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Understanding BEPS
What are the BEPS Action Plans
15 Actions across 3 main pillars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 1:</th>
<th>Address the tax challenges of the digital economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Coherence”</strong></td>
<td><strong>“Substance”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Establishing international coherence of corporate income taxation</td>
<td>ii. Restoring the full effects and benefits of international standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 2:</th>
<th>Neutralize the effects of hybrid mismatch arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 6:</td>
<td>Prevent treaty abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 11:</td>
<td>Establish methodologies to collect and analyze data on BEPS and the actions to address it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 3:</th>
<th>Strengthen controlled foreign company (CFC) rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 7:</td>
<td>Prevent the artificial avoidance of PE status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 12:</td>
<td>Require taxpayers to disclose their aggressive tax planning arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 4:</th>
<th>Limit base erosion via interest deductions and other financial payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 8:</td>
<td>Assure that transfer pricing outcomes are in line with value creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 9:</td>
<td>Risk and capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 10:</td>
<td>Other high-risk transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 13:</td>
<td>Re-examine transfer pricing documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 14:</td>
<td>Make dispute resolution mechanisms more effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 5:</th>
<th>Counter harmful tax practices more effectively, taking into account transparency and substance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 15:</td>
<td>Develop a multilateral instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Digital economy</td>
<td>Equalization levy introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Hybrid mismatches</td>
<td>No amendment in Indian tax law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: CFC Rules</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Interest deductions</td>
<td>Limit on interest deduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Harmful tax practices</td>
<td>Concessional tax regime for royalty on patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Prevent treaty abuse</td>
<td>General anti-avoidance rule effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Artificial Avoidance of PE</td>
<td>Indian tax treaties typically have wider definition of PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10: Intangibles, Risks and capital &amp; High risk transactions</td>
<td>Intangibles and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Data collection &amp; analysis</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Disclosure of aggressive tax planning</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Transfer pricing documentation</td>
<td>Country-by-country reporting and Master file requirement introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Dispute resolution mechanism</td>
<td>Multilateral instrument is signed – to the extent agreed by the participating countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: Multilateral instrument</td>
<td>India signed the multilateral instrument on 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action plan 15
Multilateral instrument
Introduction

Background

- As on 17 August 2017, the MLI was signed by India and 70 other jurisdictions including Australia, Mauritius, Canada, China, Cyprus, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Singapore and the United Kingdom.

- Interestingly, **United States, has not signed the MLI** whereas **Mauritius has not notified tax treaty with India as a Covered Tax Agreement**.

- As per provisional list, India has notified all its 93 double tax avoidance treaties indicating the intention of applying the selected MLI provisions to all treaties.

Operation of MLI

- MLI modifies the operation of existing tax treaties between MLI parties:
  - No change in treaties but MLI and treaty to be read together

- Flexibility to implement BEPS tax treaty measures in various ways
  - **Choices** where a minimum standard can be satisfied in multiple ways
  - **Choices** to apply optional and alternative provisions
  - **Reservations** to opt out of provisions or parts of provisions that are not minimum standards

- A provision of MLI would get adopted only when matching action happens i.e. both parties accept the provision. In absence of such matching, existing provisions of the tax treaties would continue
Action plan 15 - Multilateral instrument

Introduction

**Operation of MLI**

- Does not impair India’s powers to enter into new tax treaties and sign protocols to existing tax treaties.
- India can also opt in with respect to optional provisions or withdraw reservations made earlier or replace an earlier reservation with a more limited version.
- India can also completely withdraw from MLI by making appropriate notification.

**Effective date**

- The date from which the MLI provisions would become effective with respect to Indian tax treaties will depend on
  i. the date on which MLI enters into force for India and for the treaty partner countries
  ii. the date of entry into effect of the MLI, which in turn could depend on the choices made by India and the treaty partner countries.
- It is likely that the first modifications to covered tax treaties will become effective in the course of 2018
Action plan 6

Treaty abuse
Introduction

- OECD/G20 BEPS Action 6 identifies treaty abuse, in particular treaty shopping, as one of the most important sources of BEPS concerns.
- The BEPS report includes new treaty anti-abuse rules that provide safeguards against the abuse of treaty provisions and offer a certain degree of flexibility regarding how to do so.

**Treaty shopping**
- The first requirement to be satisfied by a person to claim treaty benefits is to be “a resident of a contracting state”.
- There are a number of arrangements through which a person who is not a resident of a Contracting State may attempt to obtain benefits that a tax treaty grants to a resident of that State. These arrangements are generally referred to as “treaty shopping”.

In the given scenario, a person who is resident of a third state (e.g. Resident state) is attempting to access indirectly the benefits of a treaty (e.g. between Source state and Intermediary favourable jurisdiction)
Action plan 6 - Treaty abuse

Anti-abuse rules

---

**Clear statement by the state on treaty shopping**

- States that enter into a tax treaty required to include a statement that they intend to avoid creating opportunities for non-taxation or reduced taxation through tax evasion or avoidance, including through treaty shopping arrangements

---

**Limitation-on-benefits ('LOB') rule**

- Specific rule that limits the availability of treaty benefits to entities that meet certain conditions will be included in the OECD Model Tax Convention.

- Anti-abuse rules are based on the following conditions for an entity:
  - Legal nature of the entity;
  - Ownership in the entity;
  - General activities of the entity

- These rules seek to ensure that there is a sufficient link between the entity and its State of residence.

---

**Principal purposes test or "PPT" rule**

- A general anti-abuse rule based on the principal purposes of transactions or arrangements will be included in the OECD Model Tax Convention.

- It is included to cover treaty shopping situations not covered by the LOB rule

- Under the PPT rule, if one of the principal purposes of transactions or arrangements is to obtain treaty benefits, these benefits would be denied unless it is established that granting these benefits would be in accordance with the object and purpose of the provisions of the treaty
Action plan 6 - Treaty abuse
PPT Rule – Examples of application

- T Co hold the shares of S Co and R Co and lends $1 mn to S Co in exchange for a note (Interest at 7%p.a).
- No Treaty between State T and State S and, hence, any interest paid by S Co to T Co is subject to a withholding tax
- Under the State R-State S tax treaty, there is an exemption on source country interest withholding tax
- T Co decides to assign the S Co note to R Co in exchange for another note from R Co.

In the absence of other facts and circumstances, reasonable to conclude that one of the primary purposes of assigning the note was to enjoy a lower/nil WHT and hence, granting of treaty benefit would be inappropriate.

- R Co, in business of producing electronic devices is expanding rapidly to establish a plant in a developing country to benefit from lower manufacturing costs
- Preliminary review –3 locations shortlisted with similar economic & political environment
- State S is the only country with which State R has a treaty convention
- Decision taken to build plant in State S

- In this example, whilst the decision to invest in State S is based on tax considerations, the principal purpose of investment is expansion.
- Also, one of the objectives of tax conventions is to encourage cross border investment. Hence, cannot be reasonably concluded that one of the principal purposes for investment is tax benefits.
### Action plan 6 - Treaty abuse
**Capital gains tax exemption under India’s tax treaties**

#### Signatories to BEPS multilateral instrument (PPT and PPT + simplified LOB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andorra</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Gabon</th>
<th>Isle of Man</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>Jersey</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Slovak Rep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other jurisdictions that have capital gains tax exemption under tax treaty with India
- Kenya, Philippines, Zamia and Malaysia

- **Derivative/ bonds/ mutual funds interest in LLP**
- **Shareholding less than 10%**
- **Sale to non-resident**

**Mauritius has not notified Indian tax treaty as a covered tax agreement under the multilateral instrument**

© 2017 Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India LLP
**Action plan 6 - Treaty abuse**

**Indian scenario – Measures taken so far**

**General Anti-Avoidance Rules (‘GAAR’)** enforced by the domestic tax law is akin to PPT rule

### The Concept

- GAAR empowers tax authorities to deny tax benefit in an arrangement which:
  - has been entered into with the main purpose to obtain tax benefit; and
  - lacks commercial substance; or
  - Creates rights and obligations which are not at arm’s length principle; or
  - Results in misuse of tax law provisions or is carried out by means or in a manner which are not ordinarily employed for bona fide purposes;
- GAAR would override tax treaties
- For foreign investors GAAR would apply only where treaty benefits are claimed
- GAAR will co-exist with special anti-avoidance rules
- GAAR can be applied only after obtaining approval from Commissioner of Income Tax and Approving Panel

### Exemptions & clarifications

- Under the current provisions, GAAR does not apply to:
  - Arrangements where annual tax benefit does not exceed INR 30 million (around US$ 500k)
  - Investors in FPIs
  - FPIs if they do not claim treaty benefits
  - Investments made prior to 1 April 2017
- GAAR not applicable if the entity is set up in a tax efficient jurisdiction for non-tax commercial reasons
- GAAR not applicable if LOB conditions in a treaty are met which sufficiently address tax avoidance
- Opt-in / Opt-out from a treaty not a matter to be decided by GAAR
- GAAR not to apply if a ruling from Authority for Advance Ruling is obtained to this effect
- Grandfathering benefit available to shares acquired through conversions and corporate actions after 31 March 2017 provided original investment was before 1 April 2017
Action plan 4

Limiting interest deductions
Why needed

**Original**
- A Co - high tax jurisdiction @ 35% and exempts foreign source dividend
- B Co – tax @ 15%
- B Co. borrows USD 100 from bank @ 10% and generates operating profit of USD 15. After deducting interest of USD 10, B earns pre-tax profit of USD 5 and post tax of USD 4.25

**Alternative**
- A Co. borrows money from bank and contributes to B Co. as capital
- B Co. earns a post tax profit of USD 12.75
- Assuming A Co. can set-off interest on loan from bank, its post tax cost is USD 6.5
- Transferring of interest expense from B Co. to A Co. results achieves better group result i.e. post tax profit of **USD 6.25**
- There could be multiple situations where placing a debt at a high tax jurisdiction could result into overall group benefit and result into base erosion
- In the Indian context, the tax deductibility of interest in the hands of A likely to be litigative
BEPS recommendations

De minimis monetary threshold to remove low risk entities
• Based on net interest expense of local group

Fixed ratio rule (FRR)
• Allows an entity to deduct net interest expense up to a benchmark net interest/EBITDA ratio. Relevant factors help a country set its benchmark ratio within a corridor of 10%-30%

Group ratio rule (GRR)
• Allows an entity to deduct net interest expense up to its group’s net interest/EBITDA ratio, where this is higher than the benchmark fixed ratio
• Carry forward of disallowed interest /unused interest capacity and/or carry back of disallowed interest
• Targeted rules to support general interest limitation rules and address specific risks
• Specific rules to address issues raised by the banking and insurance sectors

India adoption

Deduction
• Interest expense / similar consideration paid / payable to associated enterprise is restricted to 30% of its EBITDA

Coverage
• Indian company / PE of a foreign company in India, paying interest / similar consideration on any debt issued by a non-resident AE

Additional coverage
• Debt from third party lender deemed to be debt from AE where AE provides an implicit or explicit guarantee to the third party

Threshold
• Restriction applicable where interest paid to the AE exceeds INR 10 million pa

Carry forward
• Disallowed interest expense carried forward upto 8 years
# Action plan 4 - Limiting interest deductions

## India – Limit on interest deductions

**Illustration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBITDA</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interest expenditure (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In relation to AE (A1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In relation to other than AE (A2)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum interest deduction allowable (30% of EBITDA)(B)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest disallowed &amp; carried forward, (C) lower of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interest – 30% of EBITDA (A-B); or</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in relation to AE (A1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest allowed in computation of income* (A-C)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Presuming interest is deductible in computation of income chargeable to tax under the head ‘profits and gains from business and profession’
Action plan 4 - Limiting interest deductions

Global scenario – Steps taken by USA

The United States Treasury and the IRS have released final and temporary regulations under section 385 of the Internal Revenue Code that

(i) Impose contemporaneous documentation requirements that ordinarily must be satisfied in order for certain related-party debt by a US Corp to be treated as debt for tax purposes; and

(ii) Treat as equity certain related-party debt issued by US Corp that would otherwise be treated as debt for tax purposes.

The tax US reform template is expected to be released this week. The template will be called a consensus document that will lay out a clear tax reform framework.
Action plan 7

Avoidance of permanent establishment status
Action plan 7 - Avoidance of permanent establishment status

Review of definition of PE

**Illustrative list of impermissible ‘preparatory and auxiliary activities’ in Action plan 7 (Specific activity exemption)**

- Maintaining a large warehouse for storage and delivery of goods sold online and where large number of employees work in the warehouse and the warehouse is an important asset of the enterprise
- Premises used only for purchasing of goods by an enterprise where the overall activity of the enterprise comprises of selling these goods”
- Management office set up to manage the entire or part of an enterprise (e.g., all subsidiaries, branches, offices in a state)

**Anti-fragmentation rule**

- Hitherto, no remedy was available in existing Article 5 read with OECD Commentary to deal with cases where complementary functions were segregated among various related enterprises such that each place of business in isolation appeared to perform ‘preparatory and auxiliary activities’.
- To tackle the above situation, anti-fragmentation rule are proposed to be introduced to clarify that it is not possible to avoid PE status by fragmenting a cohesive operating business into several small operations in order to argue that each part is merely engaged in preparatory or auxiliary activities that benefit from the exceptions of Article 5(4).

Requires detailed analysis of activities undertaken by an organization to identify complementary functions that are part of a cohesive business operation
Action plan 7 - Avoidance of permanent establishment status

Illustration

Contracts negotiated in India but finalized in US

US is not a signatory to MLI

- Activities that would trigger a high risk to PE exposure (illustrative list):
  - Actively pursuing customers to solicit orders
  - Persuading/convincing customers to provide orders
  - Direct nexus between efforts and orders obtained
  - Oral contract (e.g., Acceptance of offer to enter into a contract with customers or holding out to have that authority (although contract may be signed outside India)

Intermediary HoldCo

Intermediary HoldCo is situated in country which is a signatory to MLI

Contracts negotiated in India but finalized by Intermediary HoldCo

Undertakes global sales and marketing services

Provides sales and marketing services
Action plan 7 - Avoidance of permanent establishment status

Impact analysis

**Business model**
- Permitted activities for a liaison office in India contained in FEMA regulations
- Ratio laid down in Court rulings* in relation to the issue of whether a liaison office in India constitutes a PE of the foreign enterprise in India

**Impact**
- Court rulings in the past have already held that if the LO is engaged in activities (e.g., Negotiating with customers, convincing, persuading etc.) it could result in creation of a PE in India
- Amendment in PE definition will now reinforce the ratio laid down in these rulings

---

**Business model**
- The typical business model for E-commerce companies is that customers purchase goods from an online portal.
- Stock of goods are stored at a large warehouse engaging significant personnel for storage and delivery of goods.
- Goods are delivered to customers pursuant to online sale of goods.

**Impact**
- Storage and delivery function may not qualify as ‘preparatory and auxiliary’
- Storage and delivery functions performed through the warehouse which represents an important asset and requires a large number of employees would be considered an essential part of enterprise’s sale and distribution business
- May also apply to non-online sales through warehouse
Action plan 7 - Avoidance of permanent establishment status

Impact analysis

**Business model**
- Fund managers are responsible for determining the securities/other investments that ensure the best return on investment for a fund.
- Stock brokers act on the instructions of the clients and enter into stock trades on their behalf.
- Several large investment fund houses engage closely related enterprises as brokers/fund managers.

**Impact**
- In case a closely related enterprise acts in the capacity of a fund manager of an investment fund in India, such activities may not qualify as preparatory and auxiliary activities.
- If the fund manager acting in the capacity of an agent of the enterprise concludes contracts or habitually plays the principal role in concluding contracts on behalf of the enterprise, an agency PE may be constituted.
- Presently, provisions of Act more beneficial ~ Fund managers do not constitute business connection in India (Section 9A).
- If an FPI has a related party broker/custodian in India which concludes contracts or habitually plays the principal role in concluding contracts on behalf of the enterprise, a dependent agency PE may be created.

**Business model**
Back-office support services (In-house for the foreign enterprise) business model

**Impact**
May be regarded as auxiliary activities (E.g. accounting, tax, HR functions, etc.) provided the anti-fragmentation rule does not apply.
Global scenario – Steps taken by United Kingdom

Action plan 7 - Avoidance of permanent establishment status

A key development in the UK is an anti-avoidance law called as diverted profits tax (DPT) which is levied at 25%.

The DPT applies in two distinct situations:

1) Where a foreign company has artificially avoided having a taxable presence (permanent establishment) in the UK; and/or

2) Where a group has a UK company (or UK PE of an overseas company) and there is a tax advantage as a result of an entity or transactions that lack economic substance.

Whilst DPT has been widely reported as targeting the digital sector it will, in fact, apply to a very wide range of transactions across all industry sectors.

As per HMRC guidance, DPT is not an income tax, capital gains tax or corporation tax and is intended to be a separate, standalone charge on diverted profits. Consequently, HMRC does not intend to cover DPT by double taxation treaties. From an Indian tax perspective, if DPT is not a tax covered by the India-UK tax treaty, it is questionable whether credit for the same would be available in India.

As per recent reports, HMRC has collected £ 281 mn under the DPT so far and intends to collect £ 1.8 bn by 2021.
Action plan 1

Equalization levy
In order to address the challenges in taxation of such digital transactions, India introduced a new levy called ‘Equalization Levy’ at the rate of 6% on gross consideration payable for a specified service.

**Applicability**

- The levy will be applicable on the payments received by a non-resident service provider from an Indian resident or an Indian Permanent Establishment (‘PE’) of a nonresident, in respect of the specified service. The levy is currently applicable only on B2B transactions, if the aggregate value of consideration in a year exceeds INR 100,000.
- Specified Service includes:
  1) Online advertisement; 2) Any provision for digital advertising space or facilities/ service for the purpose of online advertisement 3) Any other service which may be notified later.

**Other considerations**

- Commercial aspect such as who will bear the cost of this levy
- Practical challenges in deducting equalization levy while making payments online even if parties agree to deduction of equalization levy
- Recipient of income may not be able to claim credit of such levy in the home country
In order to address the challenges in taxation of digital transactions EU member states like France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Portugal, Romania and Slovenia have proposed to adopt ‘Equalization Levy’. However, Ireland, Luxembourg and Malta have strongly opposed to such levy.

Tax law changes require unanimous support from all EU member states. With strong opposition from several countries, unanimous support appears unlikely to be achieved.

On 21 September 2017, European Commission released a paper regarding the options for taxing the digital economy.

**Long term solutions proposed**
- Expansion of PE concept to include a digital presence, plus an arrangement to the PE profit attribution rules
- CCCTB (Common consolidated corporate tax base)

**Short term solutions proposed**
- Equalization tax on turnover of digitalized companies
- Withholding tax on digital transactions
- Levy on revenues generated from the provision of digital services or advertising activity
Action plan 8-10
Aligning transfer pricing outcomes with value creation
Action plan 8-10 - TP aspects of intangibles

India Overview

**BEPS Definition**
“Something which is not a physical asset or a financial asset, and which is capable of being owned or controlled for use in commercial activities and whose use or transfer would be compensated had it occurred in a transaction between independent parties in comparable circumstances.”

### Issues impacting India

- Research, development, and process improvement arrangements
- Development and enhancement of marketing intangibles
- Location specific advantages, local market features, workforce, etc. considered as intangibles by Indian tax authorities
For intangibles, legal ownership alone does not necessarily generate a right to all (or indeed any) of the return generated by the intangibles’ exploitation.

- **Steps in determining intangible returns**
  - Identify legal owner
  - Identify party performing important functions
  - Confirm conduct of the parties consistent with contracts
  - Identify the controlled transaction related to the key functions
  - Determine the arm’s length price for the key functions

- **Functions**
  - Design and control of research and marketing programs
  - Enhancement and management/control of budgets
  - Control over strategic decisions over intangible development
  - Important decisions regarding defense and protection
  - Adoption and exploitation of the intangibles
Action plan 8-10 - TP aspects of intangibles
BEPS recommendations aligned to existing Indian guidance

Several aspects of the BEPS guidance are in line with view of the Indian tax authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEPS</th>
<th>India- CBDT Circular No. 6/ 2013 (‘Circular’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contracts are the starting point of the analysis, however, conduct of the parties are the ultimate determinants</td>
<td>• Circular Classifies R&amp;D centres of overseas MNEs into three broad categories based on functions, assets and risk assumed by the centre established in India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on functions, risks and costs</td>
<td>• Guidelines laid down to identify the R&amp;D centres as a contract R&amp;D service provider assuming insignificant risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fact specific analysis to be done while examining the DEMPE functions</td>
<td>• Emphasis on the functions/conduct of parties rather than the contractual arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The alignment of functional contributions and financial investment with legal rights</td>
<td>• Emphasis on nature and quantum of risk borne by R&amp;D centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct exercise of all important functions and control over service providers performing outsourced activities</td>
<td>• Alignment of functional contributions and financial investment with legal rights recommended by circular as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding and intangibles - Cashbox - India impact

**BEPS**
- Affirmation that capital-rich entities without relevant economic activities ("cash boxes") will not be entitled to any excess profits
- Three scenarios possible:
  - No management of funding risk: entitlement to no more than risk-free return
  - Management of funding risk: entitlement to risk adjusted return
  - Management of funding risk and operational risk: not a cash box!

**India Impact**
- Investment in India through “cash boxes” may trigger non cost-plus outcomes
- Indian offshore subsidiary performs and controls all DEMPE functions including risk management
- From the routine return currently received by Indian subsidiary, they would now be entitled to a significant allocation of profits
- Guidance akin to Circular No. 6/2013
BEPS definition of low value-adding services quite broad

**What are “low value-adding”**
Accounting and auditing, accounts receivable / payable, human resources, legal, tax

**What are not “low value-adding”**
R&D, manufacturing, sales, marketing, distribution, corporate senior management

BEPS definition of low value-adding services may cover within its scope, most of services provided by Indian subsidiaries or shared service centres

New OECD guidance prescribes mark-up of 5% for such services
- Not in line with comparable reality

Indian Authorities had communicated that they would not be adopting the simplified approach for low value-add services in its current form

Recently revised Indian safe harbour rules specify a mark-up of 5% for the transaction of receipt of **low value-adding** services by the Indian entity – broadly aligned with the OECD guidance

In light of the new development, still to be seen whether the Indian Authorities continue their position of non-adoption of the simplified approach for **provision of low value-adding services** by the Indian entity
Action plan 8-10 - Location savings

**OECD guidance**
- Comparables provide the best evidence of location saving

**India’s historical perspective**
- Mere comparability may not consider the benefit of location savings. Need to take into account the cost difference in the low cost country and in the high cost country from where the business activity was relocated

**India’s evolving perspective**
- The revised India chapter of the proposed UN TP Manual states that compensation for location savings is in-built in the arm’s length price determined based on availability of good local comparables

**OECD guidance on workforce in place**
- Not an intangible since work force cannot be owned or controlled by a single enterprise

**India perspective on workforce in place**
- Trained and organized work force is an intangible. Also included in the definition of intangible
Action plan 13
Three tier transfer pricing documentation
Action plan 13 – Three tier transfer pricing documentation
Enhancing transparency and disclosure – mandating alignment with all Action Plans

Master File

MNEs are required to provide the tax administration with high level information regarding their global business operations and transfer pricing policies

Country-by-Country Report

The CbC report sets out for each jurisdiction, specified data pertaining to revenue, income, taxes, number of employees, capital and tangible assets

Local File

MNEs are required to maintain a detailed transactional transfer pricing documentation specific to each country and company’s transfer pricing determination

These three together will warrant taxpayers to articulate consistent policies and positions and will provide tax administrations with useful information to assess BEPS risks
### Action plan 13 – Three tier transfer pricing documentation

Contents of Country by Country report - Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3

**Table 1: Information included in CbC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(related, unrelated, total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income tax paid</td>
<td>(cash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit/loss before income tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income tax accrued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>other than cash and cash equivalents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Information included in CbC – for each tax jurisdiction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Jurisdiction of organization or incorporation if different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main business activity of each of the entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main business activity(ies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Holding or managing intellectual property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purchasing or procurement, Manufacturing or production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sales, marketing or distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of services to unrelated parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internal financial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Holding shares or equity instruments, Dormant, Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:**

To include any further brief information or explanation that taxpayer may consider necessary or that would facilitate the understanding of the compulsory information provided in the CbC Report.
Action plan 13 – Three tier transfer pricing documentation
Master File - Contents

- **Organizational Chart**
  - Legal and ownership structure and geographical location of operating entities.

- **Description of Company’s Business**
  - Drivers of business profit
  - Supply chain chart for the five largest products and service offerings plus other products or services amounting to more than 5% of MNE Group’s sales
  - Information regarding important service agreements
  - FAR Analysis, describing principal contributing to value creation
  - Business restructuring, acquisitions

- **Company’s Intangible**
  - List of important of intangibles and agreements with AEs
  - MNE Group’s strategy for the development, ownership and exploitation of intangibles, including location of principal R&D facilities and location of R&D management.
  - Transfer Pricing policy description of important transfers of interest in intangibles

- **Inter-Company Financial Instruments**
  - Details of financial arrangements of MNE group
  - Information pertaining to central financing function undertaken for the group and the place of effective management of such entities

- **Financial & Tax Positions**
  - MNE Group’s annual consolidated financial statement
  - Information on unilateral APAs and other tax rulings relating to allocation of income among countries
Action plan 13 – Three tier transfer pricing documentation

Documentation requirements introduced in India

Master file

- Finance Act 2017 has introduced the concept to maintain Master File
- Rules for maintaining and furnishing Master File are expected soon
- Penalty for non-furnishing of prescribed information and document is ₹ 500,000
- No threshold prescribed as yet, Master File requirements in India may be independent of CbC reporting requirement

CbC Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filing CbC report in India or notification of parent entity</td>
<td>MNE group having consolidated revenue exceeding € 750 million (in line with BEPS)</td>
<td>CbC report to be filed in prescribed format on or before due date of filing return of income i.e. 30 November following the end of the Financial Year</td>
<td>Graded penalty structure from ₹ 5,000 to ₹ 50,000 per day for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective from Financial Year 2016-17</td>
<td>Threshold in Indian currency – to be computed based on exchange rate as on the last day of previous year. E.g. threshold for FY 2016-17 - ₹5,562 crores</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-furnishing of CbC report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non submission of required information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Penalty of ₹ 500,000 for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishing of inaccurate particulars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-furnishing of master file data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local file

- Existing local transfer pricing documentation requirements retained
- Possibility of further alignment with BEPS Action 13 resulting in additional disclosures
Action plan 13 – Three tier transfer pricing documentation
CbC reporting requirements in India

Indian parent of an international group:
• Report to be filed on or before the due date of filing return of income

Indian entity of a foreign MNE group:
• File the CbC report in India, if the parent is resident in a:
  – country with which India will not have an arrangement for exchange of CbC report; or
  – country which fails to automatically exchange such information and such failure is intimated to
    the Indian entity
• File CbC notification providing the details of the country of residence of its parent or alternate
  reporting entity – manner, form, date to be prescribed

Indian entity appointed as the alternate reporting entity of the Group:
• File the CbC report on or before due date of filing return of income
Action plan 13 – Transfer pricing documentation
CbC reporting obligation for Indian constituent entities of a foreign parent

Indian CbCR regulations

- Section 286(4) requires the Indian constituent entity, having a foreign parent, to furnish the CbC report in India, if there is no exchange of information agreement with the parent jurisdiction.
- The term ‘agreement’ referred to in Section 286(4) is defined as an agreement referred to in section 90 (1) or section 90A(1) or any agreement as may be notified by the Central Government i.e. DTAA.

Key issue under consideration

- Whether the Indian constituent entity of a foreign parent company/foreign alternate reporting entity would be required to file the CbC report in India even though there is an exchange of information clause in their respective DTAA with India.

Key consideration factors

- Technical interpretation of the definition of ‘agreement’ v. the intent automatic exchange of CbC information.
- Indian entity required to file the CbC report in India in the absence of an agreement for exchange of CbC information between India and the other jurisdiction?
Questions
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