

Canada  
International Tax

## Contacts

**National tax policy leader**  
**Albert Baker**  
416-643-8753

**National leader -  
International Tax**  
**Etienne Bruson**  
604-640-3175

**Canadian Desk leader  
Hong Kong**  
**Chris Roberge**  
852-285 25627

**Atlantic**  
**Brian Brophy**  
709-758-5234

**Quebec**  
**François Champoux**  
514-393-5019

**Ontario**  
**Mark Noonan**  
613-751-6688

**Tony Maddalena**  
905-315-5734

**Toronto**  
**Tony Ancimer**  
416-601-5945

**Sandra Slaats**  
416-643-8227

**Alberta and Prairies**  
**Andrew McBride**  
403-503-1497

**Charles Evans**  
780-421-3884

**British Columbia**  
**Brad Gordica**  
604-640-3344

## Related links

**International Tax services**  
**Deloitte Tax services**

## International tax alert

### BEPS Action 2: Hybrid mismatch arrangements

September 18, 2014

On September 16, 2014, ahead of the G20 Finance Ministers' meeting on September 20-21, 2014, the OECD published seven papers as a first tranche of deliverables under the base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) project, including a report with respect to **Action 2: Hybrid Mismatch Arrangements**. The OECD will be continuing its work on the remainder of the 15 BEPS Actions throughout 2015. The G20 and OECD member governments intend that the recommendations under each of the Actions will form a comprehensive and cohesive approach to the international tax framework, through domestic legislation and international principles under the model tax treaty and transfer pricing guidelines. As a result, the proposed solutions in the first seven papers, while agreed to, are not yet finalized and may be affected by decisions and future work on BEPS in 2015.

### Deloitte's comments

The recommendations with respect to hybrid mismatch arrangements seek to address a number of concerns raised in consultations. However, it remains clear that, where implemented, the proposals will affect many widely used hybrid financing arrangements. The OECD will develop a Commentary by September 2015 to aid countries in implementing the new rules.

The focus on structured arrangements and related parties/controlled groups helps strike a balance between compliance costs and neutralizing the tax benefit from mismatches. The move to a 25% threshold (rather than 10%) addresses the concern that tax authorities and taxpayers will find it difficult to obtain information to conclude whether a structure could be a hybrid mismatch arrangement.

We hope clarity on the substantive open points will be provided as soon as possible, to reduce uncertainty and to limit unilateral measures that may result in double taxation. This is of particular importance to the banking and insurance sectors where there is concern that the recommendations could have a disproportionately negative effect.

The recommendations are designed for implementation in domestic legislation and tax treaties. Given the unresolved substantive issues and the need for implementation guidance, it seems unlikely that any country will begin this process prior to publication of the Commentary in September 2015.

### OECD proposals

The recommendations are designed to neutralize mismatches by targeting the following types of arrangements:

### **Deduction/no inclusion (D/NI) outcomes**

- **Hybrid financial instruments** - a deductible payment made under a financial instrument (including a hybrid transfer such as a repo) is not treated as taxable income under the laws of the recipient's jurisdiction;
- **Disregarded hybrid payments** - differences in the treatment of the hybrid payer result in a deductible payment being disregarded in the other jurisdiction; and
- **Reverse hybrids**- payments made to an intermediary are not taxable on receipt due to a hybrid effect.

### **Double deduction (D/D) outcomes**

- **Deductible hybrid payments** - a deductible payment by a hybrid payer which result in a second deduction in a parent jurisdiction; and
- **Deductible payments made by dual residents** - deductible payments made by a dual resident entity trigger a second deduction in the other jurisdiction.

### **Indirect deduction/no inclusion (indirect D/NI) outcomes**

- **Imported mismatch arrangements** - the effect of a hybrid mismatch that arises between two jurisdictions can be shifted (or imported) into another jurisdiction through the use of a plain-vanilla financial instrument.

### **Recommendations**

Specific hybrid mismatch rules are recommended to address each of these arrangements. The recommendations are in the form of "linking rules". to be adopted within domestic legislation; a primary rule, to apply whenever a mismatch arises (primarily denying a deduction); and a secondary or defensive rule, to apply in circumstances where the primary rule does not apply (generally to tax income). This approach seeks to align the tax treatment of an instrument or entity with the tax outcomes in the counterparty jurisdiction on a standalone basis, without reliance on counterparty jurisdictions. To avoid double taxation, a hierarchy operates to "switch off" the effect of one rule where there is a rule in the counterparty jurisdiction which addresses the mismatch.

Further changes to domestic law are recommended to better align domestic and cross-border outcomes: restricting dividend exemptions for deductible payments; limiting tax credits for taxes withheld at source; improving the Controlled Foreign Company (CFC) and other offshore investment regimes; restricting the tax transparency of reverse hybrids that are members of a controlled group; and adjusting information reporting requirements.

### **Scope**

Each hybrid mismatch rule has its own defined scope which seeks to achieve balance in a rule that is comprehensive, targeted and administrable. Broadly, the rules target structured arrangements and related party/controlled group transactions. In response to concerns regarding obtaining information from minority stakeholders, the related party definition applies where there is a 25% (rather than 10%) investment. The hybrid entity rules apply to controlled groups, which includes those groups consolidated for accounting purposes.

Further work is required in respect of imported mismatch arrangements and the need to clarify whether or not income taxed under a CFC regime should be treated as included in ordinary income. The OECD acknowledges countries may in the meantime make their own policy choices.

## Banking and insurance - regulatory capital

A key concern raised during the consultation process was the application of the rules to hybrid regulatory capital issued intra-group. Further work is required to clarify whether special treatment is justified.

## Treaty issues

A new model treaty provision is recommended which sets out that a recipient entity that is fiscally transparent under the tax laws of either country will be treated as if it is resident in the recipient country for the purpose of accessing the treaty, but only to the extent that the recipient country, in its domestic law, treats the entity as a resident in respect of the income concerned (and therefore taxes it). The work undertaken in respect of BEPS Action 6, Preventing the Granting of Treaty Benefits in Inappropriate Circumstances, addresses some issues in respect of dual resident entities.

## Timetable and next steps

Guidance, in the form of a detailed Commentary to enable domestic adoption, will be issued no later than September 2015. The Commentary will explain how the rules would operate in practice, including practical examples, and will set out transitional rules if there are differing dates of implementation. In addition, work will continue in respect of the outstanding substantive points - certain capital market transactions (including market stock lending and repos), imported mismatches and CFC inclusion - with a view to reaching consensus and publishing the recommendations along with the Commentary. Further input will be sought from stakeholders.

It will be necessary to consider the implications of recommendations made in respect of Action 3 - Strengthen Controlled Foreign Company Rules and Action 4 - Limit Base Erosion via Interest Deductions and Other Financial Payments.

## Deloitte resources

Deloitte's **Dbriefs webcast program** will include a discussion of BEPS actions.

In addition please refer to the Deloitte **BEPS site** which has useful resources and updates.

*Albert Baker, Toronto*

---

### [Home](#) | [Legal](#) | [Privacy](#)

2 Queen Street East, Suite 1200  
Toronto, ON M5C 3G7 Canada

© Deloitte LLP and affiliated entities.

This publication is produced by Deloitte LLP as an information service to clients and friends of the firm, and is not intended to substitute for competent professional advice. No action should be initiated without consulting your professional advisors. Your use of this document is at your own risk.

Deloitte, one of Canada's leading professional services firms, provides audit, tax, consulting, and financial advisory services. Deloitte LLP, an Ontario limited liability partnership, is the Canadian member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited.

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/about](http://www.deloitte.com/about) for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited and its member firms.

[www.deloitte.ca](http://www.deloitte.ca)

To Unsubscribe from this mailing list, please reply to this email with "Unsubscribe" in the Subject.

Please add "@deloitte.ca" to your safe senders list to ensure delivery to your inbox and to view images.