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Background

- **2015**: BEPS Action 1 Report
- **2018**: March: Interim report
- **2019**: January: Policy Note
- **2019**: February/March: Public consultation
- **2019**: Programme of Work (PoW) approved by the Inclusive Framework on 28 May 2019

“Consistent with the analytical framework of both the Action 1 Report and the Interim Report, there is agreement to examine proposals involving two pillars which could form the basis for consensus”

Over 2,000 pages of comments and 400 participants
Where are we today?

Tensions in the system
- Aggressive audits & tax disputes
- Unilateral measures
- Dissatisfaction focused on highly digitalized MNEs and allocation of taxing rights

Three proposals from IF members
- No single proposal has reached consensus in isolation

High level of political commitment
- G20 and G7 support
- IF commitment (2018 Interim Report, 2019 PoW)
Secretariat Proposal

**Pillar One**
Proposal of the Secretariat for a “Unified Approach” Multiple-tier approach

**Pillar Two**
Global Anti-Base Erosion (GLOBE) proposal

**New nexus rule**
Unconstrained by physical presence

**Profit allocation rules**

- **Amount A**
  Portion (%) of deemed residual profit
- **Amount B**
  Fixed return for distribution functions
- **Amount C**
  Additional return based on TP analysis

Consensus-based long-term solution by the end of 2020
PILLAR 1: SECRETARIAT PROPOSAL FOR A “UNIFIED APPROACH”
The “Unified Approach”

**Objective**

Design a solution that would:

- address the nexus and profit allocation for large MNE groups
  - highly digitalised and consumer facing businesses
- allocate new taxing rights to market/user jurisdiction, unconstrained by physical presence
- achieve least complexity
- coexist with Arm’s Length Principle (ALP) and limit disruptions
- avoid double taxation and tax disputes
- lead to a consensus
The “Unified Approach”

**Scope**

*Large digital and consumer facing businesses*

**New nexus rule**

*MNE group level, unconstrained by physical presence*

**New profit allocation rules**

*Formulaic, MNE group level, beyond the ALP*

**Elimination of double taxation**

**Robust tax disputes prevention and resolution**
Scope

Large size MNE group/business

- Possible indicator: global revenue

Digital and consumer-facing businesses

- Enterprises likely to derive meaningful value from interactions with consumers/users in markets
- Highly digitalised business models (e.g. intermediation platform, online advertisement)
- Consumer facing businesses – include B2C and some B2B (e.g. as sales of consumer products through intermediaries)

Further exclusions and carve-outs

- Such as extractive industries, commodities – to be determined
In an increasingly digitalised economy, large businesses conduct consumer and/or user facing activities remotely.

New nexus rule would measure an MNE group sustained and significant involvement in the economy of a market.

Indicators would look at:
- a revenue threshold, with adaptations to take into consideration the size of the market
- a time threshold
- potentially other indicators of in-scope activities carried on in the market

In a standalone provision to avoid spill over effects.
Profit Allocation

Model based on three separate returns to the market/user jurisdiction

Amount A
- New taxing right to market/user jurisdiction
- Independent of physical presence
- Formulaic approach based on group/business line profits
- No links to ALP

Amounts B & C
- No new taxing right – merely a modified operation of the ALP
- Follows the separate entity approach
Profit Allocation
Amount A – new taxing right

Step 1: Determination of total profit
  • MNE group or business-line calculations

Step 2: Exclude “deemed” routine profit to define residual
  • Profitability threshold (i.e. fixed percentage(s))

Step 3: Allocate a portion of “deemed” residual profit
  • Formulary (i.e. fixed percentage(s))

Step 4: Allocate the relevant portion of the deemed residual among market jurisdictions
  • Agreed allocation key (e.g. sales)
Profit Allocation
Amounts B and C

**Amount B**

**Objective**
- Reduce disputes
- Achieve greater certainty

**Method**
- Fixed return for “baseline” or routine marketing or distribution activities in market

**Amounts C**

**Objective**
- Retain market jurisdiction right to tax profit above baseline activity
- Prevent double counting of Amount A

**Method**
- Apply current ALP to activities beyond baseline
- Introduce effective and binding dispute resolution mechanisms
Ongoing work

• Definitions and quanta
• Differentiation for business models
• Use of financial accounting and business line segmentation
• Elimination of double taxation (incl. double counting)
• Treatment of losses
• Implementation and administration
PILLAR 2: UPDATE ON THE GLOBE PROPOSAL
Rationale of the GloBE proposal

Rationale Given for Pillar Two

- Ensuring that all internationally operating businesses pay a minimum level of tax
- Address remaining BEPS issues
- Multilateral solution to avoid uncoordinated rules, increased complexity and risk of over-taxation
- Reduce pressure on developing countries to grant tax incentives
- Address profit shifting risk from intangibles but not ring-fenced to digital economy
- Recent tax policy developments (e.g. GILTI)
Overview of the GloBE proposal

- Income inclusion rule
- Switch-over rule
- Undertaxed payments rule
- Subject to tax rule
- Income not subject to tax at a minimum rate
Selected key issues currently under discussion

**Design of switch-over and subject to tax rules**

**Coordination rules**
- Rule order among different rules
- Rule order where the same rule may otherwise be applied multiple times

**Design of income inclusion rule and undertaxed payments rule**
- Effective tax rate test and exploration of simplifications including the use of financial accounts
- Different forms of blending
- Possible carve-outs

**Consultation on some of these key design issues in December (public consultation document to be released in November)**
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS & IMPACT ASSESSMENT
Revenue and Investment Implications (1)

The combined effect of Pillars 1 and 2 would lead to a significant increase in global tax revenues

• Pillar 1 involves a significant change to the way taxing rights are allocated among jurisdictions and it would also lead to a modest increase in tax revenues
• Low and middle income economies tend to gain relatively more revenue than advanced economies from Pillar 1
• Investment hubs tend to experience significant losses in tax base
• MNEs in digital-oriented and intangible-intensive sectors would be significantly impacted by both pillars
Overall, the package would not adversely affect the investment environment

- Overall impact on forward looking effective tax rates is generally modest
- Both Pillars would reduce the dispersion of tax rates across jurisdictions and reduce incentives for MNEs to engage in profit shifting
- In contrast, inaction could lead to a further increase in tax uncertainty and a deterioration in the business and investment environment
NEXT STEPS
Next steps

- **17 Oct 2019**
  - G20 Finance Ministers’ meeting

- **21-22 Nov 2019**
  - Public consultation under Pillar One

- **Dec 2019**
  - Public consultation under Pillar Two

- **Jan 2020**
  - Inclusive Framework meeting
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