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Overview

• Background
• Australia’s Multinational Anti-Avoidance Law
• Commissionnaire Arrangements and Similar Strategies
• Artificial avoidance of PE status through the specific activity exemptions
• Fragmentation
• Splitting-up of contracts
• Insurance
• Profit attribution
• Action 7: Develop changes to the definition of PE to prevent the artificial avoidance of PE status in relation to BEPS, including through the use of commissionnaire arrangements and the specific activity exemptions. Work on these issues will also address related profit attribution issues.

• October 31, 2014: First discussion draft on Action 7, describing PE avoidance strategies and alternative options to address them.

• 21 January, 2015: Public consultation
• Released 15 May 2015
• Narrows down from multiple options to a single proposal for addressing each PE avoidance strategy previously identified
• Comments due by 12 June 2015
• Those comments will be taken into account by Working Party 1 in its 22-26 June meeting so that proposed changes to the OECD Model Tax Convention can be finalized
Australia’s Multinational Anti-Avoidance Law
Opposition’s policy position

Senate Inquiry

Polling, correspondence and media

2015-16 Budget Multinational Tax Package

Global tax schemes exposed

Future Fund, Australian companies in leaked PwC deals — Luxembourg ‘clips ticket’ — ATO probe

IKEA’s design for big profits and little tax

By operating two independent entities, the Swedish group can charge itself for its

declared profit...
Methods of multinational tax avoidance

**Problem**
- Inflated interest deductions
  - Rigorous thin cap rules restrict interest deductions (tightened in 2014)
  - No action required
    - *Being considered by OECD Action Item 4*

**Action**
- Avoiding a taxable presence (30 companies under suspicion)
  - **Multinational Anti-Avoidance Law**
    - addresses cases of no or low tax
    - consistent with OECD direction
  - **OECD Action Item 7**
    - Change treaty rules to redefine a taxable presence
    - Further consultation, including with UK

**Australia’s future action**
- Inflated transfer pricing
  - World best practice transfer pricing rules (updated in 2013)
  - ATO audits
  - **OECD Action Items 8-10**
    - Tighten transfer pricing rules
    - Further consultation, including with UK
Application of the Multinational Anti-Avoidance Law

**Foreign company**
- Foreign multinational supplies goods or services to Australians?  
  - No → Aus taxpayers not caught
  - Yes →

**Large**
- Global revenue over $1 billion?  
  - No → SMEs not caught
  - Yes →

**$$ booked offshore from Aus activities**
- Is the foreign multinational booking the revenue from Australian sales offshore?  
  - No → $$ booked in Aus not caught
  - Yes + Are activities undertaken in Australia by an associate of the multinational that are integral to the supply of goods or services?  
  - No → Minor Aus activities = not caught
  - Yes →

**Profit ends up in a tax haven**
- Is Australian sales revenue channelled to tax havens?  
  - No → Multinationals not using tax havens not caught
  - Yes →

**Tax avoidance purpose**
- Was a principal purpose of the scheme to avoid a taxable presence in Australia?  
  - No → Schemes without a tax purpose not caught
  - Yes →

**Result**
- Income tax on profit
- Withholding tax on royalties and interest
- Interest on unpaid taxes
- Penalties
Core policy: where an intermediary exercises activities in a country that are intended to result in the regular conclusion of contracts to be performed by a foreign enterprise, that enterprise should be considered to have a PE unless the intermediary is acting in the course of an independent business.

Original draft put forward four alternative options (A, B, C & D) intended to reflect that policy without allowing avoidance strategies.

Comments expressed a number of concerns about all of the options, but the majority of those that expressed a preference for one option chose option B.

Revised discussion draft included a proposal based on option B.
• Changes proposed to paragraph 5 of Article 5:
  • Apply where a person “concludes contracts, or negotiates the material elements of contracts”
  • Supplement the phrase “contracts in the name of the enterprise” with contracts for transfer of ownership or granting of right to use property owned by the enterprise or for provision of services by that enterprise; and
Changes proposed to paragraph 6 of Article 5:
- Modifying the “independent agent” exception in Art. 5(6) so that it is not available to agents that act exclusively or almost exclusively for connected enterprises.
- This was narrowed from the previous discussion draft to:
  - Limit application to agents acting for “connected” enterprises (rather than the broader category of associated enterprises); and
  - Avoid automatically excluding an unrelated agent acting exclusively for a single unrelated enterprise.
Artificial avoidance of PE status through the specific activity exemptions

- The previous discussion draft identified four issues with the list of exceptions under Article 5(4) that were seen as potentially raising BEPS concerns:
  - The fact that the exceptions are not restricted to preparatory or auxiliary activities
  - The reference to “delivery” in subparagraphs a) and b) of paragraph 4
  - The exception for purchasing goods or merchandise or collecting information
  - The fragmentation of activities between related parties
- Four options were proposed, which ranged from deleting references to specific activities to making all exemptions subject to the condition that the activity be preparatory or auxiliary
Artificial avoidance of PE status through the specific activity exemptions

• Business comments indicated strong objections to all four options
• Of the four, option E, which made all exemptions subject to the condition that the activity be preparatory or auxiliary, was considered least objectionable
• Comments noted, however, that the phrase “preparatory or auxiliary” was uncertain, and asked for additional guidance
• Comments also suggested that the changes would create PEs with very little attributable profit
Artificial avoidance of PE status through the specific activity exemptions

• The revised discussion draft proposes original Option E, accompanied by commentary intended to provide additional detail about what the phrase “preparatory or auxiliary” means
Fragmentation of activities between related parties

- Paragraph 27.1 of existing Commentary on Article 5 concludes that an enterprise cannot fragment a cohesive business into several small operations in order to claim that each is engaged only in prep/aux activity.

- An issue arises as to whether this rule should be limited to fragmentation within a single entity, or whether it should extend to cases where places of business belong to related parties.
Fragmentation of activities between related parties

• The October 2014 discussion draft proposed two alternative rules to take into account activities of related parties for purposes of applying Art. 5(4):
  • Option I: applying only to situations in which one of the enterprises maintains a fixed place of business that would constitute a PE;
  • Option J: applies where the combination of activities of the related entities goes beyond preparatory or auxiliary, even where no single entity would have a PE based on its activities
Fragmentation of activities between related parties

• Comments generally expressed strong objections to both options based on:
  • Uncertainty of language
  • Concern that the approach would undermine the separate entity principle
  • Risks of double taxation due to multitude of new PEs
Fragmentation of activities between related parties

- Revised discussion draft retains a modified version of Option I, proposing that 5(4) will not apply to a place of business if:
  - the same enterprise or a connected enterprise carries on business activities at the same place or another place in the same State; and
  - the activities exercised at these places:
    - constitute “complementary functions that are part of a cohesive business operation”; and
    - go beyond the “preparatory or auxiliary” threshold
- New commentary provisions would be added to clarify the meaning of “complementary functions that are part of a cohesive business operation.”
Splitting-up of Contracts

• Splitting up contracts to abuse the exception in paragraph 3 of Article 5 is discussed in paragraph 18 of the Commentary to Article 5.

• The October 2014 discussion draft suggested two options to address this issue, either through a mechanical rule or through the “principal purpose test” proposed under Action 6.
Splitting-up of Contracts

• Comments objected to both options proposed, but expressed a preference for addressing through the PPT rule

• The revised discussion draft proposes no changes to Article 5, but includes a proposal to add a new example to the Commentary on the PPT addressing splitting-up of contracts.
October 2014 discussion draft included two options aimed at situations in which a foreign insurance company does large-scale business in a State without a PE

- The first option was to adopt a provision similar to Article 5(6) of the U.N. Model providing for a PE if an enterprise collects premiums or insures risks through a person other than an independent agent.
- The second was to rely on general changes proposed to Article 5(5) and (6) to deal with commissionaire arrangements and similar strategies.

Following consultation, the revised discussion draft concludes that no specific rule for insurance enterprises should be added to Article 5
• Action 7 provides that work “will also address related profit attribution issues”

• The October 2014 discussion draft stated that while preliminary work had identified some areas in which additions/clarifications would be useful, it had not identified substantial changes that would need to be made to existing rules and guidance if the proposed changes were adopted.

• It acknowledged, however, that work on other parts of the BEPS Action Plan might involve reconsideration of some aspects of existing rules and guidance
A large number of comments focused on attribution of profits, and many comments indicated that more work should be done.

Comments noted that there were multiple different interpretations, as many countries had not adopted the AOA.

Some comments suggested as well that there was inadequate guidance on profit attribution outside the financial services sector.
• Revised discussion draft acknowledges the need for additional guidance on profit attribution, but notes that this cannot realistically be undertaken before the work on Action 7 and Actions 8-10 have been completed.

• Follow-up work will therefore be carried on after September 2015, with a view to providing guidance before end 2016, in advance of deadline for completion of the multilateral instrument that would implement the results of the work on Action 7.