

CHINA TAX ALERT

ISSUE 28 | October 2015

OECD 2015 BEPS Deliverables issued and China's response

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ("OECD") Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting issued on 19 July 2013
- OECD BEPS Action 1 Report "Addressing the Tax Challenges of the Digital Economy" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 2 Report "Neutralising the Effects of Hybrid Mismatch Arrangements" issued on 5 October 2015

Background

On 5 October 2015 the OECD publicly released its '2015 Deliverables' under the G20/OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative. The BEPS initiative aims to enhance the integrity and fairness of the international tax system by realigning jurisdictional taxing rights with the location of 'value creation' and the place where business activities are actually conducted.

The 2015 Deliverables, a package of 13 reports with recommendations on changes to domestic laws and tax treaties amongst other measures, which correspond to the original 15 Actions of the 2013 BEPS Action Plan work programme, were endorsed by the G20 Finance Ministers at their 8 October 2015 meeting in Lima, Peru. In addition to consolidating and updating the seven 2014 Deliverables reports, new reports are provided on controlled foreign company (CFC) rules (Action 3), interest deductions (Action 4), permanent establishment (PE) rules (Action 7), transfer pricing (TP) rules (Action 8–10), measuring and monitoring BEPS (Action 11), mandatory disclosure rules (Action 12), and dispute resolution mechanisms (Action 14). The recommendations presented in the package constitute the substantive conclusion of the initial BEPS Action Plan work. The Chinese State Administration of Taxation (SAT) posted the Chinese language versions of the BEPS reports to their website on 10 October 2015.

The SAT has recently set out new guidance which largely clarifies how China plans to 'localise' the BEPS recommendations. In particular the SAT's public discussion draft on 'Special Tax Adjustments', issued on 17 September 2015, deals with the 'localisation' of the BEPS work on TP and CFC; see [China Tax Alert Issue 25 \(September 2015\)](#). As such, it is increasingly possible to foresee what parts of the BEPS agenda will and will not be adopted by China, and the manner of adoption. As the new post-BEPS rules take shape it is becoming evident how multinational enterprises (MNEs) may need to adapt their existing investment structures and business models, as well as their tax risk management systems, to fully cope in the post-BEPS environment.

The BEPS 2015 Deliverables

The 2015 Deliverables package updates and supplements the 2014 Deliverables (full details of which are set out in [China Tax Alert Issue 27 \(October 2014\)](#)) and yields final proposals; those relevant for China are set out below. If you would like more detail please see KPMG International's [Tax News Flash - BEPS Special Edition 7 October 2015](#).

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- OECD BEPS Action 3 Report "Designing Effective Controlled Foreign Company Rules" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 4 Report "Limiting Base Erosion Involving Interest Deductions and Other Financial Payments" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 5 Report "Countering Harmful Tax Practices More Effectively, Taking into Account Transparency and Substance" issued on 5 October 2015

- *Digital economy (Action 1):* Reiterating the conclusions of the 2014 Action 1 Deliverable, the Task Force on the Digital Economy (TFDE) did not recommend specific, ring-fenced, Digital Economy tax measures, as the combined effect of 'other' BEPS Actions is argued to effectively combat aggressive tax planning in the Digital Economy space, namely:

- The Action 7 PE changes, impacting online cross-border sellers with large sales forces and/or large local warehouses in the market state
- The TP Actions (8, 9, 10), tackling shifting of contractual risk and transfer of intangible asset returns to low tax jurisdictions
- The Action 6 use of treaty anti-avoidance concepts to justify applying withholding tax (WHT) to outbound digital business payments which would otherwise be treaty protected from WHT
- The Action 5 clampdown on abusive IP regimes, as well as the potential Action 3 inclusion of digital business income under CFC rules

While Digital Economy BEPS issues are expected to be largely tackled through these 'other' Actions, the final Action 1 report does include VAT guidance tailored for digital business B2B/B2C cross-border supplies. What is more, the report indicates (while not advocating) that countries could consider use of specific Digital Economy corporate tax concepts, namely a significant economic presence nexus concept, a specific digital transaction WHT, or an "equalisation levy". The TFDE is to continue work on income characterisation (e.g. cloud computing), the value of data in TP analysis, and monitor Digital Economy tax issues.

- *Hybrid mismatch arrangements (Action 2):* The 2014 Action 2 Deliverable recommendations for changes to domestic law and treaties to counter the effects of hybrid entity, instrument and transfer-driven tax mismatches (see China Alert 27 of 2014), is now supplemented by an extensive series of examples. In addition, new rules are added to ensure that treaty relief is applied appropriately in the case of 'wholly or partly fiscally transparent' entities, such as partnerships and trusts.
- *CFC rules (Action 3):* The report sets out a series of recommended 'building blocks' which countries may use, at their own discretion, to construct a robust set of CFC rules. No CFC 'minimum standard' could be agreed on between the BEPS participant countries, despite the efforts of the US. The building blocks include (i) defining the CFC (type of entity, and type and level of control), (ii) CFC exemptions and tax rate thresholds, (iii) CFC income inclusion, (iv) CFC income computation, (v) CFC income attribution, and (vi) double tax elimination.

The potential CFC income determination approaches include (i) categorical approaches (targeting income based on legal classification, origin from related parties, or geographic source, which may also be explicitly made to include income from digital sales/services), (ii) substantive analysis (determining whether CFC income was separated from underlying 'substance' by testing the substantial contribution of employees, or using a TP-linked significant functions approach, or a staff/premises substance approach), or (iii) an excess profits approach (covering, *inter alia*, intangibles and risk transfers). A combination of these approaches is possible.

- *Interest Deductions (Action 4):* The report sets out a recommended approach (but does not agree a minimum standard) for limiting MNE use of debt-based tax planning. Targeted arrangements are (i) MNE groups placing higher levels of third party debt in their subsidiaries in high tax countries, (ii) groups using intra-group loans to generate interest deductions greatly in excess of the group's actual third party interest expense, and (iii) groups using third party or intra-group financing to fund the generation of tax exempt income. The recommended approach is an 'earnings stripping' rule which limits interest tax deductions to a percentage of earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). This may be supplemented by a worldwide group ratio rule which allows increased interest deductions where the MNE group at a global level is more heavily

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- OECD BEPS Action 6 Report "Preventing the Granting of Treaty Benefits in Inappropriate Circumstances" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 7 Report "Preventing the Artificial Avoidance of Permanent Establishment Status" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 8-10 Report "Guidance on Transfer Pricing Aspects of Intangibles" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 11 Report "Measuring and Monitoring BEPS" issued on 5 October 2015

indebted/has a greater relative interest servicing burden than the local entity. The OECD will in 2016 refine the rules further for banking and insurance.

- *Harmful Tax Practices (Action 5):* The 2015 Deliverable finalizes the 2014 initial progress report prepared by the Forum on Harmful Tax Practices (FHTP). The substantial activity requirement for preferential tax regimes, proposed in the 2014 report, has been finalized with a 'nexus approach'. This uses expenditures on R&D activities, in the context of Intellectual Property (IP) regimes, as a proxy for activity. A review of preferential regimes in OECD and non-OECD states found that all the IP regimes reviewed failed the substantial activity test and these are now being revised. The FHTP plans to next roll-out its review using the substantial activity test to non-IP preferential regimes. The parallel framework for the compulsory spontaneous inter-tax authority exchange of rulings on preferential regimes, as well as advance pricing arrangements (APAs), PE cases, conduits, etc, takes effect with the first rulings from 1 April 2016, for those countries with the necessary legal basis already in place.
- *Treaty abuse (Action 6):* The 2015 Deliverable refines (but does not finalize) the 2014 report, adding further notable proposals. The core proposals remain the required adoption in treaties of either or both of a 'principal purposes test' focused on the subjective tax motivations of a taxpayer and a US-style Limitation on Benefits (LOB) provision. However, the release in May 2015 by the US of a proposed new version of the US Model DTA's LOB provision have led to a postponement of the finalization of the BEPS LOB proposal until mid-2016. It will be included in the planned roll-out of the multilateral instrument at the end of 2016.

The updated treaty wording and guidance also clarifies that domestic anti-avoidance rules can be applied (without being blocked by treaties), facilitating, *inter alia*, application of exit taxes. In addition to the targeted anti-abuse provisions from the 2014 report, dealing with dividend, capital gains and PE based planning, the 2015 report now also contemplates adoption of recent US anti-abuse proposals. These would deny withholding tax (WHT) relief on payments to 'special tax regimes' or where a treaty partner state introduces an exemption for interest, royalties or dividends after the conclusion of a treaty. These latter proposals, along with additional guidance on applications of treaties to collective investment vehicle (CIV) and non-CIV (e.g. private equity) funds, will be finalized by mid-2016.

- *Permanent Establishment (Action 7):* The 2015 Deliverable adjusts further and finalizes changes proposed in the May 2015 BEPS PE discussion draft. For fuller detail on how the PE changes compare to prior PE concepts, and the implications for China, see [China Tax Alert Issue 12 \(June 2015\)](#).

In summary, the Agency PE concept, which had previously turned on whether a non-resident had authorized a local market-based person to habitually negotiate/contract with local customers on the former's behalf, has now been replaced. The new rule looks at whether the local market-based person 'habitually concludes contracts, or habitually plays the principal role leading to the conclusion of contracts that are routinely concluded without material modification by the [non-resident] enterprise'. Contracts that transfer property owned by the non-resident (or grant a right to use that property) are now covered. This is intended to catch cases where the non-resident is not legally bound by the contract but his property is the contract object matter (e.g. commissionaire structures).

The revised OECD Model Tax Convention (MTC) Commentary makes clear that the focus of the new test is on whether the local market-based person convinces, through relationship building efforts, customers to contract. Formalities related to legal authorization of local persons to contract, and formalistic final 'rubber stamping' approvals of contracts by non-residents, which previously provided support for a 'No PE' position, are no longer determinative. Consequently, given the de-emphasis of 'legal agency', the provision might be better regarded as a 'local representative' PE concept, rather than as an 'Agency PE' concept. All prior references to 'agency PE' have been removed from the Commentary. The independent agent

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- OECD BEPS Action 12 Report "Mandatory Disclosure Rules" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 13 Report "Guidance on Transfer Pricing Documentation and Country-by-Country Reporting" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 14 Report "Making Dispute Resolution Mechanisms More Effective" issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD BEPS Action 15 Report "Developing a Multilateral Instrument to Modify Bilateral Tax Treaties" issued on 5 October 2015

concept is now also curtailed where the local person acts largely for foreign related parties.

Furthermore, the 'preparatory and auxiliary' (P&A) PE exemptions for 'specific activities' (e.g. warehousing, purchasing, information collection etc) are now to be all subject to an overriding P&A test (though this is left to country discretion) and to an anti-fragmentation test. The latter is a de facto "force of attraction" approach under which the activities of connected enterprises at the same or separate places in the source country may be aggregated in determining if the P&A threshold has been exceeded, such that a PE exists. Finally, it is clarified that the principal purposes test (and a more mechanical rule if a country does not apply this test) should be applied to deal with 'contract splitting' strategies directed at having cross-border construction activities fall under the time limit for a construction/service PE.

The PE changes are represented as a key plank of the BEPS resolution of Digital Economy tax planning as they would treat online cross-border sellers with large sales forces and/or large local warehouses in the market state as having a local PE, dealing with existing weaknesses in the Agency PE rule and P&A PE exclusions.

- *Transfer Pricing (Action 8, 9, 10, 13):* The 2015 TP deliverables are comprised of a significant number of updates to different parts of the existing OECD TP guidance. Substantial updates are made to:

- *Chapter 1 (Arm's length principle):* The new guidance sets out a robust approach to 'delineating the transaction'. This is designed to deal with BEPS concerns about the separation of contractual risk (and associated returns) from value generating activity in order to allocate MNE profits to low tax jurisdictions. The approach taken is to "re-purpose" the five categories of 'comparability factors' from the existing OECD TP guidance (now termed 'economically relevant characteristics') to serve two roles; (i) 'delineating of the transaction' – a form of 'sense test' of the contractual arrangements, in light of the 'options realistically available' to the contracting parties, to determine whether they are an accurate representation of the true nature of the transaction and whether the transaction properly reflects how independent parties would have transacted, and (ii) the subsequent comparability analysis.

The five categories of characteristic remain, as in the prior guidance, (i) contract terms, (ii) functions performed (taking account of assets and risks) by MNE group members and their value creation significance within the group, (iii) characteristics of property transferred and services provided, (iv) the economic circumstances of the parties and the market, (v) business strategies. While guidance on all the characteristics has been expanded (e.g. economic circumstances of the market now includes local market features), the really substantive changes are item (ii) with respect to whether risks have been properly allocated.

The Guidance provides that risks contractually assumed by a party that cannot in fact exercise meaningful control over the risks, and which does not have the financial capacity to assume the risks, will be allocated to the party that does exercise such control and have the financial capacity to assume the risk. The guidance on who controls the risk turns strongly on which entity can and does make decisions on assuming risks and/or reacting to their outcomes. Where the contracts are determined not to be a full or adequate description of the transaction actually conducted then additional terms may be 'read into' the 'accurately delineated transaction'. The OECD expresses the view that it should rarely be needed to fully re-characterize a transaction, and that just because a transaction may not be seen in practice between independent parties should not lead to its rejection; transactions should just be re-characterized where they are not commercially rational from the perspective of the transacting parties.

The clarifications in the 2014 BEPS TP Deliverable on taking into account local market features, cost savings, group synergies, are also carried over to the final updates to Chapter 1.

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- OECD Explanatory Statement to the BEPS 2015 Deliverables issued on 5 October 2015
- OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations, 2010 version, with discussion draft on Revision of Chapter 6 of the OECD Guidelines on Intangibles issued on 30 July 2013
- The State Administration of Taxation (SAT) of the People's Republic of China's (PRC) Public Consultation Draft of a Circular on Implementation Measures for Special Tax Adjustments, ("Discussion Draft"), issued on September 17, 2015

- *Chapter 2 (TP methods):* While no updates have yet been made to the Guidance, a work plan lasting up to mid-2017 has been set out in respect of guidance on use of profit split methods (PSM). This clarifies the range of circumstances in which the OECD considers PSM may be optimal to use. These see expanded use of PSM, beyond the existing Guidance on when PSM is appropriate (i.e. where MNE operations are highly integrated, or where parties make 'unique and valuable contributions') to include (i) cases where, in the development of intangibles, parties outsource 'important functions' (e.g. design and control of research and marketing programmes), or (ii) where partially developed intangibles are transferred, as well as (iii) cases (further to the Chapter 1 analysis above) where multiple parties exercise control over a risk, (iv) determination of royalty rates or (v) where MNE group synergies are shared.

It is emphasized that given the highly integrated, synergistic and IP-reliant nature of Digital Economy businesses, PSM may be particularly appropriate to the latter and work will continue on this. Chapter 2 also incorporates guidance on commodities transactions.

- *Chapter 5 (Documentation):* The new TP Documentation, consisting of Master and Local File and CBC reporting, set out in 2014 and refined in 2015 in relation to the implementation rules, is finalized. See our Tax Alert Issue 25 linked below.

- *Chapter 6 (TP for intangibles):* The BEPS 2014 Deliverables set out extensive new guidance on determining how to allocation the income derived from contributions to the generation of intangible assets in an MNE, as well as from their transfer and use. A detailed description of this 2014 BEPS guidance, and their roll out into Chinese guidance, can be read in [China Tax Alert Issue 25 \(September 2015\)](#). The Intangibles TP guidance, apart from updates made to align it with the new risk allocation analysis in Chapter 1, has now been further supplemented with updates to the provisions designed to deal with transactions in intangible assets with highly uncertain valuations (e.g. the tax authorities may determine the pricing by 'reading in' a contingent payments mechanism into the transfer agreement) and to deal with 'hard-to-value intangibles' (HTVI).

For HTVI, to deal with the challenges of information asymmetry between taxpayers and tax administrations, the post-transfer profitability of an intangible may be taken into account in the valuation. The Guidance limits use of the ex-post evidence, however, to determination of whether the taxpayer's ex-ante projections adequately took into account all relevant information at the time; it is not a 'hindsight' approach. Where the taxpayer can prove that differences between ex-ante projections and ex-post results can be explained by unforeseeable developments or reasonable variation resulting from the playing out of probabilities, then ex-post information is not to be used.

- *Chapter 7 (Intra-Group Services):* An 'allocation key'-based, simplified, elective approach for allocating charges for low value-adding intra-group services is set out.

- *Chapter 8 (Cost Contribution Arrangements):* The CCA guidance integrates the new Chapter 1 approach to 'delineating the transaction', to valuing HTVIs, and generally requires CCA participants to be able to control the risks and have the financial capacity to do so.

- *Mandatory Disclosure rules (Action 12):* Recommendations (not a minimum standard) are set out, according to a modular framework, for the design of rules which would give the tax authorities early warning on aggressive arrangements and would deter promoters and taxpayers (both with potential reporting obligations) from entering into such arrangements in the first instance. The guidance covers 'hallmarks' of avoidance which would be the trigger for disclosure, tracking arrangements and penalties.
- *Dispute Resolution Mechanisms (Action 14):* A minimum standard has been developed for the resolution of treaty-related disputes, together with a Peer Monitoring mechanism, falling under the Forum on Tax Administration (FTA) Mutual Agreement Procedure (MAP) Forum. This will commence work in

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- SAT Circular on Implementation Measures for Special Tax Adjustments (Trial Implementation), Guoshuifa [2009] No. 2 ("Circular 2"), issued on January 8, 2009
- OECD Model Tax Convention on Income and Capital, issued in 2014
- Public Notice regarding information disclosure by resident enterprises on outbound investment and overseas income, SAT Public Notice [2014] No. 38, ("Announcement 38"), issued July 2014 and effective 1 September 2014

2016, with first reports due by end of 2017. The minimum standard contains commitments to include MAP clauses in treaties and ensure taxpayer MAP access, time to complete MAP procedures (target 24 months) and avoid MAP adjustment time-barring, as well as MAP case and procedure transparency. Beyond this (non-binding) best practices are also set out while a group of 20 Western countries have committed to mandatory binding arbitration, with the mechanism to be developed in time for its inclusion in the multilateral instrument in late 2016.

- *Multilateral Instrument (Action 15):* The 2014 Deliverables concluded that a multilateral instrument to update many of the world's 3,500 bilateral tax treaties simultaneously would be feasible and more than 90 countries have joined an ad hoc group (led up by China and the UK) to negotiate the instrument by the end of 2016.

"Mapping" the BEPS 2015 Deliverables to China

Some aspects of 2015 Deliverables have already been 'localised' into Chinese domestic tax law or treaty provisions, or are expected to have a significant future effect, including:

- *Transfer Pricing (Action 8, 9, 10, 13):* The details of how the 2014 BEPS TP Intangibles guidance is being 'localised' through the SAT public discussion draft on 'Special Tax Adjustments' ('discussion draft'), is set out in in [China Tax Alert Issue 25 \(September 2015\)](#). This Alert also includes consideration of the implications for MNE business models. The new Chinese TP guidance in the discussion draft will replace the existing Chinese TP guidance in SAT Circular 2 [2009]. The discussion draft emphasizes that in determining the value contribution of MNE group entities to intangible assets (and the consequent TP profit allocations) emphasis is to be put on the 'middle value chain activities' frequently carried out by MNEs in China (e.g. trial production, enablement of mass production) as well as China market-building activities. As the OECD guidance would not consider these as the most important factors for intangibles value creation, divergent TP approaches between China and other countries could ultimately lead to double taxation.

The new Chinese TP guidance also tends to push transactions involving intangibles more readily towards PSM, or the new Chinese Value Contribution Method (VCM) introduced under the proposed revision to Circular 2. The latter is supported by the comprehensive 'Value Chain Analysis' section required in the Chinese TP Local File (this appears to diverge from the BEPS TP documentation requirements, and potentially duplicates the CBC information requirements). These new measures exist in parallel with new extensive information requirements for outbound service payment arrangements and demanding tax deduction provisions on outbound service/royalty payments. The discussion draft also notably excludes the BEPS proposed low-value service simplifications.

Notably absent from the new Chinese TP guidance is any reference to the OECD's approach to 'properly delineating the transaction' by aligning risk attributions with effective risk control, and supplementing/adjusting contractual risk allocations where necessary. In fact, the new Chinese TP guidance (as with the existing Circular 2 TP guidance) provides barely any reference on the weighting to be given to control of risks and relevant decision-making in either 'delineating transactions' or in comparability analysis. This is reflective of a long-standing skepticism, borne out in the practical application of TP rules by the Chinese tax authorities, towards contractual allocations of risk which are considered to be susceptible to manipulation. To this extent, the omission of the BEPS refinements to the OECD's TP risk allocation approaches from the new China TP guidance perhaps reflects a continuation of this cautious approach, which focuses more on the performance of functions.

The new Chinese TP re-characterization provision in the discussion draft applies to "related party transactions unlikely to occur between independent third parties under comparable economic conditions". While

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- Chinese State Administration of Taxation (SAT) Announcement on Administrative Measures for Granting Tax Treaty benefits to non-residents, Gonggao [2015] No. 60 ("Announcement 60"), issued on August 27, 2015, and Interpretative Guidance Notes
- SAT Circular on understanding and recognising the Beneficial Owner in PRC Double Tax Agreements and Arrangements (DTA), Guoshuihan [2009] No.601 ("Circular 601"), issued on 27 October 2009
- China-Chile double tax agreement and accompanying protocol, signed on 25 May 2015 ('PRC-Chile DTA and Protocol')
- OECD Discussion draft "BEPS Action 7: Preventing the Artificial Avoidance of PE Status" issued on 15 May 2015 ("BEPS May 2015 PE discussion draft")

the BEP guidance point out that the mere fact that a transaction may not be seen between independent parties should not lead to its rejection (the focus being on whether it is commercially rational) it remains to be seen whether the Chinese authorities will take account of this in applying the re-characterization provision in practice.

The lack of clear correspondence between the BEPS 'transaction delineation' and control-risk approaches and the Chinese approach make it difficult to know how the future OECD PSM guidance (under development) will interact with the new China TP guidance. Likewise, the draft new Chinese TP guidance does not make clear how the 'hard-to-value intangibles' concept would apply in China, providing no guidance on the usage of ex-post results. It remains to be seen whether any of the BEPS guidance is integrated into the final Chinese TP guidance, replacing Circular 2, due to be issued towards the end of this year.

- *PE (Action 7):* As detailed in [China Tax Alert Issue 12 \(June 2015\)](#), the new BEPS PE concepts could, depending on the manner of their roll-out and their application in practice, result in challenges under the new Agency PE concept for existing MNE cross-border distribution and procurement structures into China. Enhanced documentation and operating protocols, adjustments to existing business practices and, in some cases, movement from offshore sales hubs to onshore buy-sell distributors, may be required. The impact of the anti-fragmentation rules on multi-subsidiary arrangements (e.g. China manufacturing, sales, and R&D all in separate MNE subsidiary entities) will need to be considered, as well as the impact of contract-splitting rules on dispatches of staff from multiple overseas MNE entities to China.

The SAT is understood to be committed to the roll out of the new BEPS PE concepts and in fact incorporated the rules from the May 2015 BEPS PE draft proposals into the PRC-Chile DTA signed on 25 May 2015 (China's 100th DTA and its most recent). It is also understood that the SAT is contemplating how to improve PE profit attribution guidance. Given the difficulties with the existing 'deemed percentage of sales' PE profit attribution approach, such guidance will be keenly anticipated, and it might be noted that the PRC-Chile DTA does move in the direction of determining PE profits based on functions, assets and risks. This being said, the SAT are expected to retain some aspects of their deemed PE profit approaches.

- *Treaty Abuse (Action 6):* China recently rolled out its new DTA relief system with Announcement 60 [2015] and this will take effect from 1 November 2015; see [China Tax Alert Issue 24 \(September 2015\)](#). While the Announcement is primarily focused on administrative procedures (i.e. a move from DTA relief pre-approval to self-relief and tax authority 'follow up' procedures), it also resets the SAT approach to the 'beneficial ownership' treaty relief criterion in a way which may facilitate more structured BEPS approaches to treaty shopping going forward. It should be noted that the new PRC-Chile treaty incorporates both the BEPS 'Limitation on Benefits' and 'Principal Purposes Test' approaches and the SAT statement accompanying the release of the Chinese language BEPS reports pointed to the manner of the integration of BEPS anti-abuse provisions into this treaty as indicative of future treaty policy.

Since 2009 the guidance in SAT Circular 601 effectively combined a 'control of income and assets'-based beneficial ownership test with an 'economic substance' driven treaty shopping test. These are now effectively separated under new DTA relief approach, with 'substance' factors underpinning 'follow up' challenges based on the PRC GAAR and on the general anti-avoidance provisions that the PRC has progressively been integrating in its recent concluded and updated DTAs. As the GAAR procedures in SAT Order 32 [2014] provide an opportunity for taxpayers to represent their 'reasonable businesses' purposes case and allow SAT review of local tax authority challenges, these moves might be welcomed, though it remains to be seen how such measures are applied in practice.

- *CFC rules (Action 3):* The Chinese tax authorities have recently begun to enforce their CFC rules in actual cases. As regards the BEPS CFC 'building

Regulations discussed in this issue:

- Administrative Measures for implementation of the General Anti-Tax Avoidance Rule (for Trial Implementation), SAT Order No.32 ("Order 32"), issued on December 2, 2014

block' recommendations, while the SAT have largely left unchanged the existing CFC control definition, as well as the CFC exemptions/thresholds (de minimise test and reasonable purpose test for 'non-distribution' of CFC profits), it has co-opted the BEPS 'CFC Attributable Income' guidance into the 'Special Tax Adjustments' discussion draft.

In this regard a BEPS 'Categorical' approach is taken with CFC income inclusion generally appropriate for (i) dividends earned by non-securities trading companies, (ii) interest earned by non-finance business companies, (iii) insurance premiums earned by non-insurance companies, (iv) royalties earned from related parties, (iv) sales and service income earned where goods and services have been bought-in from related parties and no or low value has been added, and, (vi) in a nod to the BEPS 'Excess Profits' approach, excess profits derived from intangible asset or risk transfers. This is supplemented/overlaid with a BEPS 'Substantive Analysis' approach; this provides that all three of the BEPS proposed alternatives (i.e. substantial contribution, TP analysis, staff/premises) may be used by the tax authorities but does not give guidance on their application or prioritization. Given the rapid ramp up of tax enforcement against 'Going Out' Chinese MNEs, further SAT refinements in the final guidance on Special Tax Adjustments, and the precise application of these provisions, will be of keen interest.

- *Other BEPS Actions:* Alongside the above BEPS Deliverables, which have most echo in a China context, the other BEPS Actions may be seen to impact as follows:
 - *Action 1:* The SAT has not yet clarified the Chinese position on the taxation of the Digital Economy, though a SAT task force is understood to have been established to examine the issues. It remains to be seen whether the SAT seeks to go beyond the OECD BEPS recommendations and pursues one of the more 'innovative' Digital Economy tax approaches.
 - *Action 2:* Hybrid mismatch arrangements are not a major feature of the Chinese tax environment, with the use of such planning obstructed by foreign exchange controls, limitations of corporate law, regulatory restrictions, as well as aspects of the tax system, such as the absence of loss grouping or comprehensive entity classification rules, and the inability to use foreign branch/partnership losses against local profits. Nonetheless, the SAT recently confirmed their intent to roll out anti-hybrid rules. It remains to be seen what form these would take, and whether the BEPS Action 2 recommendations to clarify treaties to facilitate treaty claims by 'wholly and partially transparent' entities would be adopted, clarifications much needed in China (and to-date only dealt with explicitly in the China-France DTA).
 - *Action 4:* It is understood that the SAT has decided, at least for the moment, not to roll out the BEPS Interest Deduction proposals given that this would necessitate a change to the Corporate Income Tax (CIT) law itself. Instead, the existing debt-equity ratio thin capitalization rules are fine-tuned in the new 'Special Tax Adjustments' discussion draft.
 - *Other Actions:* China's involvement in the Action 5 tax rulings spontaneous exchange system, and its position on the Action 12 mandatory disclosure proposals have not yet been clarified by the SAT. As a minimum standard, China will adhere to the Action 14 dispute resolution recommendations and will be subject to the Peer Monitoring mechanism, though not with respect to mandatory binding arbitration, and the SAT has historically shown some caution in this regard.

The SAT's leading role in the group developing the Action 15 multilateral instrument and China's role as host of the FTA and the G20 in 2016 may point towards an interest at SAT level in Chinese adoption of the instrument in late 2016, though it remains to be seen how this project evolves. The extent of the treaty updates which China may make is keenly anticipated. The SAT is also understood to be working to a very tight timetable for roll out of additional BEPS related guidance by the end of 2015, and beyond, and we advise taxpayers to keep alert for the latest developments.

Khoonming Ho Partner in Charge, Tax China and Hong Kong SAR Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7082 khoonming.ho@kpmg.com	Northern China David Ling Partner in Charge, Tax Northern China Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7083 david.ling@kpmg.com	Irene Yan Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7508 irene.yan@kpmg.com	Amy Rao Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3208 amy.rao@kpmg.com	Angie Ho Tel. +86 (755) 2547 1276 angie.ho@kpmg.com	Charles Kinsley Tel. +852 2826 8070 charles.kinsley@kpmg.com
Beijing/Shenyang David Ling Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7083 david.ling@kpmg.com	Vaughn Barber Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7071 vaughn.barber@kpmg.com	Jessie Zhang Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7625 jessie.j.zhang@kpmg.com	Wayne Tan Tel. +86 (28) 8673 3915 wayne.tan@kpmg.com	Ryan Huang Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8621 ryan.huang@kpmg.com	John Kondos Tel. +852 2685 7457 john.kondos@kpmg.com
Tianjin Eric Zhou Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7610 ec.zhou@kpmg.com	Yali Chen Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7571 yali.chen@kpmg.com	Sheila Zhang Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7507 sheila.zhang@kpmg.com	Rachel Tao Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3473 rachel.tao@kpmg.com	Jean Jin Li Tel. +86 (755) 2547 1128 jean.j.li@kpmg.com	Kate Lai Tel. +852 2978 8942 kate.lai@kpmg.com
Qingdao Vincent Pang Tel. +86 (532) 8907 1728 vincent.pang@kpmg.com	Milano Fang Tel. +86 (532) 8907 1724 milano.fang@kpmg.com	Tracy Zhang Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7509 tracy.h.zhang@kpmg.com	John Wang Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3438 john.wang@kpmg.com	Donald Lin Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8680 donald.lin@kpmg.com	Alice Leung Tel. +852 2143 8711 alice.leung@kpmg.com
Shanghai/Nanjing Lewis Lu Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3421 lewis.lu@kpmg.com	Tony Feng Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7531 tony.feng@kpmg.com	Eric Zhou Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7610 ec.zhou@kpmg.com	Mimi Wang Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3250 mimi.wang@kpmg.com	Grace Luo Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8609 grace.luo@kpmg.com	Steve Man Tel. +852 2978 8976 steve.man@kpmg.com
Chengdu Anthony Chau Tel. +86 (28) 8673 3916 anthony.chau@kpmg.com	John Gu Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7095 john.gu@kpmg.com	Central China	Jennifer Weng Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3431 jennifer.weng@kpmg.com	Maria Mei Tel. +86 (592) 2150 807 maria.mei@kpmg.com	Ivor Morris Tel. +852 2847 5092 ivor.morris@kpmg.com
Hangzhou John Wang Tel. +86 (571) 2803 8088 john.wang@kpmg.com	Helen Han Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7627 h.han@kpmg.com	Naoko Hirasawa Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7054 naoko.hirasawa@kpmg.com	Anthony Chau Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3206 anthony.chau@kpmg.com	Grace Xie Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3422 grace.xie@kpmg.com	Michelle Sun Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8615 michelle.sun@kpmg.com
Guangzhou Lilly Li Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8999 lilly.li@kpmg.com	Josephine Jiang Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7511 josephine.jiang@kpmg.com	Henry Kim Tel. +86 (10) 8508 5000 henry.kim@kpmg.com	Cheng Chi Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3433 cheng.chi@kpmg.com	Bruce Xu Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3396 bruce.xu@kpmg.com	Bin Yang Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8605 bin.yang@kpmg.com
Fuzhou/Xiamen Maria Mei Tel. +86 (592) 2150 807 maria.mei@kpmg.com	Li Li Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7537 li.li@kpmg.com	Marianne Dong Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3436 marianne.dong@kpmg.com	Cheng Dong Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3410 cheng.dong@kpmg.com	Jie Xu Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3678 jie.xu@kpmg.com	Lixin Zeng Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8812 lixin.zeng@kpmg.com
Shenzhen Eileen Sun Tel. +86 (755) 2547 1188 eileen.gh.sun@kpmg.com	Lisa Li Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7638 lisa.h.li@kpmg.com	Alan Garcia Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3509 alan.garcia@kpmg.com	Anthony Chau Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3206 anthony.chau@kpmg.com	Robert Xu Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3124 robert.xu@kpmg.com	Hong Kong
Hong Kong Karmen Yeung Tel. +852 2143 8753 karmen.yeung@kpmg.com	Thomas Li Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7574 thomas.li@kpmg.com	Simon Liu Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7565 simon.liu@kpmg.com	Chris Ho Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3406 chris.ho@kpmg.com	Hanson Zhou Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3318 hanson.zhou@kpmg.com	Yves Chan Tel. +852 2847 5108 yvette.chan@kpmg.com
	Paul Ma Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7076 paul.ma@kpmg.com	Dylan Jeng Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3080 dylan.jeng@kpmg.com	Jason Jiang Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3527 jason.jt.jiang@kpmg.com	Michelle Zhou Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3458 michelle.b.zhou@kpmg.com	Lu Chen Tel. +852 2143 8777 lu.l.chen@kpmg.com
	Alan O'Connor Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7521 alan.oconnor@kpmg.com	Flame Jin Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3420 flame.jin@kpmg.com		William Zhang Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3415 william.zhang@kpmg.com	Rebecca Chin Tel. +852 2978 8987 rebecca.chin@kpmg.com
	Vincent Pang Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7516 +86 (532) 8907 1728 vincent.pang@kpmg.com	Sunny Leung Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3488 sunny.leung@kpmg.com		Yan Zhou Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3458 yan.zhou@kpmg.com	Barbara Forrest Tel. +852 2978 8941 barbara.forrest@kpmg.com
	Shirley Shen Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7586 yinghua.shen@kpmg.com	Michael Li Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3463 michael.y.li@kpmg.com	Christopher Mak Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3409 christopher.mak@kpmg.com	Sam Fan Tel. +86 (755) 2547 1071 sam.kh.fan@kpmg.com	Sandy Fung Tel. +852 2143 8821 sandy.fung@kpmg.com
	Joseph Tam Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7605 laiyu.tam@kpmg.com	Henry Ngai Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3411 henry.ngai@kpmg.com	Joe Fu Tel. +86 (755) 2547 1138 joe.fu@kpmg.com	Ricky Gu Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8620 ricky.gu@kpmg.com	Stanley Ho Tel. +852 2826 7296 stanley.ho@kpmg.com
	Michael Wong Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7085 michael.wong@kpmg.com	Yasuhiko Otani Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3360 yasuhiko.otani@kpmg.com	Jessica Xie Tel. +86 (10) 8508 7540 jessica.xie@kpmg.com	Fiona He Tel. +86 (20) 3813 8623 fiona.he@kpmg.com	Daniel Hui Tel. +852 2865 7815 daniel.hui@kpmg.com
	Ruqiang Pan Tel. +86 (21) 2212 3118 ruqiang.pan@kpmg.com				