

## GFIA response to the OECD discussion draft on BEPS Action 7

### General Comments

GFIA welcomes the opportunity to respond to this revised discussion draft and continues to support the aims of the OECD BEPS Action Plan to address weaknesses in the international tax environment. GFIA is of the view that the revised discussion draft is an improvement compared to the one released for consultation last year.

GFIA's main concern with the proposed PE rules has always been that, for some insurance business models, PEs would be recognised for tax but not for regulatory purposes with nil or minimal additional profit being attributed to them, resulting in a disproportionate compliance burden for insurers, as well as for tax authorities. GFIA is of the view that **only the presence of Key Entrepreneurial Risk-Taking (KERT) functions in a jurisdiction should create a PE for tax purposes** and be relevant for the attribution of profits. The 2010 OECD Report on the Attribution of Profits to Permanent Establishments Part IV (Insurance) ("Part IV") recognised that the main KERT function of insurers is the assumption and management of insurance risk/business (i.e. underwriting).

### Specific Comments on the Paper

GFIA has the following comments on the contents of the discussion draft:

- GFIA welcomes the OECD's explanation in paragraph 18 of how double taxation can be avoided when both Articles 7 and 9 of the Model Tax Convention apply (i.e. when both the intermediary and the non-resident enterprise are associated enterprises).
- GFIA is of the view that Part IV should be referenced in the final guidance on Article 5(5) and 5(6). This is because Part IV includes comprehensive guidance which defines and discusses risks, risk management and allocation of risk in the context of the insurance businesses. As mentioned above, risk assumption is the essential component of insurance business models and therefore profits should be attributed to insurers' PEs only if this KERT function is present there. This is clearly set out in Part IV. Given that paragraph 18 of the OECD discussion draft makes reference to risk control functions in its analysis of risk allocation when both Article 7 and Article 9 are applicable, making a specific reference to Part IV here seems particularly relevant and important.

- The OECD's discussion draft references Part I of the 2010 Report in paragraph 16 which states that the notion of "significant people functions" is used for attributing risk assumption and economic ownership of assets to a PE. If an additional reference to Part IV is not added in paragraph 18, GFIA recommends that the full 2010 Report be referenced in the discussion draft, instead of just Part I.
  
- GFIA is of the view that a widened definition of PE which includes intermediaries would result in the creation of a potentially large number of insurance PEs with nil or minimal additional profit being attributed to them. This is because, by applying Part IV of the 2010 Report and the reasoning in paragraph 18 of the current discussion draft, the functions performed by the intermediary will be non-KERT. GFIA therefore welcomes:
  - the OECD's recognition in paragraph 19 that *"depending on the facts and circumstances of a given case, the net amount of profits attributable to the PE may be either positive, nil or negative (i.e., a loss)"*.
  - the OECD's reference in paragraph 20 to the 2010 Report and to *"administratively convenient ways of recognising the existence of a PE under Article 5(5) and collecting the appropriate amount of tax resulting from the activity of the intermediaries"*.
  
- GFIA is concerned that the creation of many such PEs with no or minimal profit attributed would create an entirely unnecessary administrative burden for insurers and tax authorities. Therefore, GFIA is strongly of the view that the final OECD guidance on Article 5(5) and 5(6) must include an explicit recommendation that jurisdictions should, in these circumstances, have administratively convenient ways of collecting the appropriate amount of tax to reduce the compliance burden for both business and tax authorities. A good example of how this can be achieved is provided in paragraph 21 of the OECD's discussion draft.

**GFIA contact:**

Peggy McFarland, Chair of the GFIA Taxation Working Group ([pmcfarland@clhia.ca](mailto:pmcfarland@clhia.ca))

**About GFIA**

Through its 41 member associations, the Global Federation of Insurance Associations (GFIA) represents the interests of insurers and reinsurers in 62 countries. These companies account for around 87% of total insurance premiums worldwide. The GFIA is incorporated in Switzerland and its secretariat is based in Brussels.