## RE: RWC Group summary for licensing meeting (b)(6)"Blackborow, Davin" From: (b)(6)To: (b)(6)Cc Date: Thu, 15 Oct 2015 18:29:43 -0400 Looks good - thank you! From: (b)(6) Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2015 5:11 PM To: Blackborow, Davin; (b)(6) Cc: (b)(6) Subject: RE: RWC Group summary for licensing meeting Hi Davin: This is (b)(6) summary of the RWC reconsideration request for John and Andrea in preparation for tomorrow's meeting. Please let us know if you have any questions. Thank you, (b)(6)RWC Group, LLC Ukraine-EO13661-2015-318183-1 Summary RWC Group (RWC) is a U.S. company that imports products, from Russian weapons manufacturer Baikal for sale on the U.S. civilian market. On July 30, 2014, after Kalashnikov Concern (KC) was designated on July 16, 2014, RWC submitted a request to OFAC for an advisory opinion on whether Baikal would be considered a blocked person due to its relationship with KC, which RWC stated was strictly a marketing relationship. RWC sought this guidance (b)(4) RWC sought this guidance (b)(4)RWC wanted to sell once it had received confirmation from OFAC on Baikal's status. OFAC obtained additional information that indicated that Baikal was majority-owned by KC and that KC would have an interest in (b)(4) Therefore, in March of 2015, under Case No. Ukraine-EO13661-(b)(4)2014-311648-1 (attached), Licensing denied the request to sell the In April of this year, RWC submitted a reconsideration request claiming that Baikal had no ownership interest in (b)(4) at the time KC was designated in July of 2014 because (b)(4) was fully paid for prior to KC designation and thus, the (b)(4) belonged entirely to RWC; however, RWC paid Baikal for belonged entirely to RWC; however, RWC paid Baikal for (b)(4) (see December 17, 2014 email from RWC attached). Therefore, according to RWC, if OFAC were to argue that RWC did not entirely own the (b)(4) (b)(4) at the time KC was designated because it remitted a certain amount towards the total purchase price for (b)(4) (to be evenly applied to (b)(4), RWC asserts that it still owned (b)(4) prior to KC's designation. \*See Pages 3-4 of Application\* **Payment Details** (b) 1. The total value of (b)(4)The total value of 3. RWC remitted (b)(4) towards (b)(4)RWC remitted towards never left Russia, the (b)(4) that was remitted prior to KC's designation RWC argues that since which would be an overpayment of (b)(4) (b)(4)should be applied to 6. If OFAC argues that RWC did not entirely own the (b)(4)when KC was designated because it (b)(4) towards the total (b)(4) for only remitted RWC asserts that were owned by RWC prior to KC's designation. Despite Baikal's designation on July 30, 2015, RWC would still like to receive a response from OFAC, including a copy of the administrative record regarding OFAC's determination that Baikal was majority-owned by KC

This document is made available through the declassification efforts and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

## The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

**Discover the Truth at: http://www.theblackvault.com** 

## (b)(6)

Sanctions Licensing Officer Licensing Division Office of Foreign Assets Control U.S. Department of the Treasury

2018-08-116: 002291

From:		(b)(6)	S
To:	"Smith, John"	(b)(6)	"Gacki, Andrea" (b)(6)
Cc:		(b)(6) (b)(6)	Blackborow, Davin" (b)(6)
Date:	Fri, 16 Oct 2015		3/
Attachments:	Ukraine-EO13661-2014-311648-1 Denial.pdf (78.58 kB); Ukraine-EO13661-2015-318183-1.pdf (12.68 MB); Re_RWC - Case Number Ukraine-EO13661-2014-311648-1.msg (163.84 kB)		
Hi John and An	drea,		
Please find belo	ow a summary of a	n application that is o	n the agenda for the licensing meeting today.
Thanks, (b)(6)			
		RWC Group, LI	C Ukraine-EO13661-2015-318183-1
Summary			
weapons mani was designate	ufacturer Baikal d on July 16, 20 a blocked perso his guidance	14, RWC submitted n due to its relation	civilian market. On July 30, 2014, after Kalashnikov Concern (KC) a request to OFAC for an advisory opinion on whether Baikal would ship with KC, which RWC stated was strictly a marketing relationship.  (b)(4)
and that KC w	ould have an int	AC obtained addition	
(b)(4) a designation an attached). Th (b)(4) (b)(4)	at the time KC want the time KC was the (b)(4) erefore, according to the time KC was (to be evenly a	as designated in Jul (b)(4) g to RWC, if OFAC as designated becau	
<ol> <li>The to</li> <li>RWC</li> <li>RWC</li> <li>RWC</li> <li>RWC</li> <li>should</li> <li>If OFA</li> </ol>	tal value of tal value of remitted (b)(4 remitted argues that since be applied to	(b)(4) WC did not entirely towards the total	(b)(4)  tleft Russia, the (b)(4) that was remitted prior to KC's designation which would be an overnayment of (b)(4)  when KC was designated because it
Despite Baika of the adminis	l's designation o trative record re	n July 30, 2015, RV garding OFAC's de	WC would still like to receive a response from OFAC, including a copy termination that Baikal was majority-owned by KC. (b)(5)  (b)(5)

(b)(6)
Sanctions Licensing Officer
Licensing Division
Office of Foreign Assets Control
U.S. Department of the Treasury