

Tax Analysis

For more BEPS information,
please contact:

Transfer Pricing

Shanghai

Eunice Kuo

Tel: +86 21 6141 1308

Email: eunicekuo@deloitte.com.cn

Hong Kong

Patrick Cheung

Tel: +852 2852 1095

Email: patcheung@deloitte.com.hk

International Tax

Beijing

Jennifer Zhang

Tel: +86 10 8520 7638

Email: jenzhang@deloitte.com.cn

Shanghai

Leonard Khaw

Tel: +86 21 6141 1498

Email: lkhaw@deloitte.com.cn

Hong Ye

Tel: +86 21 6141 1171

Email: hoye@deloitte.com.cn

Hong Kong

Anthony Lau

Tel: +852 2852 1082

Email: antlau@deloitte.com.hk

BEPS Action 8: OECD Releases Draft Guidance on Cost Contribution Arrangements

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) on April 29 released a non-consensus discussion draft on cost contribution arrangements (CCAs) that contains proposed revisions to Chapter VIII of the OECD's transfer pricing guidelines. The CCA discussion draft was issued in relation to the OECD's Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) Action Plan under Action 8 (transfer pricing valuation with respect to transfers of intangibles). Comments from the public are invited and due by 29 May 2015. A public consultation on this draft and other transfer pricing topics is scheduled for July 6-7 at the OECD's Paris headquarters.

The CCA discussion draft primarily updates the existing guidance to take into account guidance released under other BEPS action items, rather than take a fresh look at CCAs. The CCA discussion draft incorporates draft guidance on: (1) risk in Chapter I of the OECD transfer pricing guidelines released in December 2014 (the "Risk Draft"); and (2) taxation of transfers of intangibles in accordance with the value attributable to such intangibles in Chapter VI of the transfer pricing guidelines released in September 2014 (the "Intangibles Draft"). Thus, to the extent that the Risk Draft and the Intangibles Draft, including any changes on hard-to-value intangibles and special measures, undergo further revisions to reach consensus among OECD member countries, the CCA draft is likely to also undergo revisions to be consistent with the other discussion drafts.

Consistent with the current guidance, the CCA discussion draft applies to both service CCAs, in which participants share the cost of services, and development CCAs, in which participants share the costs and risk of developing property. The CCA discussion draft takes the position that the outcome of operating within the context of a CCA should be the same as if the CCA had not existed. Therefore, both initial contributions to the CCA and ongoing contributions must be measured by value rather than cost. The CCA discussion draft provides one exception to this rule for low-value services, for which valuation of contributions at cost is permitted. Example 2 in the Annex to the discussion draft illustrates this principle. The value of each participant's contribution is determined by reference to the other chapters of the OECD's transfer pricing guidelines, in particular Chapter VI for intangible development CCAs. The requirement that contributions be based on value rather than costs is more limiting than the current guidance, but aligns with the BEPS Action Plan and the increased emphasis on value splits. Nonetheless, the requirement to use value rather than cost is the change likely to have the greatest impact on existing CCAs.

The CCA discussion draft requires that a participant must benefit from the CCA activity. For development CCAs, every participant must be able to participate in controlling and managing the risk that is contractually assigned to it under the CCA. Thus, a “cash box” entity that only provides funding would not be allowed to be a participant in a development CCA, as discussed in Example 5. However, consistent with the Intangibles Draft, a participant that participates in control and management but only provides funding may have its returns limited to a risk-adjusted return on its funding activities. See Example 4.

Each participant’s initial and ongoing contributions to the CCAs activities should be based on their reasonably anticipated benefits (RAB) from the CCA activity. If the value of a participant’s overall contributions is not equal to its overall expected RAB, a balancing payment is required to “top up” the value of the participant’s contribution. For this purpose, both initial contributions and ongoing contributions are analyzed together to determine whether each participant’s contribution is equal to its RAB. The guidance permits taxpayers to include in their CCAs an adjustment clause that enables taxpayers to make future adjustments to their contributions to adjust contributions to changes in RAB. The potential scope of an adjustment clause is unclear. For example, could the adjustment clause permit a downward adjustment to a participant’s contributions if an intangible did not perform as well as projected both in the aggregate and relative to the other participants?

The guidance permits tax authorities to make an adjustment to a participant’s contribution to “top up” a payment if contributions: (1) are not consistent with the actual RAB shares of each entity; or (2) are not consistent with the actual value attributable to the contribution. The CCA discussion draft is unclear on whether this analysis is to be based solely on *ex ante* information or whether adjustments may be made based on *ex post* information.¹ The CCA draft indicates that, in the case of development CCAs, it may be appropriate for tax authorities to consider multiple years rather than a single year’s results in determining whether an additional balancing payment should be made to align contributions with projected RAB. The guidance appears to require alignment of contributions and RAB over time and does not provide a range of permitted deviations between contributions and RAB, which will undoubtedly occur over the course of a development CCA.

The CCA discussion draft contains recommendations for structuring and documenting a CCA that make only minor changes to the existing guidance. The guidance on documentation contains a detailed list of items that taxpayers should be prepared to provide tax authorities. However, the list is not coordinated with the new documentation requirements contained in Chapter V, which leaves open the question of what information regarding CCAs must be included in either the master or local files.

Multinational entities (MNEs) that have an entity that is a participant in a cost sharing arrangement (CSA) governed by the U.S. cost sharing regulations should be aware that the CCA draft takes a very different approach to the taxation of CCAs than the U.S. regulations in several ways:

- The “cash box” entity described in Example 5 would be allowed under the U.S. cost sharing regulations, because the U.S. rules do not have a control and management requirement;
- Under the U.S. cost sharing regulations, CSA participants share the intangible development costs related to the intangible development activity of the CSA “at cost” rather than “at value” as called for under the CCA draft;
- Initial contributions and ongoing payments are tested separately rather than combining the two; and
- Any commensurate with income-type adjustments are subject to safe harbors and other exceptions.

MNEs with CCAs governed by other local regulations should review the existing terms and conditions to identify potential differences with the CCA discussion draft, in particular regarding sharing “value” instead of “costs”.

China Comments

In China, the current Circular 2 - Special Adjustments Implementation Measures (Trial Implementation) (“Circular 2”) issued by the State Administration of Taxation (“SAT”) allows for the use of CCA. However, it does not provide detailed guidance on the implementation. While the OECD CCA discussion draft provides significant updates of the existing global guidance, there remain a number of uncertainties as to how it can be successfully implemented in China.

¹ Compare Par. 17 of the discussion draft, which states that the analysis should not utilize hindsight, with Par. 19, which requires adjustments based on actual benefits. It is unclear whether Par. 19 requires a U.S.-style “commensurate with income” (CWI) type of adjustment, but without any of the exceptions to such CWI adjustments that are found in the U.S. cost sharing regulations (in Treas. Reg. 1.482-7(i)(6)). If the OECD is going to implement such CWI-like adjustments, the concomitant safe harbors and exceptions to such adjustments to avoid adjustments for minor deviations that would be inconsistent with the arm’s length standard should also be considered

Valuation of Contribution in form of Intangibles

China's current tax laws and regulations do not provide specific guidance regarding the valuation of intangible property for transfer pricing purposes. Chapter 7 of Circular 2 provides the administrative guidance concerning CCA, but it does not provide specific guidance regarding the applicability of methods for CCA purpose.

With respect to the valuation standards on intangible properties, in practice, tax authorities often refer to the valuation analysis prepared by appraisal firms submitted by taxpayers, most of which would adopt China's standards of valuation. There is a convergence between China's standards of valuation and the international valuation standards, however, there are still differences remaining such as the scope of application, practicability of principles, the detailed principles regarding specific assets, etc.

Possible Application of Benefit Tests

Given the increasing scrutiny regarding intragroup outbound payment, the SAT may also apply benefit tests similar to those introduced in the Bulletin on Enterprise Income Tax Issues Concerning Outbound Payments to Overseas Related Parties ("Bulletin 16") when reviewing a service CCA involving Chinese participants. For example, the SAT may focus particularly on the review of the determination/classification of the cost pool (e.g. whether stewardship and non-beneficial expenses have been inappropriately included – "benefit test"), how the participants are determined (whether the participants have made a contribution and benefit from the CCA, especially for those participants located in low-tax jurisdictions – "benefit test", "value creation test"), etc.

Operating Losses related to CCA Business in China

Since a CCA is premised on all participants sharing not only contributions but also risks of the CCA activities, to qualify as a participant in a CCA an entity must have the capability and authority to control the risks associated with the risk-bearing opportunity under the CCA. This part is in fact consistent with both the overall BEPS Actions with respect to intangibles and value contribution as well as SAT's stated positions on the subject.² However, does this also mean that the SAT will accept situations where operating losses are driven by current year CCA related activities since the relevant China entity will in effect be a (co-)entrepreneurial entity (for CCA related business) and not be subject to loss limitation such as those outlined in Circular 363?³

Location-Specific Advantages

Currently Circular 2 does not address issues on location-specific advantages ("LSA"). However, as the SAT has repeatedly stressed its view that LSA shall be taken into consideration in the transfer pricing analysis, it is expected that the revised Circular 2 may include certain requirements in relation to LSA under CCA, in order to allow for adjustments on the undervalued R&D contribution of China participants due to low labor costs; or on the market premium resulted from special purchasing power in China; or on special market environment in China leading to product prices being higher than the general market prices. Also, these factors may affect SAT's view on tax treatments in relation to buy-in, buy-out and balancing payments under CCA involving intangibles.

General China Tax Implications of CCA Payments

The tax consequences of CCA transactions are ultimately determined in accordance with applicable local tax laws and regulations. With respect to buy-in/buy-out transactions in relation to intangible development CCA, Article 72 of Circular 2 classifies them as "purchase or disposal of intangible assets" for China domestic corporate income tax purpose. That is, buy-in payment is treated as the purchase of intangibles which may be subject to amortization for China domestic taxation purposes, while buy-out payment is treated as the disposal of intangibles such that capital gain or loss from the disposal will be recognized for China domestic taxation purposes.

² The SAT's views have been repeated in the UN Manual (released on 2 October 2012) and Administration Plan for International Taxation Compliance in 2014-2015, by Jiangsu Provincial Office of SAT in April 2014. The SAT put emphasis on functions performed, assets used and risks incurred at local Chinese entities and transfer pricing outcome should be in line with value creation.

³ Guo Shui Han [2009] No. 363 - The Notice issued by SAT to strengthen the supervision and investigation of cross-border related party transactions

In the event that the cross-border buy-in/buy-out transactions are carried out between China and overseas entities, the respective withholding income tax and indirect tax implications are summarized from a China perspective as below.

	Buy-in	Buy-out
Withholding income tax	Whether the overseas entity(ies) are subject to China income tax for the buy-in payment received from China entity are uncertain. If the tax authorities consider that the buy-in transaction is a form of "royalties" or "license fee", the payment could be liable for withholding tax; however, if the transaction is treated as the "purchase of intangible", it may be argued that withholding tax is not applicable.	Whether the buy-out payment received by China entity from overseas entity(ies) are liable for income tax/indirect tax in counter country(ies), will be subject to the domestic tax law/regulation in counter country(ies) and/or the tax treaty between China and counter countries, if any.
Indirect tax	The overseas entity(ies) could be exempt from VAT/Business Tax ("BT") liabilities in China, if the subject intangibles are qualified for VAT/BT exemption and relevant approvals are granted by in-charge tax authorities and Science and Technology Commission.	

Conclusion

MNEs that have existing CSAs/CCAs in place -- in particular CSAs that comply with prevailing cost sharing rules in local countries -- should keep an eye on the final CCA rules to determine if any modifications to the existing arrangement are needed and also if there is any application/approval for the arrangement required going forward.

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: kevnng@deloitte.com.cn

Hong Kong

Sarah Chin
Partner
Tel: +852 2852 6440
Fax: +852 2520 6205
Email: sachin@deloitte.com.hk

Shenzhen

Victor Li
Partner
Tel: +86 755 3353 8113
Fax: +86 755 8246 3222
Email: vicli@deloitte.com.cn

Chongqing

Frank Tang
Partner
Tel: +86 23 6310 6206
Fax: +86 23 6310 6170
Email: ftang@deloitte.com.cn

Jinan

Beth Jiang
Director
Tel: +86 531 8518 1058
Fax: +86 531 8518 1068
Email: 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
mliang@deloitte.com.cn

Dalian

Leo Yang
Partner
Tel: +86 411 8371 2801
Fax: +86 411 8360 3297
Email: leoyang@deloitte.com.cn

Macau

Sarah Chin
Partner
Tel: +853 2871 2998
Fax: +853 2871 3033
Email: sachin@deloitte.com.hk

Tianjin

Jason Su
Partner
Tel: +86 22 2320 6680
Fax: +86 22 2320 6699
Email: jassu@deloitte.com.cn

Guangzhou

Victor Li
Partner
Tel: +86 20 8396 9228
Fax: +86 20 3888 0121
Email: vicli@deloitte.com.cn

Nanjing

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

Wuhan

Justin Zhu
Partner
Tel: +86 27 8526 6618
Fax: +86 27 8526 7032
Email: juszhu@deloitte.com.cn

Hangzhou

Qiang Lu
Partner
Tel: +86 571 2811 1901
Fax: +86 571 2811 1904
Email: qilu@deloitte.com.cn

Shanghai

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

Xiamen

Jim Chung
Partner
Tel: +86 592 2107 298
Fax: +86 592 2107 259
Email: jjchung@deloitte.com.cn

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

National Leader

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

Northern China

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

Southern China (Hong Kong)

Davy Yun
Partner
Tel: +852 2852 6538
Fax: +852 2520 6205
Email: 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

Eastern China

Kevin Zhu
Director
Tel: +86 21 6141 1262
Fax: +86 21 6335 0003
Email: 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 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 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.