



International Tax

OECD Tax Alert

8 July 2016

Discussion draft issued on attribution of profits to PEs

Contacts

Alison Lobb
alobb@deloitte.co.uk

Bill Dodwell
bdodwell@deloitte.co.uk

Lisa Shipley
lshipley@deloitte.co.uk

On 4 July 2016, the OECD released a discussion draft on the attribution of profits to permanent establishments (PEs) (as well as a discussion draft on revised guidance on profit splits; for additional coverage, see the [alert dated 8 July 2016](#)). The draft on the attribution of profits to PEs follows the work previously undertaken by the G20/OECD in relation to preventing the artificial avoidance of PE status (action 7 of the G20/OECD BEPS action plan). It does not reflect, at this stage, a consensus position of the governments involved, but is designed to provide substantive proposals for public review and comment.

Comments

As expected, the discussion draft draws on the existing guidance set out in the OECD's 2010 *Report on the Attribution of Profits to Permanent Establishments*. The key building blocks of the 2010 report are: (1) that a PE should be treated as if it were distinct and separate from its overseas head office; and (2) that assets and risks should be attributed to the PE or the head office in line with the location of "significant people functions."

This approach is based on the adoption of the 2010 version of the business profits article (article 7) of the OECD model tax treaty. However, not all countries have adopted the principles of the new version of article 7 and the associated 2010 report. Particular concerns relate to the recognition of "dealings" for the use or transfer of intangibles, or rights in intangibles, between a head office and a PE that would require a country to take account of "notional" payments. Since countries are not starting from a common approach to the attribution of profits to PEs, the discussion draft requests comments on other approaches that may be applied to each of the scenarios set out in the draft.

The draft includes factual examples and focuses on the changes to the threshold for PEs concerning dependent agents and warehouses. The examples illustrate the effect of changes in the facts of each case,

particularly in relation to the location of significant people functions. The examples are helpfully supported by numerical calculations proposing the profits attributable to the PEs, the head offices and other group companies. However, the examples are limited to a small number of fact patterns and it would be helpful if these were expanded. Useful additions would include examples involving toll manufacturing, ownership of stock by a nonresident stored in a third party's or other group company's warehouse and multi-year scenarios where significant people functions vary between the head office and PE.

One example that is provided illustrates a case where there is no additional profit to be taxed in a newly-created PE. It is important that participating countries consider simplification measures to minimize the compliance burden that would arise from separate filing of a nil PE tax return. In addition, it will be necessary to eliminate any double taxation. Double taxation could arise not only where the tax authorities in different countries do not share the same view of the profits attributable to a PE, but also within a country if the same profits are taxed in the dependent agent and in the PE (e.g. if transfer pricing rules and attribution of profits to PEs are not aligned).

Background

The final report on action 7 of the BEPS project (*Preventing the Artificial Avoidance of Permanent Establishment Status*) was published on 5 October 2015 and included the following:

- Changes to the rules on deemed PEs created by dependent agents, addressing *commissionnaire* and other undisclosed agent arrangements;
- Changes to the exceptions from creating a fixed place of business PE for specific activities (such as maintenance of stocks of goods for storage, display, delivery or processing, purchasing or the collection of information) so that these will apply only where the activity in question is preparatory or auxiliary in relation to the business as a whole; and
- An anti-fragmentation rule that removes exceptions (including those for preparatory or auxiliary activities) in circumstances where activities in a country are carried out by different group companies, where the activities are part of a "cohesive business operation" and not, in the aggregate, preparatory or auxiliary.

These changes will be made to article 5 of the OECD model treaty concerning the threshold for creation of a PE, and subsequently will be incorporated into the BEPS multilateral instrument and bilateral tax treaties. The final report on action 7 mandates follow-up work to develop additional guidance to:

- Apply the rules for the attribution of profit to PEs (under the business profits article (article 7) of the OECD model treaty) to PEs resulting from the threshold changes under BEPS; and

- Take account of the results of the work on other parts of the BEPS action plan dealing with transfer pricing, in particular, with respect to intangibles, risk and capital.

Overview of discussion draft

The discussion draft sets out proposed guidance concerning the attribution of profits to PEs in two areas:

- Dependent agent PEs, including those created through *commissionnaire* and similar arrangements; and
- Warehouse operations that are no longer exempted from being fixed place of business PEs by virtue of their specific activities.

The discussion draft sets out a number of proposals and, in particular, numerical examples, for public comment, although it stresses that these cannot be relied upon until the G20/OECD and other participating countries' work is finalized.

Although the BEPS changes lower the threshold for when a PE arises, the discussion draft notes that the nature of the PE (or deemed PE) has not changed and, therefore, any guidance on how to attribute profits should be applicable to a PE both before and after the BEPS recommendations have been implemented. The draft refers to the "Authorised OECD Approach" (AOA) to attributing profits, as set out in the OECD's 2010 *Report on the Attribution of Profits to Permanent Establishments*.

Dependent agent PEs

The discussion draft sets out four similar examples and an analysis of how profits should be allocated by considering article 5 (PEs), article 7 (business profits) and article 9 (associated enterprises) of the OECD model tax treaty. The varying factor in the examples is the extent to which there is a significant people function in the country with the PE. Profits are attributed to the location of functions, and assets and risks attributed to the significant people functions that perform significant functions in respect of assets and control the risks. It is recognized that the additional profit allocated to a PE created under the revised threshold may be very small or nil (illustrated in Example 1).

The discussion draft notes that, in some circumstances, the source country may have taxing rights over two different legal entities: the dependent agent, if it is a resident of the PE jurisdiction, and the PE of a nonresident company created by the presence of the dependent agent. The examples provide illustrations of such cases, and the determination of the profits of the dependent agent and the PE. The discussion draft proposes that it would be most efficient to apply transfer pricing rules (if applicable) to transactions between the nonresident company and the resident dependent agent first, before moving to an analysis of the profit to be attributed to the PE of the nonresident.

Example 1: The nonresident company acting as a principal engages an associated company resident in the source country to perform activities that give rise to a dependent agent PE. This example sets out the attribution of profits to the PE under the principles of the AOA alongside the transfer pricing analysis. There are no profits to be attributed to the PE since there are no significant people functions performed in the country of the dependent agent.

Example 2: The transfer pricing analysis results in the allocation of risk to the party that has control over risk and the financial capacity to assume the risk (rather than the party contractually assuming the risk). The impact of this on the profit attribution to the PE is explored. Significant people functions are performed by the dependent agent that result in the attribution of risks and economic ownership of assets to the PE, in line with the assumption of risk under transfer pricing.

Example 3: A nonresident company sends an employee to the source country to perform activities that give rise to a dependent agent PE. There are significant people functions performed by the employee and attributable to the PE that result in the attribution to it of the inventory and receivables risks and the economic ownership of assets. Accordingly, there are profits attributable to the PE over and above the salary paid to the employee.

Example 4: Activities related to the provision of credit to customers are performed by both the dependent agent and the nonresident company. This illustrates the consequences for the attribution of profits to the PE resulting from the attribution of risk for the PE and the allocation of risk under transfer pricing principles.

Warehouses as fixed place of business PEs

Examples are provided where the level of significant people functions in the country of the PE increases along with the level of profit attributed. The profits in the PE also reflect the reward for economic ownership of assets. The examples cover A) warehousing as a core business (i.e. providing warehouse capacity and associated services to third parties); B) the use of warehouses by a nonresident company on its own behalf; and C) where the warehouse owned by the nonresident is managed by a separate resident group company.

Example 5A: The profits in the PE reflect the reward for the economic ownership of the warehouse and the routine functions performed at the warehouse, since all the significant people functions and related risk are performed by the head office.

Example 5B: The profits in the PE reflect the reward for the economic ownership of the warehouse and the routine functions performed at the warehouse, since all the significant people functions in relation to the business and related risks are performed by the head office. The example attributes to the PE profits commensurate with investment in the asset, taking into account costs of funding and investment advice, as well as the performance of the warehouse functions.

Example 5C: Based on the facts, only the reward for economic ownership of the warehouse is attributable to the PE. Additional functions and the assumption of risk by the separate warehouse company do not affect the profits attributed to the PE.

Mechanisms for coordination and avoidance of double taxation

Comments are invited as to whether there are mechanisms that could ensure additional coordination of the application of transfer pricing and the rules for PEs without providing opportunities for the re-emergence of BEPS risks that the changes were designed to reduce.

The discussion draft notes that this is important where (i) countries do not coordinate the changes to transfer pricing with rules on PEs that may lead to double taxation; and (ii) where the existence of a dependent agent PE may arise even when there are no attributable profits (with resulting filing requirements and potentially other tax liabilities).

Next steps

Comments are invited by 5 September 2016 and a public consultation will be held on 11-12 October 2016 at the OECD in Paris.

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee (“DTTL”), its network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL (also referred to as “Deloitte Global”) does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms.

Deloitte provides audit, consulting, financial advisory, risk management, tax and related services to public and private clients spanning multiple industries. Deloitte serves four out of five Fortune Global 500[®] companies through a globally connected network of member firms in more than 150 countries and territories bringing world-class capabilities, insights, and high-quality service to address clients’ most complex business challenges. To learn more about how Deloitte’s approximately 225,000 professionals make an impact that matters, please connect with us on [Facebook](#), [LinkedIn](#), or [Twitter](#).

This communication 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 communication, 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 communication.

© 2016. For information, contact Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited.