

Further scrutiny on intra-group outbound payments under way

March 2015
Issue 11

In brief

On March 18, 2015, the State Administration of Taxation (SAT) released the *Public Notice Regarding Certain Corporate Income Tax Matters on Outbound Payments to Overseas Related Parties* (SAT Public Notice [2015] No.16, hereinafter referred to as the “Public Notice 16”) as well as its official Interpretation (hereinafter referred to as the “SAT’s Interpretation”)¹. Public Notice 16, together with the SAT’s Interpretation, further set out SAT’s position from a transfer pricing perspective in relation to the outbound payments. Compared to Circular 146, Public Notice 16 deals with all types of outbound payments to overseas related parties, rather than focusing on outbound service fee and royalty fee payments. Public Notice 16 reiterates that outbound payments to overseas related parties should follow the arm’s length principle, and more importantly, specifies four types of payments that should not be deductible for corporate income tax (CIT) purpose. It is considered that Public Notice 16 is SAT’s another important enforcement in response to the action plan on base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS).

In detail

Background

In March 2014, in response to United Nations’ (UN) request for comments on intra-group services and management fees, the SAT submitted an official Response to express its views. In the Response, the SAT reaffirmed its stance that service fees paid and received by related parties must be in compliance with the arm’s length principle. In regards to management fees, the SAT stated that these expenses, in general, related to shareholder activities and therefore shall not be deductible for CIT purposes.² Later on, the SAT released the *Notice of Anti-Avoidance Examination on Significant Outbound Payments* (Shuizongbanfa [2014] No.146, hereinafter referred to as the

“Circular 146”), which requested local-level tax bureaus to launch comprehensive tax examinations on taxpayers with significant outbound service fee and royalty fee payments to overseas related parties³, and submit the investigation reports to the SAT⁴. Public Notice 16 is the culmination of the SAT’s views towards intra-group outbound payments as stated in the Response to the UN, and provides guidance to the local-level tax authorities for scrutinizing the intra-group payments made by the Chinese enterprises. The issuance of Public Notice 16 makes “outbound payment to overseas related parties” back to the spotlight.

While Circular 146 illustrates SAT’s nation-wide tax examination on significant outbound payments to overseas related parties in a BEPS context, it is considered that Public Notice 16 depicts the SAT’s further guidelines on the local-level tax authorities’ administration on the various types of outbound payments to overseas related parties.

Arm’s length principle and authenticity test

Public Notice 16 states that taxpayers must comply with the arm’s length principle when making payments to its overseas related parties. Taxpayers shall provide relevant documentation upon request, such as intercompany agreements, documentation that verifies the authenticity as well as the arm’s length nature of the transactions.

The SAT’s Interpretation further states that:

“Outbound payments by an enterprise to its overseas related parties should be regarded as the enterprise’s normal business operation, and could be paid without the tax authority’s approval. However, for the purpose of examining the arm’s length principle of the outbound payments, the in-charge tax authority may require an enterprise making

outbound payments to overseas related parties to provide contracts or agreements concluded with its overseas related party, and relevant documentation which can verify the authenticity of the transaction and prove that the transaction complies with the arm's length principle within the certain period. If outbound payments by an enterprise to its overseas related party are not in compliance with the arm's length principle, the tax authorities are empowered to make special tax adjustments."

Article 7 of Public Notice 16 reconfirms China's existing legal framework for the 10 year statute of limitations for special tax adjustments, which include transfer pricing matters.

Four types of payments which are not deductible for CIT purpose

Article 3: Unqualified overseas related parties - not deductible

Article 3 of Public Notice 16 states that *"payments to an overseas related party which does not undertake functions, bear risks or has no substantial operation or activities shall not be deductible for CIT purpose."* However, neither Public Notice 16 nor the SAT's Interpretation gives clear instructions to local tax authorities about how to determine this issue. For example, whether an overseas related party that only functions as a clearing centre for intercompany payments between group companies will be captured under Article 3 is unclear. Different outcomes may arise depending on whether a holistic or narrow view of the arrangements is adopted.

Article 4: Unqualified service fee - not deductible

According to Public Notice 16 and SAT's Interpretation, taxpayers should receive services that enable them to obtain direct or indirect economic benefits in return for service fees paid to overseas related parties. Expenses related to the beneficial services received by the enterprise can be paid based on the arm's length principles and payments for non-beneficial services are not deductible for CIT purpose.

Article 4 outlines the situations where service fee payments to overseas related parties in compensation for the following services would not be deductible for CIT purpose:

- i) *Services that are unrelated to the functions and risks borne by the enterprise or operation of the enterprise.*

Insights on what this situation may entail can be gained from reference to Circular 146 (e.g. suspicious service payments)⁵ or the SAT's official Response to the UN (e.g. necessity test). For example, various advisory and legal services provided by a parent company may indeed confer some benefit to a manufacturing subsidiary in China. However, these high-end services may not be needed from the perspective of the subsidiary given its functions and a cost-benefit analysis.

- ii) *Intra-group services relating to the protection of the investment interests of the direct or indirect investor of the Enterprise, including control, management, supervising activities for the Enterprise.*

This situation mainly focuses on shareholder activities based on explanations in the SAT's official Response to the UN⁶ and Circular 146⁷.

- iii) *Intra-group services that have already been purchased from a third party or have been undertaken by the Enterprise itself.*

This situation refers to duplicative activities which are also covered under Circular 146 and in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations (OECD TP Guidelines). However, the OECD TP Guidelines also provide two exceptions when determining if a service is duplicative. It is uncertain whether China tax authorities will accept the exceptions described in the OECD TP Guidelines when they are determining whether a service provided to the taxpayer is duplicative or not.

- iv) *Services where the Enterprise obtains additional benefits solely for being part of a corporate group, and the enterprise has not received any specific services from related party within the group.*

This situation is similar to the concept of "incidental benefits"⁸

and "passive association"⁹ discussed in the OECD TP Guidelines. How and when the China tax authorities determine that this situation arises will be of interest, as it is the first time that this language has appeared on any official China tax legislation or guidance. It is uncertain how the China tax authorities will interpret this Article in practice.

- v) *Services that have been remunerated through payments for other related party transactions.*

This situation refers to the remuneration test which is consistent with the provisions set in Circular 146.

- vi) *Other services that have not provided the enterprise with any direct or indirect economic benefits.*

This situation can be regarded as a "catch all" clause to capture all the other situations where service fee payments may have been made for non-beneficial services and which would not be deductible for CIT purpose.

Article 5: Royalties paid to an overseas related party which only owns the legal rights of the intangible asset but having no contribution to its value creation, not in compliance with the arm's length principle - not deductible

Article 5 of Public Notice 16 states that:

"For royalties in compensation for usage of intangible assets provided by an overseas related party, the contribution of each party to the value creation of the intangible assets should be considered to determine the economic benefits that each party is entitled to. Royalties paid to an overseas related party which only owns the legal rights of the intangible asset but having no contribution to its value creation, not in compliance with the arm's length principle, is not deductible for CIT purpose."

According to the SAT's Interpretation of this article:

"Enterprises, who are required to make royalty payments about technology, brand and other intangible assets, they should analyse each party's functions performed,

assets employed and risks assumed in the intangible assets development, enhancement, maintenance, protection, application and promotion to decide the contributions made by each party to the value creation of the intangible assets, to further confirm the economic benefits that each party is entitled to. Furthermore, complying with the arm's length principle, whether it is necessary to make royalty payments to overseas related parties and the amount of payments would be ascertained. Royalties paid to an overseas related party which only owns the legal rights of the intangible asset but having no contribution to its value creation, not in compliance with the arm's length principle, is not deductible for CIT purpose. For example, the domestic real estate enterprise utilizes overseas related party's brand or trademark for real estate development, if the brand or trademark is gradually being recognized during the domestic real estate development process and being promoted and maintained by the domestic enterprise to realize the brand valuation, the royalties paid should be regarded as not in compliance with the arm's length principle, and therefore, the payment is not deductible for CIT purpose."

We believe that Article 5 of Public Notice 16 directly echoes the BEPS Action 8: Guidance on Transfer Pricing Aspects of Intangibles released in 2014. With respect to the royalty transactions, Public Notice 16 requires taxpayers to analyse each party's functions performed, assets employed and risks assumed in the intangible assets development, enhancement, maintenance, protection, application and promotion, which is consistent with the descriptions relating to "transactions involving the development, enhancement, maintenance, protection and exploitation intangibles" in BEPS Action 8. It should be pointed out that the OECD's framework for intangibles under BEPS Action 8 allows scope for a legal owner to charge fees to the licensee based on legal or contractual rights. However, Public Notice 16 reveals SAT's stricter attitudes towards this issue: royalties paid to an overseas related party who is only the legal owner of the intangible asset but has no contribution to its value creation (i.e. not an economic owner), might not be deductible for CIT purpose. We have observed that in practice, some multinational

corporations may have sub-license or multi-license arrangements to use certain intangible assets. For example, a MNC group headquarter may license the intangible to its group member, Company A, and Company A will further license the intangible to other group subsidiaries. After Company A receives the royalty payments from related parties, it will transfer the payment to the headquarters. Based on this situation, it is uncertain whether the tax authorities will consider such an arrangement to fall directly under Article 5 and disallow the royalty payments from Company A, being not deductible for CIT purpose.

It is challenging to evaluate the contributions of each party to the value creation of the intangible assets. Public Notice 16 does not provide clear guidance about the contribution analysis. However, without any doubt, outbound payments to overseas related parties who only own the legal rights of intangible assets, and are located in tax havens or low tax jurisdictions, will very likely be targets of tax investigations and audits in the future. Public Notice 16 requires the analysis of contributions made by each party to the value creation of the intangible assets, which indirectly reveals that the tax authorities will apply the Profit Split Method more frequently in conducting transfer pricing evaluation in the future.

Article 6: Royalties paid to an overseas related party in compensation for incidental benefits arising from the financing or listing activities - not deductible

Article 6 of Public Notice 16 states that:

"Where a holding or financing company is established offshore for the main purpose of financing or listing, royalties paid to an overseas related party in compensation for incidental benefits arising from such financing or listing activities is not deductible for CIT purpose."

We believe that this Article may have implication for taxpayers whose parent entities or related party entities are listed abroad with their main business(es) within the territory of China. The tax authorities may consider that the overseas related party has no reason to receive the royalty payment merely because of the overseas companies' names, stock

code and related information listed on the publicity materials. As a result, the relevant payment would not be deductible for CIT purpose.

The takeaway

Public Notice 16 was only issued a week ago and at this stage it is uncertain if the China tax authorities must launch a formal transfer pricing investigation procedure in order to make the special tax adjustments for the four types of outbound payments outlined in Public Notice 16. It will not be a surprise that there will likely be different views between the China tax authorities and taxpayers on the deductibility of an outbound payment to overseas related parties. It is still probable that local-level tax authorities may require taxpayers to make self-evaluation and self-adjustments to their corporate income tax returns, rather than deal with these issues under a formal tax investigation or audit.

It should be noted that, according to China tax regulations, corresponding adjustments will not be applied to situations where the transfer pricing adjustments made by China tax authorities apply to intercompany transactions where taxes are already withheld in respect of the payment, e.g. interest, rental or royalty payment to overseas related parties (i.e. withholding income tax). Therefore, the taxpayers may need to consider whether it is possible to request Mutual Agreement Procedures (MAP) to resolve international double taxation issue. However, a potential approach taken by tax authorities could be that the tax authorities directly conclude that the relevant payment to overseas related parties is not deductible for CIT purpose based on the corporate income tax regulations, rather than making a special tax adjustment through a transfer pricing investigation. Under such situation, whether an enterprise and its overseas related parties are still eligible to apply for MAP in accordance with tax treaty, should be analysed case by case.

At an operational level, it is uncertain at this stage how the local-level tax authorities will enforce the guidelines provided in Public Notice 16. However, there is no doubt that the SAT's aim is to strengthen the tax administration of outbound payments to overseas related parties. Therefore, we consider that the following actions are critical in monitoring the tax risks

of an MNC's Chinese local subsidiary's intra-group outbound payments:

- As a good starting point, a comprehensive tax health check is necessary to identify the status and risks for a subsidiary and the group based on its current intra-group outbound charges. Immediate actions should be taken to rectify any issues identified and build up a sustainable intra-group charges structure and system which may involve both the overseas parent company / related parties and Chinese local subsidiaries.
- Taxpayers should be ready for a potential transfer pricing investigation by the tax authorities, focusing on thorough and proper tax and transfer pricing documentation and adequate justification of intra-group outbound service charges. During a transfer pricing investigation, taxpayers should evaluate whether the overseas related party has substantial operation or activities or not, the tax authorities may request the enterprise to disclose the detailed information of its overseas parent company / related parties.
- Effective and efficient communication should be maintained between taxpayers and local-level tax bureaus to resolve any potential disagreements early on, so as to mitigate the potential for surprises in a tax investigation or audit.
- Sound ongoing internal tax risk control and update/improve the intra-group outbound service charges mechanism to ensure

timely and effective tax compliance.

Endnote

1. For SAT's Interpretation, please refer to <http://www.chinatax.gov.cn/n810341/n810760/c1519250/content.html>
2. For details of this Response, please refer to our PwC Tax Insights – Transfer Pricing issued in April 2014. http://www.pwccn.com/home/eng/t_p_china_sat_apr2014.html
3. For details of our observation for the Circular 146, please refer to our China Tax/Business News Flash, 2014, Issue 19. http://www.pwccn.com/home/eng/chinatax_news_sep2014_19.html
4. For details of the local-level tax authorities' examination on the intra-group outbound payments, please refer to our China Tax/Business News Flash, 2014, Issue 34. http://www.pwccn.com/home/eng/chinatax_news_dec2014_34.html
5. "Fee paid for services that are unrelated to the domestic enterprise's function and risk profile, or even though related but not suitable for its current operation phase".
6. Certain types of management services (using SAT's example, management decision approvals from the parent company when the subsidiary has their own management team) are likely to be duplicative activities or shareholder activities and hence should not be charged.
7. The services of shareholder include planning, management, supervising activities regarding the operation, finance, human resource etc. for the domestic enterprises.
8. "There are some cases where an intra-group service performed by a group member such as a shareholder

or coordinating centre relates only to some group members but incidentally provides benefits to other group members. Examples could be analysing the question whether to reorganise the group, to acquire new members, or to terminate a division. These activities could constitute intra-group services to the particular group members involved, for example those members who will make the acquisition or terminate one of their divisions, but they may also produce economic benefits for other group members not involved in the object of the decision by increasing efficiencies, economies of scale, or other synergies. The incidental benefits ordinarily would not cause these other group members to be treated as receiving an intra-group service because the activities producing the benefits would not be ones for which an independent enterprise ordinarily would be willing to pay." ("OECD Guidelines", §7.12)

9. "An associated enterprise should not be considered to receive an intra-group service when it obtains incidental benefits attributable solely to its being part of a larger concern, and not to any specific activity being performed. For example, no service would be received where an associated enterprise by reason of its affiliation alone has a credit-rating higher than it would if it were unaffiliated, but an intra-group service would usually exist where the higher credit rating were due to a guarantee by another group member, or where the enterprise benefitted from the group's reputation deriving from global marketing and public relations campaigns." ("OECD Guidelines", §7.13)

Let's talk

For a deeper discussion of how this issue might affect your business, please contact a member of **PwC's China Transfer Pricing Service Team** :

China

Spencer Chong
+86 (21) 2323 2580
spencer.chong@cn.pwc.com

Winnie Di
+86 (10) 6533 2805
winnie.di@cn.pwc.com

Mei Gong
+86 (21) 2323 3667
mei.gong@cn.pwc.com

Ken Kurokawa
+86 (21) 2323 3233
ken.kurokawa@cn.pwc.com

Jeff Yuan
+86 (21) 2323 3495
jeff.yuan@cn.pwc.com

Qisheng Yu
+86 (10) 6533 3117
qisheng.yu@cn.pwc.com

Kevin Tsoi
+86 (20) 3819 2380
kevin.lk.tsoi@cn.pwc.com

Han Tao
+86 (10) 6533 3230
tao.han@cn.pwc.com

Hong Kong

Cecilia Lee
+852 2289 5690
cecilia.sk.lee@hk.pwc.com

Rhett Liu
+852 2289 5619
rhett.k.liu@hk.pwc.com

We have approximately 200 dedicated transfer pricing professionals in China with knowledge in economics, accounting, law, efficient project management skills and in-depth industry experience. We help clients to develop tax efficient structures to increase compliance with transfer pricing regulatory requirements, prepare for rapid audit responses, resolve disputes, and decrease future adjustment exposure. To offer global support to our clients, we work closely with our global transfer pricing network comprised of more than 100 partners and 1,500 dedicated professionals in over 50 countries

In the context of this News Flash, China, Mainland China or the PRC refers to the People's Republic of China but excludes Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, Macao Special Administrative Region and Taiwan Region.

The information contained in this publication is for general guidance on matters of interest only and is not meant to be comprehensive. The application and impact of laws can vary widely based on the specific facts involved. Before taking any action, please ensure that you obtain advice specific to your circumstances from your usual PwC's client service team or your other tax advisers. The materials contained in this publication were assembled on 25 March 2015 and were based on the law enforceable and information available at that time.

This China Tax and Business News Flash is issued by the **PwC's National Tax Policy Services** in China and Hong Kong, which comprises of a team of experienced professionals dedicated to monitoring, studying and analysing the existing and evolving policies in taxation and other business regulations in China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan. They support the PwC's partners and staff in their provision of quality professional services to businesses and maintain thought-leadership by sharing knowledge with the relevant tax and other regulatory authorities, academics, business communities, professionals and other interested parties.

For more information, please contact:

Matthew Mui
+86 (10) 6533 3028
matthew.mui@cn.pwc.com

Please visit PwC's websites at <http://www.pwccn.com> (China Home) or <http://www.pwchk.com> (Hong Kong Home) for practical insights and professional solutions to current and emerging business issues.