

# Tax Analysis

For more BEPS information,  
please contact:

**International Tax**  
Beijing

Jennifer Zhang  
Tel: +86 10 8520 7638  
Email: [jenzhang@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:jenzhang@deloitte.com.cn)

**Shanghai**

Leonard Khaw  
Tel: +86 21 6141 1498  
Email: [lkhaw@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:lkhaw@deloitte.com.cn)

**Hong Ye \***

Tel: +86 21 6141 1171  
Email: [hoeyeqinli@qinlilawfirm.com](mailto:hoeyeqinli@qinlilawfirm.com)

**Hong Kong**

Anthony Lau  
Tel: +852 2852 1082  
Email: [antlau@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:antlau@deloitte.com.hk)

**Transfer Pricing**

**Shanghai**

Eunice Kuo  
Tel: +86 21 6141 1308  
Email: [eunicekuo@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:eunicekuo@deloitte.com.cn)

**Hong Kong**

Patrick Cheung  
Tel: +852 2852 1095  
Email: [patcheung@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:patcheung@deloitte.com.hk)

\* Hong Ye is from Qin Li Law Firm, which is a licensed Chinese law firm and forms part of Deloitte's global Tax & Legal network. Deloitte Legal is one of the major legal practices around the world.

## BEPS Action 7: Preventing the artificial avoidance of PE status

On 31 October 2014, the OECD, as part of its work on the Action Plan to address Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS), released a Discussion Draft on Action 7 in relation to preventing the artificial avoidance of permanent establishment (PE) status. This Action is focused on the need to update the OECD tax treaty definition of PE (article 5 in the OECD model treaty) to prevent abuses of the threshold allocating taxing rights for trading activities to different jurisdictions. As part of this work, the OECD is considering the modernization of the PE threshold in relation to digital cross-border business, in line with the work on Action 1.

As with other Discussion Drafts on BEPS Actions, the proposals do not represent a consensus view from the G20/OECD governments involved, but are designed to provide preliminary but substantive proposals for public analysis and comment.

### Deloitte comments and next steps for business

The work on taxable presence is a key facet of the BEPS project, and one that has potentially far-reaching consequences for both businesses and governments. The aim of the proposals is to remove the ability of some businesses to escape material taxation in a sales country by contractual arrangements, or so-called "fragmentation." Many multinational businesses will need to undertake considerable work in determining whether a PE exists, even in the absence of structures that involve *commissionnaires* or other arrangements designed to limit PEs. In some cases, there will be additional PEs in countries with a corresponding increase in compliance costs. It is likely that there will be more audits by tax authorities seeking to understand the circumstances of a multinational's operations and what this means for potential PEs within their borders.

The PE issue is primarily one of the boundary between different governments and the allocation of taxing rights between countries in relation to trading activities. There is an onus on OECD and G20 governments to make this boundary as clear as possible for businesses and tax authorities to apply successfully, efficiently and appropriately. Alongside additional compliance costs, the risk for business is that tax authority challenges for additional tax will lead to more disputes placing more pressure on dispute resolution, or potentially double taxation. For example, where the principal purposes test is proposed as a solution to abuse involving splitting up of contracts, it is essential that there is adequate protection for taxpayers via access to mutual agreement procedures.

Similarly, issues around the attribution of losses to PEs may need to be addressed.

Businesses should consider their structures and supply chains now, and work out how the proposed changes may affect their tax and compliance positions, including whether any double taxation can be relieved through exemption or credit methods. Participation in the OECD's consultation process will help the OECD understand the consequences of the proposals in scenarios not envisaged by the Focus Group working on this Action.

Insurance companies will be justified in thinking that the specific proposal being considered in relation to insurance PEs is a potential re-drawing of the taxing boundary between source and residence countries. It is odd that this appears in the BEPS work given the OECD's stated aims.

The Discussion Draft comments that preliminary work suggests that limited changes will be required in relation to transfer pricing and attribution of profits to PEs. Given the need to ensure a balance between the costs of additional compliance and the amount of tax to be raised in the PE countries it seems essential that the consequences are fully considered. In addition, the OECD's 2010 *Report on the Attribution of Profits to Permanent Establishments* that sets out the OECD's approach is focused almost entirely on the financial services industry. Parts II-IV deal with specific financial services situations, and Part I, which applies generally, contains many financial services examples. Additional guidance for nonfinancial services sectors will be essential to ensure a consistent approach by different businesses and different governments.

### Proposals for amendments to article 5

Artificial avoidance of PE status through *commissionnaire* arrangements and similar strategies: The OECD proposes changes to the current rules on dependent and independent agents, which set out when an intermediary creates a PE of a nonresident company. The changes are intended to limit the currently favorable treatment of *commissionnaire* and similar arrangements (as well as potentially limited risk distributors through changes to specific exemptions, below). Activities performed by an intermediary in a sales country that are intended to result in the regular conclusion of contracts by a foreign entity will in future create an agency PE (taxable presence) of the foreign entity. The exception for independent agents remains, but the Discussion Draft proposes tightening the rule to make it clear this will not apply to an agent acting only for a group of companies. The Discussion Draft puts forward four alternative (but similar) proposals to amend the agency PE provisions (paragraph 5 of article 5 of the model treaty). The alternatives are:

- A. Proposals to add a reference to contracts for the provision of property or services by the foreign entity where the intermediary "engages with specific persons in a way that results in the conclusions of contracts."
- B. Proposals to add a reference to contracts for the provision of property or services by the foreign entity where the intermediary "concludes contracts, or negotiates the material elements of contracts."
- C. Proposals to focus on contracts which, by virtue of the legal relationship between the agent and the foreign enterprise "are on the account and risk of the enterprise" where the intermediary "engages with specific persons in a way that results in the conclusion of contracts."
- D. Proposals to focus on contracts which, by virtue of the legal relationship between the agent and the foreign enterprise, "are on the account and risk of the enterprise" where the intermediary "concludes contracts, or negotiates the material elements of contracts."

It is difficult to see how in practice the concepts in proposals A and C, in particular, can be determined consistently. In addition, the OECD proposes to strengthen the requirements (paragraph 6 of article 5 of the model treaty) for an agent to be considered "independent" such that it does not create a PE of a foreign entity. The exemption would only apply where the agent is acting on behalf of "various persons" and specifically clarifies that acting "exclusively or almost exclusively on behalf of one enterprise or associated enterprises" will not be sufficient to be considered an independent agent.

Artificial avoidance of PE status through the specific activity exemptions: The OECD proposes changes to the list of exceptions for specific activities (such as maintenance of stocks of goods for storage, display, delivery or processing, and purchasing) under which a fixed place of business is treated as not creating a PE (paragraph 4 of article 5). This is a proposal to modernize the exemptions for activities, such as warehousing, that would have been considered preparatory or auxiliary when the model tax treaty provisions were originally negotiated. Modern ways of doing business and, in particular, internet sales have made warehousing in the form of sophisticated logistics centers a key part of some businesses' value chains; it is clear that many governments think the current exemption is far too wide. The Discussion Draft discusses possible alternative amendments—a "catch all" approach that will require analysis of businesses' value chains or a series of more targeted amendments that will remove altogether the application of exemptions for some activities:

- E. A catch-all requirement that for the exemption to apply, each specific activity (or the combination of activities) must be of a “preparatory or auxiliary character.”
- F. An alternative proposal if E is not adopted would be to remove “delivery” from the specific activity exemptions.
- G. A further proposal if E is not adopted would be to remove “purchasing goods or merchandising” from being a specific activity for exemption.
- H. An alternative to proposal G if proposal E is not adopted would be to remove “purchasing goods or merchandising” and “collecting information” from being specific activities for exemption.

In addition, the OECD is concerned with situations where activities are “fragmented” between related parties to meet the requirements for activities to be preparatory or auxiliary. Two alternative proposals are put forward here:

- I. Under this proposal the specific activity exemptions will not apply where “the same enterprise or an associated enterprise” carries on activities, one of the enterprises has a PE (under the provisions of the rest of article 5) and the business activities constitute “complementary functions that are part of a cohesive business operation.”
- J. Under this proposal the specific activity exemptions will not apply as with proposal I and also where the “overall activity resulting from the combination of the activities... is not of a preparatory or auxiliary character” where the activities constitute “complementary functions that are part of a cohesive business operation.” Under this option, there is no need for one or other enterprise to have a PE under the rest of the provisions of article 5.

Splitting up of construction contracts: The OECD is considering proposals to deal with the splitting up of contracts between related parties in relation to the specific 12-month time period for creating permanent establishments for building sites, construction or installation projects (paragraph 3 of article 5) (and also non-OECD model services PE articles for countries that have adopted them). The proposals put forward are as follows:

- K. For purposes of determining the 12-month period, activities carried on by associated enterprises will be added to the period of time of an enterprise’s activities on site.
- L. As an alternative to the specific rule proposed in K, the principal purposes test proposed in relation to preventing treaty abuse under Action 6 of the BEPS Action Plan could be used to address splitting up of contracts. An example would be added to the Commentary on article 5 of the model treaty to illustrate this.

Insurance: The Discussion Draft considers specifically a concern that has been raised that insurance companies may do large-scale business in a country without having a PE. The OECD is considering two alternative approaches here and asks for input on whether re-insurance raises specific concerns related to the avoidance of PE status. The approaches are:

- M. A specific PE threshold, similar to that found in the UN model, for insurance companies, “if it collects premiums in the territory ... or insures risks situated therein.” Re-insurance is excluded from this.
- N. Under this proposal, there would be no specific treaty provision for insurance companies, and any issues would be dealt with through the proposed changes to PEs in respect of sales in options A-D, which apply equally to insurance as to other industries.

### [Profit attribution to PEs and interaction with action points on transfer pricing](#)

This section recognizes the need to coordinate the work on thresholds for PEs with the BEPS work on transfer pricing (particularly on interest deductions and other financial payments, intangibles and risks and capital) and the allocation of profits to PEs under existing principles. The Discussion Draft comments that the preliminary work by the OECD to date has not identified substantial changes that would need to be made in relation to the attribution of profits to a PE (although some additions and /or clarifications would be useful). The OECD acknowledges, however, that work on other areas, in particular risks and capital, might involve a reconsideration of some aspects of the existing rules.

### [Timetable](#)

Comments are invited by 9 January 2015 and, in particular, the OECD is interested in examples of unintended effects. A public consultation meeting will be held at the OECD in Paris on 21 January 2015, for which registration opens on 15 November 2014. The meeting also will be broadcast over the internet.

Given that changes to the definition of taxable presence will require amendments to tax treaties, it may take some time for the final rules to take effect globally. Changes could be made through a multilateral convention, but we also should expect countries to use bilateral protocols to implement quicker change.

Tax Analysis is published for the clients and professionals of the Hong Kong and Chinese Mainland offices of Deloitte China. The contents are of a general nature only. Readers are advised to consult their tax advisors before acting on any information contained in this newsletter. For more information or advice on the above subject or analysis of other tax issues, please contact:

#### Beijing

Kevin Ng  
Partner  
Tel: +86 10 8520 7501  
Fax: +86 10 8518 7501  
Email: [keving@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:keving@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Hong Kong

Sarah Chin  
Partner  
Tel: +852 2852 6440  
Fax: +852 2520 6205  
Email: [sachin@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:sachin@deloitte.com.hk)

#### Shenzhen

Sarah Chin  
Partner  
Tel: +86 755 8246 3255  
Fax: +86 755 8246 3186  
Email: [sachin@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:sachin@deloitte.com.hk)

#### Chongqing

Frank Tang  
Partner  
Tel: +86 23 6310 6206  
Fax: +86 23 6310 6170  
Email: [ftang@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:ftang@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Jinan

Beth Jiang  
Director  
Tel: +86 531 8518 1058  
Fax: +86 531 8518 1068  
Email: [betjiang@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:betjiang@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Suzhou

Frank Xu / Maria Liang  
Partner  
Tel: +86 512 6289 1318 / 1328  
Fax: +86 512 6762 3338  
Email: [frakxu@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:frakxu@deloitte.com.cn)  
[mliang@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:mliang@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Dalian

Frank Tang  
Partner  
Tel: +86 411 8371 2888  
Fax: +86 411 8360 3297  
Email: [ftang@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:ftang@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Macau

Sarah Chin  
Partner  
Tel: +853 2871 2998  
Fax: +853 2871 3033  
Email: [sachin@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:sachin@deloitte.com.hk)

#### Tianjin

Jason Su  
Partner  
Tel: +86 22 2320 6680  
Fax: +86 22 2320 6699  
Email: [jassu@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:jassu@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Guangzhou

Sarah Chin  
Partner  
Tel: +86 20 8396 9228  
Fax: +86 20 3888 0121  
Email: [sachin@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:sachin@deloitte.com.hk)

#### Nanjing

Frank Xu  
Partner  
Tel: +86 25 5791 5208  
Fax: +86 25 8691 8776  
Email: [frakxu@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:frakxu@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Wuhan

Justin Zhu  
Partner  
Tel: +86 27 8526 6618  
Fax: +86 27 8526 7032  
Email: [juszhu@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:juszhu@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Hangzhou

Qiang Lu  
Partner  
Tel: +86 571 2811 1901  
Fax: +86 571 2811 1904  
Email: [qilu@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:qilu@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Shanghai

Eunice Kuo  
Partner  
Tel: +86 21 6141 1308  
Fax: +86 21 6335 0003  
Email: [eunicekuo@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:eunicekuo@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Xiamen

Sarah Chin  
Partner  
Tel: +86 592 2107 298  
Fax: +86 592 2107 259  
Email: [sachin@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:sachin@deloitte.com.hk)

#### About the Deloitte China National Tax Technical Centre

The Deloitte China National Tax Technical Centre ("NTC") was established in 2006 to continuously improve the quality of Deloitte China's tax services, to better serve the clients, and to help Deloitte China's tax team excel. The Deloitte China NTC prepares and publishes "Tax Analysis", "Tax News", etc. These publications include introduction and commentaries on newly issued tax legislations, regulations and circulars from technical perspectives. The Deloitte China NTC also conducts research studies and analysis and provides professional opinions on ambiguous and complex issues. For more information, please contact:

#### National Tax Technical Centre

Email: [ntc@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:ntc@deloitte.com.cn)

#### National Leader

Leonard Khaw  
Partner  
Tel: +86 21 6141 1498  
Fax: +86 21 6335 0003  
Email: [lkhaw@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:lkhaw@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Northern China

Julie Zhang  
Partner  
Tel: +86 10 8520 7511  
Fax: +86 10 8518 1326  
Email: [juliezhang@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:juliezhang@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Southern China (Hong Kong)

Davy Yun  
Partner  
Tel: +852 2852 6538  
Fax: +852 2520 6205  
Email: [dyun@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:dyun@deloitte.com.hk)

#### Southern China (Mainland/Macau)

German Cheung  
Director  
Tel: +86 20 2831 1369  
Fax: +86 20 3888 0121  
Email: [gercheung@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:gercheung@deloitte.com.cn)

#### Eastern China

Kevin Zhu  
Director  
Tel: +86 21 6141 1262  
Fax: +86 21 6335 0003  
Email: [kzhu@deloitte.com.cn](mailto:kzhu@deloitte.com.cn)

If you prefer to receive future issues by soft copy or update us with your new correspondence details, please notify Wandy Luk by either email at [wanluk@deloitte.com.hk](mailto:wanluk@deloitte.com.hk) or by fax to +852 2541 1911.

#### About Deloitte

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee, and its network of member firms, each of which is a legally separate and independent entity. Please see [www.deloitte.com/cn/en/about](http://www.deloitte.com/cn/en/about) for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited and its member firms.

Deloitte provides audit, tax, consulting, and financial advisory services to public and private clients spanning multiple industries. With a globally connected network of member firms in more than 150 countries, Deloitte brings world-class capabilities and high-quality service to clients, delivering the insights they need to address their most complex business challenges. Deloitte has in the region of 200,000 professionals, all committed to becoming the standard of excellence.

#### About Deloitte in Greater China

We are one of the leading professional services providers with 22 offices in Beijing, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Taipei, Chengdu, Chongqing, Dalian, Guangzhou, Hangzhou, Harbin, Hsinchu, Jinan, Kaohsiung, Macau, Nanjing, Shenzhen, Suzhou, Taichung, Tainan, Tianjin, Wuhan and Xiamen in Greater China. We have nearly 13,500 people working on a collaborative basis to serve clients, subject to local applicable laws.

#### About Deloitte China

The Deloitte brand first came to China in 1917 when a Deloitte office was opened in Shanghai. Now the Deloitte China network of firms, backed by the global Deloitte network, deliver a full range of audit, tax, consulting and financial advisory services to local, multinational and growth enterprise clients in China. We have considerable experience in China and have been a significant contributor to the development of China's accounting standards, taxation system and local professional accountants.

This publication contains general information only, and none of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, its member firms, or their related entities (collectively the "Deloitte Network") is by means of this publication, rendering professional advice or services. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your finances or your business, you should consult a qualified professional adviser. No entity in the Deloitte Network shall be responsible for any loss whatsoever sustained by any person who relies on this publication.