



ICAEW TAX REPRESENTATION

CONSULTATION ON CONTROLLED FOREIGN COMPANIES (CFC) REFORM – DRAFT CLAUSES

Initial comments submitted in December 2011 by the Tax Faculty of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England & Wales (ICAEW) to HM Treasury in response to the draft clauses published on 6 December 2011 and in particular to the provisions relating to the ‘Gateway’ test

Contents

	Paragraph
Introduction	1
Who we are	2 – 4
Background	5 - 7
Our initial comments on the Gateway test	8 - 27
Compatibility with EU Law	28 – 29
Drafting	30
Further contact	31
ICAEW and the Tax Faculty: who we are	Appendix 1
Ten Tenets for a Better Tax System	Appendix 2

CONSULTATION ON CONTROLLED FOREIGN COMPANIES (CFC) REFORM

INTRODUCTION

1. We set out below our initial comments on the Gateway test incorporated in the draft clauses published on 6 December 2011.

WHO WE ARE

2. The ICAEW operates under a Royal Charter, working in the public interest. Its regulation of its members, in particular its responsibilities in respect of auditors, is overseen by the Financial Reporting Council. As a world leading professional accountancy body, the ICAEW provides leadership and practical support to over 136,000 members in more than 160 countries, working with governments, regulators and industry in order to ensure the highest standards are maintained. The ICAEW is a founding member of the Global Accounting Alliance with over 775,000 members worldwide. The Tax Faculty is the focus for tax within ICAEW.
3. Our members provide financial knowledge and guidance based on the highest technical and ethical standards. They are trained to challenge people and organisations to think and act differently, to provide clarity and rigour, and so help create and sustain prosperity. The Institute ensures these skills are constantly developed, recognised and valued.
4. The Tax Faculty is the focus for tax within the Institute. It is responsible for technical tax submissions on behalf of the Institute as a whole and it also provides various tax services including the monthly newsletter TAXline to more than 11,000 members of the Institute who pay an additional subscription, and a free weekly newswire.

BACKGROUND

The earlier attempt to introduce a new CFC regime

5. In mid 2007 a number of CT Reforms were put forward to be introduced as a single package. The reforms included a recasting of the CFC regime which was introduced in 1984 and has been subject to a considerable number of changes and modifications over the subsequent years.
6. Those initial CFC reform proposals proved to be extremely contentious and the Government decided to go ahead with the balance of the package in 2009 and leave the reform of CFC for a separate consultation.

The importance of the CFC regime

7. The CFC regime goes to the very heart of the international tax regime for UK based business and if the UK is to achieve its objective to have the most competitive corporate tax regime amongst the G20 countries then this latest consultation is of fundamental importance to achieving that goal.

OUR INITIAL COMMENTS ON THE GATEWAY TEST

8. We welcome the Government's positive approach to the most recent consultation over the course of the past summer/autumn and in particular its agreement to design a „Cadbury” based “Gateway” exemption to eliminate the majority of UK controlled foreign subsidiaries from the new CFC regime.
9. We do not believe the current drafting or structure of the legislation will achieve that objective, nor will it make the new legislation easy to operate and it is almost certain to result in undue bureaucracy and significantly increased compliance costs, unless modified.

10. We set out below our understanding of the current Gateway test(s) and we include our comments on the tests.
11. First of all we think the structure of the legislation, and the way it is set out, should follow the helpful diagram on page 5 of the „Response to Consultation“ document as this clearly establishes the role of the Gateway in eliminating at the initial stage businesses that are not intended to be caught by the CFC regime. So what is currently Chapter 8 of the draft clauses, setting out the Gateway test, should feature towards the beginning of the statutory provisions probably immediately after the definition of a CFC and should be clearly labelled as the Gateway test .
12. Moreover, the Gateway should be an exemption rather than another category of chargeable profits ie “bad income”. What is potentially CFCable income is defined in Chapter 7 section 371GA(2) as the total of Chapters 8 – 12 profits as adjusted by Chapter 13 „amounts to be left out“. So even if you do not have CFCable income under the sections 371HA – HK Gateway tests there are still categories of mainly finance income that remain CFCable ie Chapter 9 non-trading finance profits, Chapter 10 Trading finance profits, Chapter 11 Captives and Chapter 12 Solo consolidations. We accept that Chapters 10 and 12 are probably only of concern to banks and other financial traders. The Gateway is not therefore a true gateway, as in debt cap.
13. Under the provisions of step 2 section 371H in Chapter 8, if there are no UK Significant People Functions (SPFs) relevant to the economic ownership of the CFC’s assets/the assumption or management of the CFC’s risks then there are no Chapter 8 profits
14. While this would appear to be a relatively clear test we believe that it is hardly ever likely to be met in real life. Subsidiaries in groups are hardly ever completely autonomous, for obvious commercial reasons.
15. Step 4, as modified by s371HB via Step 5, then requires the provisional Chapter 8 profits, which come within the CFC regime, to be determined by taking out of the potential CFCable profits those that are attributable to UK SPFs where these are no more than the CFC’s profits re its assets/risks attributable to non-UK SPFs.
16. Again, when deciphered, this looks like a generous exemption but will it require a full functional transfer pricing analysis for every CFC everywhere in the world? And will the analysis require an asset by asset/risk by risk assessment which would be incredibly onerous? We accept that other exemptions eg the Chapter 6 s371FA Tax Exemption (which we think should be called the Not Low tax or Designer rate Exemption) may apply but we thought the whole purpose of the Gateway was to screen out 90%+ of foreign subsidiaries, without the need to refer to the rest of the legislation.
17. There are then a number of further tests under Step 5 under which profits will be excluded from the CFC regime.
18. Apart from the exclusions already mentioned above, if there are UK SPFs but by having the CFC involved the group has generated „substantial“ non-tax value then even if the CFC uses the SPFs in relation to its assets and/or risks then there will be no Chapter 8 profits (section 371HC).
19. This is akin to a commercial purpose test but „substantial“ is undefined. Is it intended that this test will be similar to the 20% threshold that applies in the Substantial Shareholding Exemption (SSE) legislation? What evidence will HMRC require re valuation?
20. Inevitably because of valuation issues it is also going to be an extremely subjective test.

21. There is then an arm's length exclusion under section 371HD so that if there are UK SPFs but the arrangements would have been entered into on the same terms with a third party, in relation to the UK SPFs, then the CFC has no Chapter 8 profits.
22. Again, will it be necessary to carry out a full transfer pricing comparables exercise in order to self assess this issue? What documentation requirements will there be?
23. Section 371HE is the final provision under which profits can be excluded from the CFC regime and it, in turn, has sections 371HF to HJ to explain what each of the provisions in s371HE actually means.
24. These provisions in effect reflect a trading income version of the „Cadbury“ let out but we are very concerned that they are terribly complicated and only very distantly related to Cadbury.
25. The various let outs are that the CFC:
 - is genuinely established in terms of business premises (371HF);
 - no more than 20% of its trading income (excluding interest and income from goods made by the CFC in its residence territory sold to the UK) come from UK residents or UK PEs of non-UK residents (371HG);
 - no more than 20% of its management expenditure relates to UK based staff (371HH);
 - does not hold IP transferred out of the UK within the last 6 years as a result of which the value of IP held by group companies other than the CFC is significantly reduced (not taking account of the other trigger re the transfer of only parts of the IP) (371HI) and
 - no more than 20% of its trading income is in relation to goods exported from the UK (but excluding goods exported into the territory of the CFC) (371HJ)
26. The first requirement comes from the CJEU decision in Cadbury but there is no EU law basis for any of the other requirements. The SGI decision is of no relevance as Belgian TP has an inbuilt commercial purpose test.
27. Finally there is a TAAR for the gateway (371HK). We counted 6 TAARs in the draft legislation. This is not going to assist in achieving legal certainty.

COMPATIBILITY WITH EU LAW

28. Amongst other things, Chapter 9 picks up interest on upstream loans to the UK (section 371D). We can fully appreciate why this was considered necessary from a UK policy perspective but we cannot see that there is any basis in the Cadbury Schweppes CJEU judgment for such a provision and we question whether it is compliant with EU law without a commercial purpose test.
29. We are also concerned that the fat cap test in Chapter 10 may not be EU law compliant. This may be based on the SGI judgment of the CJEU but as noted above that was by reference to Belgian transfer pricing rules which have an inbuilt commercial purpose test which the proposed new UK CFC rules do not have. So even if you come out from the CFC under the „substantial“ non tax value in paragraph 18 above you could still face CFCable income under Chapter 10 because there is no overall commercial purpose get out (see section 371GA(2)) which defines the new CFC charge as the total of Chapter 8 to Chapter 12 profits.

DRAFTING

30. Lastly, the drafting is appallingly dense. By comparison, the draft GAAR, or the King James Bible, or even arguably Spenser's Faerie Queene are more intelligible..

Further contact

31. For any further enquiries please contact:

Ian Young International Tax Manager, ICAEW Tax Faculty Email: ian.young@icaew.com Tel: +44 (0)20 7920 8652	Peter Cussons Partner, PwC LLP Email: peter.cussons@uk.pwc.com Tel: +44 (0)20 7804 5260
--	--

Copyright © ICAEW 2011
All rights reserved.

This document may be reproduced without specific permission, in whole or part, free of charge and in any format or medium, subject to the conditions that:

- it is appropriately attributed, replicated accurately and is not used in a misleading context
- the source of the extract or document is acknowledged and the reference number and title are quoted.

Where third-party copyright material has been identified application for permission must be made to the copyright holder.

www.icaew.com/taxfac

APPENDIX 1

ICAEW AND THE TAX FACULTY: WHO WE ARE

1. ICAEW is a world-leading professional accountancy body. We operate under a Royal Charter which obliges us to work in the public interest. ICAEW's regulation of its members, in particular its responsibilities in respect of auditors, is overseen by the UK Financial Reporting Council. We provide leadership and practical support to over 136,000 member chartered accountants in more than 160 countries, working with governments, regulators and industry in order to ensure that the highest standards are maintained.
2. ICAEW members operate across a wide range of areas in business, practice and the public sector. They provide financial expertise and guidance based on the highest professional, technical and ethical standards. They are trained to provide clarity and apply rigour, and so help create long-term sustainable economic value.
3. The Tax Faculty is the voice of tax within ICAEW and is a leading authority on taxation. Internationally recognised as a source of expertise, the faculty is responsible for submissions to tax authorities on behalf of ICAEW as a whole. It also provides a range of tax services, including *TAXline*, a monthly journal sent to more than 8,000 members, a weekly newswire and a referral scheme.

THE TAX FACULTY'S TEN TENETS FOR A BETTER TAX SYSTEM

The tax system should be:

1. Statutory: tax legislation should be enacted by statute and subject to proper democratic scrutiny by Parliament.
2. Certain: in virtually all circumstances the application of the tax rules should be certain. It should not normally be necessary for anyone to resort to the courts in order to resolve how the rules operate in relation to his or her tax affairs.
3. Simple: the tax rules should aim to be simple, understandable and clear in their objectives.
4. Easy to collect and to calculate: a person's tax liability should be easy to calculate and straightforward and cheap to collect.
5. Properly targeted: when anti-avoidance legislation is passed, due regard should be had to maintaining the simplicity and certainty of the tax system by targeting it to close specific loopholes.
6. Constant: Changes to the underlying rules should be kept to a minimum. There should be a justifiable economic and/or social basis for any change to the tax rules and this justification should be made public and the underlying policy made clear.
7. Subject to proper consultation: other than in exceptional circumstances, the Government should allow adequate time for both the drafting of tax legislation and full consultation on it.
8. Regularly reviewed: the tax rules should be subject to a regular public review to determine their continuing relevance and whether their original justification has been realised. If a tax rule is no longer relevant, then it should be repealed.
9. Fair and reasonable: the revenue authorities have a duty to exercise their powers reasonably. There should be a right of appeal to an independent tribunal against all their decisions.
10. Competitive: tax rules and rates should be framed so as to encourage investment, capital and trade in and with the UK.

These are explained in more detail in our discussion document published in October 1999 as TAXGUIDE 4/99 (see <http://www.icaew.com/~media/Files/Technical/Tax/Tax%20news/TaxGuides/taxguide-4-99-towards-a-better-tax-system.ashx>).