323, 324
545815 dated Apr. 28, 1995....446
545817 dated Oct. 25, 1995....416, 419
545818 dated June 29, 1995.....205
545824 dated Aug. 28, 1995....292, 386
545840 dated Aug. 11, 1995....**543**
545841 dated June 13, 1996....390
545843 dated May 11, 1995....240, 252
545844 dated Dec. 22, 1995....388
545846 dated Dec. 9, 1994.....77
545848 dated Sep. 1, 1995....272
545851 dated May 8, 1995.....27, 68, 82
545861 dated May 26, 1995....**553**
545865 dated Aug. 25, 1995....415
545869 dated Mar. 31, 1995....287
545877 dated Mar. 23, 1995....232
545878 dated July 31, 1996....324, 451
545890 dated May 22, 1995....223
545891 dated June 23, 1995....222
545895 dated June 9, 1995....382
545898 dated June 12, 1995....447
545902 dated June 18, 1997....454
545903 dated Apr. 30, 1998....392
545907 dated Oct. 11, 1996....254
545908 dated Nov. 30, 1995....25, 45, 46, 47, 56
545909 dated Nov. 30, 1995....350
545917 dated Aug. 1, 1996....232
545920 dated July 25, 1996....450
545927 dated Jan. 30, 1996....300
545929 dated Jan. 30, 1998....342
545930 dated June 28, 1995....383
545938 dated June 5, 1996.....83
545948 dated Dec. 5, 1997....456
545949 dated Aug. 24, 1995....**553**
545951 dated Feb. 12, 1998....391
545953 dated Aug. 3, 1995.....107
545958 dated Apr. 12, 1996....**475**
545959 dated Apr. 22, 1996.....148
545960 dated Aug. 16, 1995....323
545963 dated May 25, 1995....221
545967 dated July 7, 1995....448
545970 dated Aug. 30, 1995....47, 236
545974 dated May 4, 1995....223
545979 dated Aug. 24, 1995....448
545980 dated Dec. 12, 1995....416
545984 dated May 16, 1995....205
545985 dated Dec. 19, 1996....453, 456
545987 dated Aug. 28, 1995.....34
545988 dated May 18, 1995.....82
545995 dated Oct. 12, 1995....251
545998 dated Nov. 13, 1996....254, 390
545999 dated Dec. 12, 1995....**508**
546000 dated Sep. 6, 1996....253
546007 dated Sep. 21, 1995....273
546009 dated Dec. 4, 1995....218
546012 dated May 6, 1996....240
546015 dated Dec. 13, 1996....254, 418, 452, **476**
546017 dated Aug. 11, 1995....414
546020 dated Apr. 17, 1996....217, **533**, **548**
546029 dated Dec. 12, 1995....**523**
546030 dated June 13, 1995....205
546031 dated Oct. 12, 1995....415

546033 dated Mar. 14, 1996 ..... 388, 391
546034 dated May 6, 1997 ..... 292, 390
546035 dated July 11, 1996. 83
546037 dated Jan. 31, 1996 ..... 162, 174, **475**, **523**
546038 dated July 19, 1996 365
546043 dated Nov. 30, 1995 ..... 169, 172, 236
546053 dated Nov. 7, 1995 ..... **553**
546054 dated Oct. 23, 1996. 35
546055 dated July 14, 1995 222
546056 dated Mar. 22, 1996 ..... 207, 208, 253
546057 dated Mar. 14, 1996 ..... **508**
546067 dated Oct. 31, 1996 417
546069 dated Aug. 1, 1996 451
546070 dated Apr. 25, 1996 209
546072 dated May 21, 1998 ..... 326, 392
546077 dated Aug. 22, 1995 213
546078 dated Jan. 30, 1996 253
546079 dated Nov. 22, 1995 224
546087 dated May 21, 1998 419
546089 dated Jan. 17, 1997 453
546091 dated Jan. 3, 1996 449
546092 dated Sep. 16, 1996 ..... **534**, **549**
546097 dated Mar. 7, 1996 283
546098 dated Sep. 18, 1996 451
546102 dated Dec. 22, 1995. 52
546110 dated Mar. 2, 1999 419
546111 dated Mar. 1, 1996 ..... 174, **514**
546112 dated July 5, 1996 ..... **539**
546120 dated Mar. 26, 1996. 133
546122 dated Jan. 11, 1996 ..... **558**
546128 dated July 26, 1996 451
546132 dated Apr. 10, 1996 ..... 167, 200, 253
546135 dated Nov. 25, 1996. 84
546141 dated Apr. 16, 1996 313
546142 dated Nov. 29, 1996 418
546143 dated Feb. 23, 1996 450
546146 dated May 10, 1996 389
546149 dated May 29, 1996 ..... **533**, **543**
546150 dated July 11, 1996. 149
546151 dated Dec. 6, 1995 ..... **508**
546156 dated Jan. 10, 1997. 101
546158 dated June 13, 1996 225
546159 dated July 18, 1997 390
546161 dated May 7, 1996 ..... 277, **505**
546166 dated Apr. 5, 1996 353
546190 dated July 31, 1996 180
546191 dated Apr. 12, 1999. 175
546192 dated Feb. 23, 1996 417
546206 dated Apr. 11, 1996 450
546207 dated Dec. 20, 1996 255
546211 dated June 10, 1996 324
546217 dated Apr. 8, 1998 ..... **503**
546225 dated Apr. 14, 1997 454
546226 dated Mar. 25, 1996 ..... **515**
546229 dated May 31, 1996 ..... 292, 389
546231 dated Feb. 10, 1997 ..... 186, 188, 277, 325
546233 dated Nov. 25, 1996 ..... 417, 452
546253 dated July 9, 1997 454
546260 dated June 6, 1997 ..... 454, 461
546262 dated Nov. 29, 1997. ..... 85, 206
546267 dated Dec. 4, 1998 ..... 71, 458
546273 dated July 25, 1996 ..... **514**
546284 dated July 14, 1997. 84
546285 dated June 7, 1996 324
546287 dated Apr. 25, 1996 237
546288 dated July 11, 1996 450
546305 dated Apr. 29, 1996 219
546311 dated Sep. 19, 1996 ..... 149, 283
546312 dated Jan. 17, 1997. 136
546316 dated May 29 417
546319 dated Apr. 18, 1997 351
546325 dated Oct. 4, 1999. 65
546341 dated Nov. 12, 1996. 84
546343 dated May 22, 1996 300
546349 dated Aug. 23, 1996 209
546353 dated Dec. 15, 1998 458
546354 dated July 19, 1996. 149
546357 dated Aug. 26, 1997 455
546363 dated July 15, 1997 ..... **524**
546364 dated Dec. 19, 1996 ..... 200, 254
546367 dated Dec. 1, 1999 ..... 366, 395
546370 dated Mar. 28, 2000. 65
546373 dated May 21, 1996 225
546377 dated Nov. 12, 1996 ..... 417, 452
546396 dated Nov. 29, 1996. 208
546399 dated Mar. 20, 1997 ..... 207, 208
546401 dated May 21, 1998 392
546409 dated July 9, 1997 ..... 303, 455
546421 dated Mar. 27, 1998. 185
546422 dated May 7, 1997 ..... **524**
546424 dated Feb. 2, 1999 ..... 419, 458
546427 dated Dec. 19, 1996 453
546429 dated Feb. 5, 1998 ..... 418, 457
546430 dated Jan. 6, 1997 ..... 325, **553**
546433 dated Jan. 9, 1998 ..... 388, 391
546437 dated Feb. 21, 1997 225
546439 dated Sep. 30, 1996 253
546442 dated Mar. 23, 1999 ..... 137, **543**
546449 dated Jan. 6, 1998 325
546450 dated July 3, 1997 454
546461 dated Dec. 21, 1998 302
546464 dated Apr. 3, 1997 453
546471 dated Sep. 28, 2001 ..... 36, 353
546479 dated Oct. 29, 1996 232
546511 dated Apr. 15, 1999 ..... 35, 36
546513 dated Feb. 11, 1998 ..... 273, 386, 391, 394
546515 dated July 7, 1999 220
546518 dated Feb. 9, 1998 457
546520 dated Aug. 11, 1997. 85
546523 dated Aug. 11, 1997. 125
546534 dated Aug. 21, 1998 226
546535 dated Dec. 19, 1997 456
546536 dated Aug. 29, 1997 ..... **505**
546539 dated Oct. 30, 1996 ..... 77, 84
546541 dated May 1, 1998 419
546543 dated Aug. 6, 1997. 85
546552 dated Jan. 13, 1998 ..... 325, 418
546553 dated Mar. 31, 1997 418
546561 dated Mar. 16, 1998 ..... 325, 457
546565 dated Sep. 11, 1997 390
546583 dated Dec. 2, 1997 320
546584 dated Sep. 10, 1997 255
546586 dated June 23, 1999 459
546602 dated Jan. 29, 1997. ..... 116, 137

546604 dated Aug. 8, 1997. 77
546607 dated Aug. 17, 1999 ..... 73, 420, 460
546612 dated Jan. 10, 1997 220
546626 dated Nov. 9, 2001 ..... 261, 396
546629 dated Apr. 2, 1998. 419
546638 dated Oct. 4, 1999 ..... 255, 365
546640 dated Nov. 7, 1997 418
546658 dated Jan. 30, 1998 456
546660 dated June 23, 1999 393
546661 dated Oct. 7, 1998. 149
546673 dated Mar. 17, 1998 ..... 107, 440
546674 dated Apr. 16, 1998 225
546675 dated June 23, 1999 394
546679 dated Aug. 11, 1997. 42
546681 dated July 31, 1998 458
546683 dated Aug. 13, 1997 303
546690 dated June 18, 1997 233
546691 dated Sep. 8, 1997 ..... 77, 456
546697 dated Aug. 26, 1999 ..... 240, 241, 255, 282
546701 dated Dec. 2, 1999 302
546709 dated Dec. 1, 1997 77
546720 dated July 21, 1999. 35
546727 dated Nov. 25, 1997. 85
546735 dated June 19, 1997 101
546735 dated June 24, 1997 101
546736 dated Mar. 31, 1998. 186
546744 dated Feb. 24, 1998. 85
546750 dated Aug. 6, 1997 455
546760 dated Mar. 2, 1999 459
546761 dated Sep. 23, 1999. ..... 150, 153
546771 dated Mar. 27, 1998. 20
546782 dated Dec. 2, 1999 ..... 35, 395
546787 dated Jan. 11, 1999 ..... 293, 393
546798 dated July 31, 1998 266
546801 dated Nov. 5, 1998. 107
546803 dated Feb. 25, 1998 ..... **517**
546804 dated May 4, 1999 302
546810 dated July 16, 1999 460
546813 dated July 23, 1998. 458
546820 dated Sep. 28, 2002 ..... **467**
546821 dated July 15, 1998 458
546824 dated Nov. 4, 1998 ..... **558**
546825 dated Feb. 20, 1998 457
546834 dated Dec. 16, 1998 226
546835 dated Jan. 11, 1999 255
546838 dated Apr. 9, 1999 219
546858 dated June 2, 2000 ..... 461, **476**
546865 dated Aug. 6, 1999 326
546868 dated Aug. 19, 1998 ..... **524**
546871 dated Feb. 17, 1999 ..... 301, 459
546873 dated Mar. 24, 1999 ..... 326, 459
546874 dated Aug. 17, 1999. 73
546875 dated Apr. 2, 1999 459
546882 dated Apr. 9, 1999. ..... 108, 124
546887 dated June 23, 1999 460
546898 dated July 27, 2000 461
546934 dated Jan. 27, 1999. 72
546941 dated Aug. 11, 1999 ..... **534**, **549**
546946 dated Sep. 30, 1999 ..... 420, 461
546951 dated Oct. 22, 1999 ..... 366, 375, 394
546953 dated May 5, 1999 ..... 342, **544**
546957 dated Mar. 26, 2001 463
546966 dated Nov. 5, 1999 366
546979 dated Aug. 30, 2000 ..... 327, **493**
546981 dated Feb. 8, 1999. 73
546999 dated Apr. 12, 1999 ..... **503**
547006 dated Apr. 28, 1998 ..... 43, 276
547018 dated Sep. 10, 1999 ..... 25, 26, 57
547019 dated Mar. 31, 2000 ..... 274, 420
547020 dated Apr. 9, 1999 220
547026 dated July 31, 1998 ..... **524**
547027 dated Sep. 17, 1999 ..... 284, 311, 313
547033 dated June 25, 1998. 43
547035 dated Aug. 18, 1999 460
547037 dated July 12, 1999 ..... 175, **515**
547042 dated June 17, 1999 ..... 150, 355
547046 dated Aug. 18, 1999 461
547054 dated Aug. 6, 1999 ..... 64, 301, 460
547055 dated June 3, 1999 303
547056 dated Feb. 8, 1999 279
547058 dated May 19, 1998 86
547060 dated Mar. 8, 2000. 153
547061 dated Mar. 19, 1999 ..... **536**, **549**, **550**, **553**
547062 dated May 7, 1999. 149
547069 dated Nov. 16, 1998 ..... **525**
547070 dated Dec. 21, 1998. 28
547071 dated Nov. 1, 2001 463
547073 dated Mar. 8, 2000 219
547074 dated Sep. 17, 1999 ..... **517**, **525**
547087 dated July 30, 1998 ..... 70, 78
547088 dated Aug. 29, 2002 226
547094 dated June 3, 1999. 108
547098 dated Feb. 2, 1999 ..... 72, 264
547108 dated Mar. 28, 2000 ..... 255, 326, 353, **532**
547116 dated Mar. 22, 2001 462
547117 dated Aug. 31, 1998. 86
547127 dated Nov. 20, 1998 ..... 86, 87
547134 dated July 27, 1999 ..... 273, 386, 391, 394
547140 dated Sep. 21, 1998 302
547142 dated May 12, 1999 ..... 180, **536**, **543**, **550**
547144 dated Nov. 20, 1998. 164
547146 dated May 14, 1999 ..... **525**
547147 dated Mar. 23, 1999 ..... **536**, **545**, **549**, **550**, **552**, **553**, **554**, **558**
547148 dated Sep. 12, 2002 397
547155 dated Mar. 22, 2001 ..... 395, 420, 462, **493**, **494**, **496**
547158 dated Mar. 1, 2002 ..... **465**, 476
547168 dated Apr. 12, 1999 ..... 277, **490**
547175 dated Apr. 21, 2000 ..... 47, 256
547176 dated Oct. 23, 1998. 86
547178 dated Jan. 13, 1999 ..... 167, 283
547196 dated Jan. 28, 1999 ..... **492**, **517**
547197 dated Aug. 22, 2000 ..... 438, 462, **509**, **534**
547199 dated Aug. 18, 1999 220
547210 dated Mar. 25, 1999 ..... 167, 274
547225 dated Nov. 9, 2001 ..... 69, 476, **493**, **497**
547226 dated July 27, 1999 394
547231 dated Dec. 16, 2001 ..... 135, **493**
547239 dated Mar. 29, 1999 ..... 86, 87
547249 dated Sep. 7, 1999 420
547273 dated Apr. 22, 1999 ..... 283, 311, 313
547286 dated Mar. 8, 2000. 65
547302 dated Mar. 29, 1999 ..... **525**

547313 dated July 19, 1999......186
547314 dated Sep. 27, 2001. 137
547332 dated Jan. 22, 2002.....**464**
547349 dated May 5, 2000 461
547352 dated July 8, 1999.....237
547368 dated June 28, 2000 .....279, **558**
547372 dated Aug. 10, 2001.....226
547381 dated Mar. 14, 2000 .....**545**
547382 dated Feb. 14, 2002 .....**465**
547395 dated June 30, 2000 256
547416 dated June 2, 2000.....**536**, **545**, **550**, **554**
547417 dated Nov. 9, 2001 .....65, 69, **476**
547419 dated Oct. 31, 2001.....36
547421 dated May 8, 2002 .....**465**
547435 dated Oct. 30, 2001.....**496**
547436 dated Aug. 10, 2000.....461
547451 dated Oct. 22, 1999......35
547480 dated Oct. 31, 2001.....463
547487 dated June 23, 2000. 36
547489 dated Mar. 20, 2000 263
547493 dated Mar. 14, 2002. 188
547523 dated Mar. 28, 2001. 65
547531 dated May 5, 2000 303
547532 dated Nov. 2, 2001 366
547534 dated Jan. 19, 2001.....256, 267, 287
547540 dated Dec. 30, 1999 221
547546 dated Jan. 18, 2000......125
547548 dated Sep. 26, 2001. 102
547550 dated Dec. 30, 1999 221
547557 dated Feb. 13, 2001 395
547573 dated Apr. 21, 2000.....119, 440, **505**
547578 dated Jan. 18, 2000......36
547585 dated Sep. 28, 2001 256
547588 dated Jan. 18, 2002.....**464**, **491**
547591 dated Apr. 21, 2000.....119, 440, **505**
547594 dated June 27, 2000 .....420, **496**
547596 dated July 13, 2000.....**476**
547604 dated Apr. 10, 2001.....116, **491**, **544**
547607 dated Feb. 14, 2002 .....**465**
547608 dated Feb. 21, 2002 .....88, 256
547611 dated Mar. 22, 2001. 20
547612 dated Dec. 27, 2001 .....174, **492**
547623 dated Feb. 21, 2002 .....88, 257
547625 dated Nov. 2, 2001 .....463, **493**
547628 dated Apr. 21, 2000.....119, 440, **505**
547633 dated June 9, 2000. 126
547635 dated Nov. 7, 2001 .....280, 302, 463
547642, 547643, 547644 dated Feb. 13, 2002......87
547645 dated Feb. 13, 2002. .....37, 87
547652 dated Apr. 9, 2002......108
547654 dated Nov. 9, 2001 .....**491**, **493**
547662 dated Sep. 20, 2002 .... 257, 293, 320, 328, 367, 397
547668 dated July 31, 2002.....**466**
547672 dated May 21, 2002.....328
547677 dated June 30, 2000. 175
547686 dated May 31, 2000.....266
547696 dated May 18, 2001.....302
547697 dated Dec. 27, 2001 .....**464**
547710 dated Dec. 16, 2001 .....293, 366, **495**
547712 dated Aug. 1, 2002.....**466**
547714 dated Nov. 7, 2001 .....**518**
547729 dated Sep. 20, 2002..... 263, 328
547736 dated Sep. 29, 2002..... 227
547738 dated Nov. 13, 2001..... **505**
547761 dated Mar. 14, 2002..... 396
547790 dated Sep. 10, 2001..... 343
547798 dated Aug. 23, 2000 462
547806 dated Jan. 31, 2001 ..... 65, 327
547808 dated Dec. 19, 2001..... 36, 37
547825 dated July 16, 2001 ..... 256, **493**, **496**
547826 dated Jan. 22, 2002. 141
547842 dated May 7, 2002..... 214
547844 dated Feb. 15, 2001.....420, 433, 436, **496**, **497**
547850 dated Jan. 12, 2001 ..... **504**
547859 dated Nov. 26, 2001..... **464**
547877 dated Jan. 23, 2002 ..... **544**
547880 dated Aug. 21, 2002. 37
547881 dated Aug. 27, 2001 226
547901 dated Dec. 7, 2001..... **496**
547917 dated Nov. 2, 2001..... **492**, **497**
547924 dated Mar. 21, 2002..... 241
547926 dated Nov. 20, 2001..... **488**
547936 dated Aug. 3, 2001. ..... 181, 192
547946 dated Nov. 30, 2001..... **485**, **491**
547956 dated Mar. 22, 2002..... 222
547958 dated July 23, 2001 ..... 266, **495**
547968 dated May 7, 2002..... 367, 397
547978 dated Dec. 11, 2001..... **480**
547982 dated May 20, 2002 ..... 327, 351, 421
548002 dated June 13, 2002...... 74
548003 dated July 16, 2002 257
548014 dated Sep. 13, 2002..... 259, 262
548024 dated Mar. 5, 2002 ..... 327, 351
548055 dated Mar. 14, 2002..... 176, 396
548057 dated May 20, 2002 ..... **466**
548065 dated Sep. 6, 2002..... 353, **532**
548079 dated June 25, 2002..... **466**
548087 dated Apr. 5, 2002 327
548093 dated Apr. 26, 2002 ..... 150, 311
548095 dated Sep. 19, 2002..... 343
548096 dated June 4, 2002. ..... 102, 176
548097 dated Jan. 28, 2003 ..... 36, 37
548098 dated May 20, 2002 328
548111 dated Aug. 23, 2001 ..... **544**, **554**
548112 dated Sep. 23, 2002..... 367, 397, **467**
548128 dated July 15, 2002. 175
548135 dated July 30, 2002. 88
548137 dated Sep. 26, 2002...... 66
548148 dated Aug. 12, 2002 301
548149 dated Aug. 21, 2002. ..... 103, 108
548161 dated Aug. 21, 2002 ..... 175, 267
548163 & 548188 dated Aug. 29, 2002. 88
548164 dated Sep. 20, 2002..... **539**
548165 dated Mar. 21, 2003..... 102, 137, 421
548167 dated Aug. 14, 2002 ..... **554**
548173 dated Dec. 6, 2002..... 421, **477**
548184 dated Nov. 5, 2002..... 150, 311
548190 dated Nov. 25, 2002..... **485**
548196 dated Dec. 13, 2002..... 257
548198 dated Dec. 26, 2002..... **467**
548206 dated Nov. 15, 2002. 73
548211 dated July 2, 2003 ..... 356, **533**, **542**
548222 dated Feb. 27, 2003...... 66

548233 dated Nov. 7, 2003 329
548234 dated Jan. 15, 2003 ..... **558**
548236 dated Mar. 27, 2003 ..... 137, **467**, **546**
548239 dated June 5, 2003 ..... 343, 421
548242 dated Feb. 19, 2003. 20
548247 dated Mar. 10, 2003 ..... **509**, **545**, **551**
548257 dated Mar. 19, 2003 233
548258 dated Oct. 9, 2003. 73
548273 dated Apr. 17, 2003 421
548276 dated Apr. 29, 2003 ..... 109, 258, 546
548284 dated Mar. 22, 2004. 100
548286 dated Mar. 17, 2003 ..... 41, 235
548291 dated May 28, 2003 343
548298 dated July 25, 2003 ..... 258, 264, 273, 280
548305 dated Aug. 11, 2003 .... 257, 293, 320, 328, 367, 397
548306 dated July 9, 2003 258
548316 dated July 16, 2003 ..... 20, 44, 45, 206
548331 dated Oct. 31, 2003 258
548332 dated Oct. 31, 2003. 208
548356 dated May 19, 2004. 66
548364 dated Oct. 2, 2003 ..... 221, 227
548367 dated Oct. 22, 2003. 176
548368 dated Dec. 24, 2003 ..... 37, 42, 398
548371 dated Nov. 19, 2003 ..... 438, 462, **509**, **534**
548373 dated Nov. 24, 2003 ..... 259, 397
548375 dated Oct. 30, 2003 258
548380 dated Oct. 23, 2003 ..... 421, **467**
548386 dated Nov. 26, 2003 ..... 259, 314, 353
548387 dated Feb. 24, 2004 ..... **480**
548390 dated Jan. 12, 2004. 150
548391 dated Feb. 6, 2004. 135
548420 dated Jan. 13, 2004 ..... 42, 265, 367, 429, **468**
548432 dated May 20, 2004 ..... **525**
548460 dated Mar. 25, 2004. 66
548462 dated Jan. 19, 2005. 150
548464 dated May 25, 2004 259
548482 dated July 23, 2004 344
548489 dated Aug. 4, 2004 398
548490 dated Aug. 18, 2004 42
548494 dated Jan. 26, 2005 429
548503 dated June 3, 2004 351
548504 dated June 3, 2004 421
548507 dated Jan. 25, 2005. 151
548515 dated Sep. 28, 2004 ..... 73, **477**
548519 dated Sep. 20, 2004 ..... **525**
548520 dated July 30, 2004 ..... 421, **468**
548526 dated Jan. 5, 2005 429
548532 dated July 16, 2004. 38
548540 dated July 28, 2004 ..... 20, 23
548552 dated Aug. 19, 2004 398
548557 dated Oct. 20, 2004 ..... 22, 23, 53, 155
548559 dated July 7, 2004 265
548560 dated Sep. 3, 2004 259
548566 dated Oct. 19, 2004. 38
548568 dated Oct. 19, 2004. 57
548569 dated Oct. 20, 2004 26
548573 dated July 25, 2005 ..... 367, 370
548574 dated Mar. 17, 2005 ..... 116, **546**
548576 dated Oct. 27, 2004. 38
548609 dated Apr. 19, 2005 422
548626 dated Apr. 18, 2005 ..... 28, 42
548635 dated Apr. 7, 2005. 151
548644 dated Mar. 9, 2005 ..... **492**
548667 dated Oct. 5, 2005. ..... 28, 52
548688 dated Oct. 20, 2005 356
548690 dated Apr. 4, 2006 ..... 235, 281
548698 dated Oct. 4, 2005 ..... **547**
554998 dated Jan. 24, 1989 434
554999 dated Jan. 5, 1989 ... 29, 91, 198, 247, 272, 291, 321
555040 dated Oct. 24, 1989 434
555053 dated July 26, 1991 178
555312 dated June 26, 1989 434
563355 dated Jan. 18, 2006 440
563362 dated Dec. 11, 2005. 126
563369 dated Jan. 12, 2006. 38
563400 dated March 29, 2006 436
563407 dated Apr. 13, 2006 ..... **547**
563417 dated Apr. 19, 2006 398
563419 dated May 4, 2006. 164
563420 dated Apr. 14, 2006 422
563461 dated May 18, 2006 ..... **540**
563470 dated June 12, 2006 ..... **549**
563482 dated June 29, 2006 423
563483 dated Dec. 28, 2006. 138
563522 dated Sep. 11, 2006 ..... 274, 294
563551 dated Oct. 12, 2006 424
567376 dated Feb. 8, 1999 ..... 255, 393
956604 dated Sep. 26, 1994 222
H002823 dated July 22, 2009 431
H004683 dated Apr. 12, 2007 ..... **526**
H004684 dated Mar. 16, 2007 ..... 47, 263
H004991 dated Apr. 2, 2007 399
H005222 dated June 13, 2007 ..... **469**
H005402 dated April 11, 2007 440
H006576 dated Dec. 19, 2007 424
H006585 dated Apr. 12, 2007. 138
H007484 dated Apr. 19, 2007 356
H007667 dated May 25, 2007. 133
H008101 dated Oct. 9, 2012 ..... 347, 442
H008706 dated Jan. 12, 2010 345
H009113 dated Nov. 17, 2008 369
H009727 dated Feb. 5, 2008 424
H010504 dated Aug. 22, 2007 ..... **535**
H010509 dated June 19, 2007 303
H010949 dated July 31, 2007. 181
H010951 dated Sep. 21, 2007 109
H011276 dated February 4, 2008 ..... **547**
H012412 dated Oct. 16, 2007 39
H012659 dated Nov. 14, 2007 423
H014663 dated Feb. 13, 2008. 151
H014885 dated Sep. 18, 2008 430
H015414 dated Dec. 30, 2010 425
H015975 dated Sep. 13, 2007 21
H016585 dated Dec. 30, 2008 430
H016966 dated Dec. 17, 2007 424
H017621 dated Oct. 30, 2007 423
H017624 dated Sep. 28, 2007. 181
H017761 dated Sep. 27, 2007 344
H017956 dated Feb. 23, 2009 430
H018314 dated Mar. 18, 2013 ..... 308, 334
H019073 dated Nov. 2, 2007 ..... **551**
H019263 dated Nov. 8, 2010. 89

H019710 dated Dec. 18, 2009 ..... **541**
H019722 dated Mar. 21, 2008 441
H019749 dated July 22, 2008. 135
H020231 dated June 25, 2009. 70
H020270 dated July 3, 2008. 140
H021399 dated Apr. 29, 2011 116
H021424 dated Feb. 3, 2009. 162
H022287 dated Dec. 30, 2010 331
H023094 dated July 22, 2010 425
H023269 dated Oct. 27, 2010 432
H023812 dated Apr. 4, 2008 ..... **526**
H023813 dated Dec. 1, 2008. 189
H023814 dated June 2, 2008. 50
H024566 dated Oct. 15, 2008 368
H024857 dated Jan. 7, 2014 335
H024979 dated May 6, 2009 370
H024980 dated July 22, 2008 399
H025216 dated Aug. 16, 2010 294
H026063 dated Aug. 17, 2010 345
H028000 dated June 20, 2008 ..... **490**
H028002 dated Sep. 14, 2009 265
H029330 dated Jan. 2, 2009 430
H029658 dated Dec. 8, 2009 330
H029876 dated Mar. 25, 2011 400
H031244 dated Apr. 10, 2009 ..... 21, 23
H032883 dated Mar. 31, 2010 331
H033861 dated Dec. 12, 2008 260
H034062 dated Mar. 3, 2009 369
H036078 dated Dec. 18, 2009 431
H037375 dated Dec. 11, 2009 331
H038381 dated Nov. 17, 2014 ..... 45, 135, 494
H042055 dated Apr. 17, 2009 168
H042055 dated Apr. 17, 2009. 168
H043478 dated Mar. 23, 2009 430
H043842 dated Mar. 31, 2009. 70
H044163 dated Jan. 13, 2009. 21
H044166 dated Jan. 23, 2009. 152
H044417 dated Jan. 14, 2009. 23
H047284 dated June 22, 2009. 24
H048152 dated Apr. 30, 2009. 162
H048276 dated Mar. 27, 2009 234
H049855 dated Jun. 26, 2009 21
H050895 dated December 6, 2010 75
H051136 dated July 20, 2010 67
H053359 dated Jun. 24, 2009 354
H056445 dated July 24, 2009 ..... **481**
H057714 dated May 13, 2009 ..... 21, 23
H057716 dated Jun. 30, 2009. 163
H057735 dated July 15, 2009 24
H060455 dated Oct. 7, 2009 ..... **526**
H062635 dated Nov. 30, 2009 330
H064075 dated Mar. 25, 2011 371
H065015 dated Apr. 14, 2011 ..... 109, 345
H065024 dated July 28, 2011 346
H065028 dated Jan. 8, 2014 275
H067846 dated Mar. 15, 2010 432
H077419 dated Apr. 5, 2011 400
H078555 dated Dec. 18, 2009 370
H082455 dated Nov. 19, 2009 260
H082475 dated Mar. 2, 2010 260
H083958 dated Feb. 17, 2010 430
H083960 dated Sep. 10, 2010 ..... **541**
H085036 dated Dec. 18, 2009 ..... **540**
H086246 dated Mar. 2, 2010. 21
H086775 dated Mar. 12, 2010 ..... 181, 284
H086776 dated Oct. 25, 2011 ..... 68, 469
H088115 dated Apr. 19, 2010 21
H088815 dated Sep. 28, 2011 332
H089759 dated Dec. 23, 2011 ..... 372, 485
H090177 dated Nov. 26, 2010. 163
H090181 dated Apr. 7, 2010 138
H092448 dated May 4, 2010 438
H092560 dated Apr. 7, 2010 268
H092575 dated July 2, 2010 311
H095240 dated Sep. 12, 2014 439
H095412 dated Mar. 8, 2010. 93
H097035 dated Nov. 15, 2011 332
H097616 dated Nov. 21, 2011 470
H098419 dated Oct. 26, 2010. 75
H099255 dated Mar. 24, 2010 266
H100056 dated Nov. 15, 2010 399
H102516 dated Sep. 16, 2010 ..... **542**
H105275 dated Dec. 21, 2011 506
H105276 dated Aug. 17, 2012 441
H106603 dated July 25, 2011 332
H109699 dated July 19, 2010 67
H110615 dated July 2, 2010 311
H110855 dated Dec. 8, 2011 279
H116829 dated Sep. 28, 2010 ..... **481**
H119455 dated Feb. 16, 2011 554
H119857 dated Sep. 9, 2010 268
H119858 dated Sep. 9, 2010 269
H121800 dated Dec. 10, 2010 267
H125103 dated Dec. 28, 2010 481
H125115 dated Apr. 6, 2011 ..... 116, 548
H125118 dated Sep. 12, 2014 187
H125835 dated May 18, 2011 68
H127377 dated Mar. 31, 2011 371
H127536 dated Dec 28, 2010 ..... **547**
H128018 dated Apr. 6, 2011 371
H130303 dated June 22, 2014 151
H130310 dated Nov. 18, 2010 ..... **536**
H130311 dated Apr. 26, 2011 432
H131663 dated Apr. 14, 2011 116
H131675 dated May 19, 2011 526
H133039 dated Feb. 25, 2011 187
H133042 dated Dec. 20, 2010 124
H133044 dated Mar. 9, 2011 275
H134595 dated July 7, 2012 53
H135296 dated May 29, 2012 54
H137435 dated Jan. 5, 2012 ..... 39, 372
H137455 dated Feb. 16, 2012 279
H138203 dated Oct. 11, 2011 346
H144039 dated Apr. 19, 2011 269
H144042 dated Oct. 30, 2013 ..... 347, 548
H148196 dated Mar. 28, 2011 75
H148715 dated Nov. 16, 2011 269
H156115 dated Jan. 27, 2014 68
H157795 dated June 29, 2015 136
H160935 dated Feb. 11, 2015 ..... 337, 401
H161675 dated Jan. 27, 2012 400
H161677 dated July 11, 2013 ..... 334, 470
H165361 dated Nov. 1, 2011 117
H167112 dated Oct. 11, 2011 527

H167196 dated Jan. 20, 2012.....284
H167495 dated June 28, 2011.....549
H168397 dated Jul. 5, 2011.....400
H169975 dated Jan. 20, 2012.....347
H170395 dated June 15, 2011.....542
H172356 dated Jan. 9, 2012.....39, 373
H174030 dated Nov. 15, 2011.....372
H176775 dated Mar. 6, 2014.....335
H178135 dated Nov. 22, 2011.....270
H179139 dated Oct. 11, 2011.....270
H179141 dated Nov. 21, 2011.....270
H179142 dated Nov. 21, 2011.....270
H186055 dated Jan. 15, 2015.....311
H186056 dated Mar. 26, 2013.....373
H189076 dated June 26, 2013.....518
H189369 dated Feb. 22, 2012.....477
H190269 dated Feb. 20, 2014.....21
H194998 dated July 24, 2014.....494
H196897 dated Mar. 13, 2012.....202
H197899 dated Sep. 26, 2012.....165
H200463 dated July 23, 2013.....478, 515
H202435 dated May 22, 2012.....433
H204329 dated Aug. 18, 2014.....311, 335
H204776 dated Dec. 27, 2012.....427
H205579 dated Aug. 2, 2012.....39
H205797 dated June 7, 2012.....267
H206715 dated Jan. 29, 2015.....348
H206976 dated Aug. 17, 2012.....39
H208055 dated Oct. 12, 2012.....333, 426
H212283 dated June 19, 2014.....233, 236, 277
H213946 dated Oct. 12, 2012.....427
H215556 dated July 17, 2012.....165
H215658 dated June 11, 2012.....332
H218255 dated June 7, 2012.....165
H218258 dated July 24, 2014.....75, 471
H218759 dated July 9, 2012.....437
H218916 dated Apr. 29, 2014.....118, 354
H219346 dated June 18, 2014.....434, 491
H219515 dated Oct. 11, 2012.....354
H219516 dated July 30, 2012.....271
H219520 dated Apr. 1, 2014.....471
H221835 dated Aug. 13, 2012.....426
H223036 dated July 24, 2015.....136, 338
H224598 dated Dec. 30, 2014.....336
H225295 dated July 1, 2013.....478
H225296 dated July 27, 2012.....53
H229700 dated Jan. 30, 2013.....528
H229701 dated Sep. 19, 2012.....426
H229800 dated July 16, 2013.....549
H231836 dated Jun. 19, 2014.....22
H231895 dated September 4, 2012.....437
H232355 dated Nov. 20, 2012.....527
H233019 dated Nov. 14, 2013.....139, 427, 555
H233328 dated Apr, 1, 2015.....337
H233789 dated June 21, 2013.....117
H234540 dated Jan. 23, 2013.....103
H234735 dated June 23, 2014.....374
H235016 dated June 9, 2015.....552
H235527 dated Aug. 4, 2015.....339
H235529 dated May 8, 2014.....559
H235553 dated Dec. 23, 2014.....428, 434
H235776 dated Apr. 16, 2013.....271
H235895 dated Aug. 22, 2014.....5, 8, 39, 199
H236154 dated Apr. 8, 2015.....338
H236428 dated Sep. 8, 2014.....437
H236744 dated Dec. 12, 2013.....275, 334, 347
H236746 dated July 1, 2013.....374
H237182 dated Apr. 16, 2013.....518
H237458 dated July 11, 2013.....506
H238027 dated Feb. 19, 2015.....311, 340
H238990 dated Apr. 7, 2014.....340
H239496 dated Mar. 13, 2015.....261
H239671 dated June 7, 2013.....373
H240423 dated July 31, 2013.....347
H240424 dated July 31, 2014.....347
H240546 dated July 28, 2014.....166
H241090 dated Dec. 23, 2013.....470
H241893 dated June 26, 2014.....152, 165
H242509 dated Aug. 15, 2013.....103, 507, 544
H242894 dated Dec. 4, 2013.....375, 401, 492
H242984 dated Feb. 19, 2014.....193
H243327 dated Nov. 5, 2014.....428
H243689 dated Jan. 9, 2014.....135, 347
H246429 dated Jan. 7, 2014.....470
H246651 dated Feb. 5, 2014.....117, 482
H246654 dated Mar. 6, 2014.....470
H248853 dated Feb. 7, 2014.....24
H249096 dated Mar. 17, 2015.....233, 528
H249150 dated Jan. 28, 2014.....428
H249191 dated Feb. 3, 2014.....550
H251593 dated Sep. 22, 2014.....551
H251594 dated Sep. 22, 2014.....550
H251797 dated July 28, 2014.....471
H253493 dated Sep. 14, 2014.....24
H253767 dated Mar. 30, 2015.....40, 45
H254700 dated Nov. 25, 2015.....136, 341
H254798 dated Aug. 18, 2014.....433, 488, 548
H255028 dated Nov. 21, 2014.....472
H255442 dated Oct. 9, 2014.....22, 50
H255619 dated Jan. 16, 2015.....260, 278, 544
H256223 dated Aug. 20, 2014.....286
H256333 dated Mar. 3, 2015.....166, 348
H256363 dated Jan. 29, 2015.....309, 341
H256777 dated June 5, 2015.....154
H256778 dated Sep. 16, 2015.....101
H257520 dated Jan. 16, 2015.....428, 544
H258738 dated Feb. 20, 2015.....134, 141, 172, 528
H259476 dated Mar. 24, 2015.....472
H259584 dated July 7, 2015.....535
H259861 dated Jan. 28, 2015.....210
H260036 dated Feb. 24, 2015.....136, 342
H261216 dated Feb. 11, 2015.....237
H261556 dated June 25, 2015.....155, 200
H262685 dated Mar. 23, 2015.....295, 374
H264394 dated May 22, 2015.....22
H264679 dated July 10, 2015.....103
H264876 dated Sep. 17, 2015.....119
H264877 dated July 10, 2015.....174
H269186 dated Nov. 6, 2015.....134
W548314 dated May 16, 2012.....187, 311, 333
W548453 dated Mar. 8, 2005.....**480**, **546**
W548475 dated Mar. 25, 2004.....259
W548547 dated Mar. 7, 2006.....20, 44, 45, 206, 282
W548589 dated Nov. 23, 2005.....422

W548600 dated Feb. 5, 2009. 135
W548618 dated Nov. 23, 2005 ..... **534**
W548649 dated Sep. 5, 2006 368
W548670 dated Nov. 19, 2007 ..... **469**, **477**
W548679 dated Apr. 20, 2007 ..... **506**
W548683 dated Oct. 9, 2007 430
W548692 dated Mar. 2, 2007 368
W548697 dated June 13, 2006 ..... **540**
W563326 dated Nov. 3, 2006 330
W563354 dated Oct. 27, 2010 ..... 367, 370
W563382 dated May 25, 2006 398
W563404 dated Mar. 3, 2006 368
W563428 dated Apr. 11, 2007 410
W563462 dated Oct. 11, 2006 164
W563467 dated June 22, 2009 345
W563468 dated Mar. 24, 2008 425
W563469 dated Mar. 21, 2006 276
W563480 dated June 9, 2006 285
W563485 dated Sep. 10, 2007 ..... 344, **491**
W563503 dated May 26, 2006 ..... 273, 294
W563531 dated Oct. 27, 2006 259
W563534 dated May 6, 2009 209
W563543 dated Nov. 17, 2006 52
W563545 dated Jan. 9, 2007 ..... **468**
W563557 dated Dec. 26, 2006 356
W563562 dated Nov. 20, 2008 369
W563598 dated Dec. 6, 2006 ..... **530**
W563602 dated Sep. 4, 2007 ..... **469**
W563605 dated Nov. 19, 2009 431
W563614 dated Mar. 5, 2007 423
W563617 dated Sep. 14, 2007 ..... 89, **518**

Cases

All Channel Products v. United States 492
Allied International v. United States. 303
Aris Isotoner Gloves, Inc. v. United States.....18
Brosterhous, Coleman & Co. A/C Lurgi Chemie Und Huttentechnik GmbH v. United States. 390
Campbell Soup Co., Inc. v. United States. 101
Caterpillar Inc. v. United States.....246
Century Importers, Inc. v. United States 168, 169, 304
Chrysler Corporation v. United States.....18, 246
Cutter & Buck, Inc. v. United States……..512
E.C. McAfee Co., et. al. v. United States, et. al.....389
Esprit de Corp v. United States. 303
Fabil Mfg. Co. v. United States.....142, 143
Figure Flattery, Inc. v. United States.....132
Four Seasons Produce v. United States 482
Generra Sportswear Company v. United States 245, 296
Goodman Manufacturing, L.P. v. United States. 174, 175
Heng Ngai Jewelry v. United States.....395
Jay-Arr Slimwear Inc. v. United States.....62
La Perla Fashions, Inc. v. United States 318, 394
Luigi Bormioli Corp., Inc. v. United States.....200
Merck, Sharp & Dohme Intl. v. United States.....19
Monarch Luggage Co., Inc. v. United States.....64
Moss Manufacturing Co., Inc. v. United States 64, 245
Murjani International Ltd. v. United States. 297
Nissho Iwai American Corporation v. United States.....392
Orbisphere Corporation v. United States 391
Pier I Imports, Inc. v. United States.....63
Rosenthal-Netter, Inc. v. United States 61
Saab Cars USA, Inc. v. United States.....144
Salant Corp. v. United States.....19
Samsung Electronics America, Inc. v. United States 141, 142, 238
Skaraborg Invest USA v. United States 468
Skechers U.S.A., Inc. v. United States.....200
Synergy Sport International, Ltd. v. United States.....392
Texas Apparel Co. v. United States 18
Tikal Distrib. Corp. v. United States, ...247
United States v. Hitachi America.....393
United States v. Menard, Inc. 141
Victor Woollen Products of America, Inc. v. United States.....3793, 394, 455
Volkswagen of America, Inc. v. United States.....143, 145, 146

Treasury Decisions

T.D. 81-282 dated Oct. 16, 1981 157
T.D. 81-7, dated Jan. 12, 1981 510
T.D. 84-235, dated Nov. 29, 1984 ..... 511, 515k
T.D. 85-111, dated July 17, 1985 204
T.D. 85-124, dated Aug. 7, 1985 484
T.D. 86-56 dated Feb. 20, 1986 211
T.D. 91-15 dated Mar. 29, 1991 ..... 503, 508
T.D. 96-87 dated Jan. 2, 1997 409

Notices

Actual Freight and Insurance Deductions, Vol. 31, No. 8 Cust. B. & Dec. (February 19, 1997).....513
Countertrade Transactions, Customs Bulletin and Decisions, Vol. 24, No. 22, May 30, 1990 121
Countertrade Transactions, Customs Bulletin and Decisions, Vol. 25, No. 6, February 6, 1991.....121
Determining Transaction Value in Multi-Tiered Transactions, T.D. 96-87 , Vol. 30/31, No. 52/1 Cust. B. & Dec. (January 2, 1997) 409
Dutiability of Royalty Payments, Vol. 27, No. 6, Cust. B. & Dec., February 10, 1993.....363
Limitation of E.C. McAfee, et. al. vs. United States, et. al, Customs B. & Dec., Vol. 22, No. 18, May 4, 1988.....404
Notice to Require Submission of Royalty and Purchase/Supply Agreements in Ruling Requests Regarding Dutiability of Royalty or License Fees, Vol. 29, No. 36 Cust. B. & Dec., September 6, 1995.....364
Tie-in Sale Transactions, Customs Bulletin & Decisions, Vol. 30, No. 23, June 5, 1996.....111
Transfer Pricing; Related Party Transactions, Vol. 27, No. 4, Cust. B & Dec., January 27, 1993 319