

tax notes international

Italy's Domestic Definition of Permanent Establishment

by Luigi Perin

Reprinted from Tax Notes Int'l, 26 April 2004, p. 357

TAX NOTES INTERNATIONAL

Copyright 2004, Tax Analysts ISSN 1048-3306

Editor: Cathy Phillips

Special Reports Editor: Alice Keane Putman

Managing Editor: Maryam Enayat

Deputy Editor: Doug Smith **Production:** Paul M. Doster

Chief of Correspondents: Cordia Scott (cscott@tax.org)

Executive Director and Publisher: Chris Bergin Senior Executive Editor: Robert Manning Editor-in-Chief, International: Robert Goulder

Founder: Thomas F. Field

Correspondents

Africa: Zein Kebonang, University of Botswana, Gaborone Albania: Adriana Civici, Ministry of Finance, Tirana Angola: Trevor Wood, Ernst & Young, Lisbon

Anguilla: Alex Richardson, Anguilla Offshore Finance Centre, Anguilla Antigua: Donald B. Ward, PricewaterhouseCoopers Center, St. John's Argentina: Cristian E. Rosso Alba, Hope, Duggan & Silva, Buenos Aires

Armenia: Suren Adamyan, Association of Accountants and Auditors of Armenia, Yerevan Australia: Graeme S. Cooper, University of Sydney, Sydney; Richard Krever, Deakin University, Melbourne,

Austria: Markus Stefaner, Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration,

Vienna

Bahamas: Hywel Jones, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce Trust Company (Bahamas) Ltd.,

Bangladesh: M. Mushtaque Ahmed, Ernst & Young, Dhaka Barbados: Patrick B. Toppin, Pannell Kerr Forster, Christ Church

Belgium: Werner Heyvaert, Nauta Dutilh, Brussels Bermuda: Wendell Hollis, Ernst & Young, Bermuda

Botswana: I.O. Sennanyana, Deputy Director, Tax Policy, Ministry of Finance & Development Planning, Gaborone

Brazil: David Roberto R. Soares da Silva, Farroco & Lobo Advogados, São Paulo British Virgin Islands: William L. Blum, Solomon Pearl Blum Heymann & Stich LLP, St.

Thomas, USVI and New York

Bulgaria: Todor Tabakov, Interlex, Sofia Cameroon: Edwin N. Forlemu, International Tax Program, Harvard University, Cambridge Canada: Brian J. Arnold, Goodmans, Toronto, Ontario; Jack Bernstein, Aird & Berlis, Toronto,

Ontario; Martin Przysuski, Srini Lalapet, and Hendrik Swaneveld, Transfer Pricing and Competent Authority Services, BDO Dunwoody, Toronto (Markham) Ontario Caribbean: Bruce Zagaris, Berliner, Corcoran, and Rowe, Washington, D.C.

Cayman Islands: Timothy Ridley, Maples & Calder Asia, Hong Kong

Chile: Macarena Navarrete, Ernst & Young, Santiago

China (P.R.C.): David D. Liu, Sidley Austin Brown & Wood, Shanghai; Jinyan Li, York University, Toronto; Lawrence Sussman, O'Melveny & Myers LLP, Beijing Cook Islands: David R. McNair, Southpac Trust Limited, Rarotonga

Croatia: Hrvoje Zgombic, Zgombic & Partners, Zagreb Cyprus: Theodoros Philippou, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Nicosia Czech Republic: Michal Dlouhy, White & Case, Prague

Denmark: Thomas Froebert, Philip & Partners, Copenhagen; Nikolaj Bjørnholm, Bech-Bruun Dragsted Law Firm, Copenhagen

Dominican Republic: Dr. Fernándo Ravelo Alvarez, Santo Domingo

Eastern Europe: Iurie Lungu, Graham & Levintsa, Chisinau Egypt: Farrouk Metwally, Ernst & Young, Cairo

Estonia: Helen Pahapill, Ministry of Finance, Tallinn

European Union: Joann M. Weiner, Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis, Brussels

Fiji: Bruce Sutton, KPMG Peat Marwick, Suva

Finland: Marjaana Helminen, University of Helsinki in the Faculty of Law, Helsinki

France: Marcellin N. Mbwa-Mboma, Baker & McKenzie, New York; Olivier Delattre, Latham

Gambia: Samba Ebrima Saye, Income Tax Division, Banjul

Germany: Jörg-Dietrich Kramer, Ministry of Finance, Berlin/Bonn; Rosemarie Portner, Meilicke

Hoffmann & Partner, Bonn; Klaus Sieker, Flick Gocke Schaumburg, Frankfurt

Ghana: Seth Terkper, Chartered Accountant/Tax Expert, Accra Gibraltar: Charles D. Serruya, Baker Tilly, Gibraltar

Greece: Alexandra Gavrielides, Athens

Guam: Stephen A. Cohen, Carlsmith Ball LLP, Hagatna

Guernsey: Neil Crocker, PricewaterhouseCoopers, St. Peter Port

Guyana: Lancelot A. Atherly, Georgetown

Hong Kong: Colin Farrell, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Hong Kong Hungary: Daniel Deak, Budapest University of Economics, Budapest Iceland: Indridi H. Thorlaksson, Reykjavik

India: Nishith M. Desai, Nishith Desai Associates, Mumbai; Sanjay Sanghvi, RSM & Co., Mumbai

Indonesia: Freddy Karvadi, Karvadi & Co Law and Tax Office, Jakarta

Iran: Mohammad Tavakkol, Maliyat Journal, College of Economic Affairs, Tehran

Ireland: Kevin McLoughlin, Ernst & Young, Dublin

Isle of Man: Richard Vanderplank, Cains Advocates & Notaries, Douglas

Israel: Joel Lubell, Teva Pharmaceutical Industries, Ltd., Petach Tikva; Doron Herman, S. Friedman

& Co. Advocates & Notaries, Tel-Aviv

Italy: Alessandro Adelchi Rossi and Luigi Perin, George R. Funaro & Co., P.C., New York; Gianluca Queiroli, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Japan: Gary Thomas, White & Case, Tokyo; Shimon Takagi, White & Case, Tokyo

Jersey: J. Paul Frith, Ernst & Young, St. Helier

Kenya: Glenday Graham, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Nairobi Korea: Chang Hee Lee, Seoul National Univ. College of Law, Seoul, Korea

Kuwait: Abdullah Kh. Al-Avoub, Kuwait Latin America: Ernst & Young LLP, Miami

Latvia: Andrejs Birums, Tax Policy Department, Ministry of Finance, Riga

Lebanon: Fuad S. Kawar, Beirut

Libya: Ibrahim Baruni, Ibrahim Baruni & Co., Tripoli

Lithuania: Nora Vitkuniene, International Tax Division, Ministry of Finance, Vilnius Luxembourg: Jean-Baptiste Brekelmans, Loyens & Loeff, Luxembourg Malawi: Clement L. Mononga, Assistant Commissioner of Tax, Blantyre

Malaysia: Jeyapalan Kasipillai, University Utara, Sintok

Malta: Dr. Antoine Fiott, Zammit Tabona Bonello & Co., and Lecturer in Taxation, Faculty of Law,

University of Malta, Valletta

Mauritius: Ram L. Roy, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Port Louis

Mexico: Jaime Gonzalez-Bendiksen, Baker & McKenzie, Juarez, Tijuana, Monterrey, and

Guadalajara; Ricardo Leon-Santacruz, Sanchez-DeVanny Eseverri, Monterrey

Middle East: Aziz Nishtar, Nishtar & Zafar, Karachi, Pakistan

Monaco: Eamon McGregor, Moores Rowland Corporate Services, Monte Carlo Mongolia: Baldangiin Ganhuleg, General Department of National Taxation, Ulaanbaatar

Morocco: Mohamed Marzak, Agadir

Myanmar: Timothy J. Holzer, Baker & McKenzie, Singapore

Nauru: Peter H. MacSporran, Melbourne

Nepal: Prem Karki, Regional Director, Regional Treasury Directoriate, Kathmandu

Netherlands: Eric van der Stoel, Otterspeer, Haasnoot & Partners, Rotterdam; Dick Hofland, Freshfields, Amsterdam; Michaela Vrouwenvelder, Loyens & Loeff, New York; Jan Ter Wisch, Allen & Overy, Amsterdam

Netherlands Antilles: Dennis Cijntje, KPMG Meijburg & Co., Curaçao; Koen Lozie, Deurle

New Zealand: Adrian Sawyer, University of Canterbury, Christchurch

Nigeria: Elias Aderemi Sulu, Lagos

Northern Mariana Islands: John A. Manglona, Saipan

Norway: Frederik Zimmer, Department of Public and International Law, University of Oslo, Oslo

Oman: Fudli R. Talyarkhan, Ernst & Young, Muscat

Panama: Leroy Watson, Arias, Fabrega & Fabrega, Panama City Papua New Guinea: Lutz K. Heim, Ernst & Young, Port Moresby

Peru: Italo Fernández Origgi, Yori Law Firm, Lima

Philippines: Benedicta Du Baladad, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Manila Poland: Dr. Janusz Fiszer, Warsaw University/White & Case, Warsaw

Portugal: Francisco de Sousa da Câmara, Morais Leitao & J. Galvão Teles, Lisbon; Manuel

Anselmo Torres, Galhardo Vilão, Torres, Lisbon Qatar: Finbarr Sexton, Ernst & Young, Doha

Romania: Sorin Adrian Anghel, Senior Finance Officer & Vice President, The Chase Manhattan

Russia: Scott C. Antel, Ernst & Young, Moscow; Joel McDonald, Salans, London

Saint Kitts-Nevis: Mario M. Novello, Nevis Services Limited, Red Bank

Saudi Arabia: Fauzi Awad, Saba, Abulkhair & Co., Dammam

Sierra Leone: Shakib N.K. Basma and Berthan Macaulay, Basma & Macaulay, Freetown

Singapore: Linda Ng, White & Case, Tokyo, Japan Slovakia: Alzbeta Harvey, Principal, KPMG New York South Africa: Peter Surtees, Deneys Reitz, Cape Town Spain: José M. Calderón, University of La Coruña, La Coruña

Sri Lanka: D.D.M. Waidyasekera, Mt. Lavinia

Sweden: Leif Mutén, Professor Emeritus, Stockholm School of Economics

Taiwan: Keye S. Wu, Baker & McKenzie, Taipei; Yu Ming-i, Ministry of Finance, Taipei

Trinidad & Tobago: Rolston Nelson, Port of Spain

Tunisia: Lassaad M. Bediri, Hamza, Bediri & Co., Legal and Tax Consultants, Tunis

Turkey: Mustafa Çamlica, Ernst & Young, Istanbul

Turks & Caicos Islands, British West Indies: Ariel Misick, Misick and Stanbrook, Grand Turk

Uganda: Frederick Ssekandi, Kampala

United Arab Emirates: Nicholas J. Love, Ernst & Young, Abu Dhabi

United Kingdom: Trevor Johnson, Trevor Johnson Associates, Wirral; Eileen O'Grady,

barrister, London; Jefferson P. VanderWolk, Baker & McKenzie, London

United States: Richard Doernberg, Emory Univ. School of Law, Atlanta GA.; James Fuller,

Fenwick & West, Palo Alto

U.S. Virgin Islands: Marjorie Rawls Roberts, Attorney at Law, St. Thomas, USVI

Uruguay: Dr. James A. Whitelaw, Whitelaw Attorneys, Uruguay

Uzbekistan: Ian P. Slater, Arthur Andersen, Almaty Vanuatu: Bill L. Hawkes, KPMG, Port Vila

Venezuela: Ronald Evans, Baker & McKenzie, Caracas

Vietnam: Frederick Burke, Baker & McKenzie, Ho Chi Minh City

Western Samoa: Maiava V.R. Peteru, Kamu & Peteru, Apia

Yugoslavia: Danijel Pantic, European Consulting Group, Belgrade Zambia: W Z Mwanza, KPMG Peat Marwick, Lusaka

Zimbabwe: Prof. Ben Hlatshwayo, University of Zimbabwe, Harare

Italy's Domestic Definition of Permanent Establishment

by Luigi Perin

Luigi Perin is a partner with George R. Funaro & Co., P.C. in New York.

On 12 December 2003,¹ the Italian government introduced IRES (Imposta sul Reddito delle Società), the new corporate income tax, which replaced IRPEG (Imposta sul Reddito delle Persone Giuridiche), the former corporate income tax, effective 1 January 2004. Among the key features of IRES is the introduction of a definition of "permanent establishment" under Italian domestic law. As under IRPEG foreign persons are generally subject to IRES on business profits only if those profits arise with activities carried out in Italy through a PE.²

Prior Rules: OECD Definition of PE

Under prior rules, absent a definition of PE, the Ministry of Finance recognized the general applicability of the definition set forth in the OECD model.³ As a result Italy granted nontreaty investors the benefit of a similar threshold level for taxation as the one granted to treaty investors.

For example, to establish whether the business profits of a foreign corporation were attributable to an Italian PE, a U.S. corporation needed to make reference to the PE definition contained in article 5 of the 1984 Italy-U.S. income tax treaty. A British Virgin Islands company needed to make reference to the similar PE definition contained in article 5 of the OECD model, regardless of whether the British Virgin Islands had entered into an income tax treaty with Italy.

New Rules: Domestic Definition of PE

Article 162 of the Italian Income Tax Code⁴ introduces a definition of PE to income taxes and the regional tax on productive activities (*Imposta Regionale sulle Attività Produttive*, or IRAP). Income taxes include IRES and IRPEF (*Imposta sul Reddito delle Persone Fisiche*), which is the income tax on individuals. Article 162(2) does not indicate that the PE definition is applicable for VAT purposes.

With a few exceptions, the domestic definition of PE closely mirrors the definition contained in article 5 of the OECD model.

Article 162(1) defines PE as a fixed place of business, through which the business of a foreign person is wholly or partly carried on.

Consistent with the OECD model, article 162(4) contains exceptions to the general rule, listing a number of activities that may be carried on through a fixed place of business, but which do not create a PE. Also consistent with the OECD model, the Italian statute provides that a PE does not exist when the overall activity of the fixed place of business, resulting from a combination of exempt activities, is of a preparatory or auxiliary character. By inserting such a provision, Italy abandoned its long-standing unwillingness to commit that all or several of the exempt activities may be undertaken in combination without constituting a PE. Before, Italian authorities departed from the OECD model and reserved their right to judge actual cases on the relevant facts and circumstances as to whether the combination of activities constituted a PE.5 As a result none of Italy's income tax treaties currently contains a

¹See Decreto Legislativo 344 published in the Gazzetta Ufficiale 291 on 16 December 2003.

²Foreign persons are also subject to IRES on other categories of Italian-source income that do not constitute business profits, such as, for example, dividends, interest, royalties, real estate income, and capital gains.

³See Circolare Ministeriale 7/1496 dated 30 April 1977, and Risoluzione Ministeriale 9/2398 dated 1 February 1983.

⁴Testo unico delle imposte sui redditi, Decreto del Presidente della Repubblica 917 dated 22 December 1986 (ITC). Article references are to the ITC, unless otherwise noted.

⁵In the past, at least in one situation the Italian authorities ruled in favor of the taxpayer regarding this issue. A U.K. entity's offices in Italy that carried out advertising, market research, and quality control services for the head office in London did not constitute a PE. The activities fell within the definition of exempt activities under the Italy-U.K. income tax treaty. See Risoluzione Ministeriale 501504 dated 7 December 1991.

provision stating that a combination of exempt activities retaining preparatory or auxiliary character does not constitute a PE.

The primary departures from the OECD model are outlined below.

Definition of Place of Extraction of Natural Resources

Consistent with the OECD model, article 162(2) enumerates a list of typical examples of fixed places of business constituting a PE: a place of management; branch; office; factory; workshop; mine; oil or gas well; quarry; or any other place of extraction of natural resources.

Some domestic exemptions from PE status are broader and others are narrower than the ones provided by the OECD model.

Unlike the OECD model, article 162(2) goes on to state that places of extraction of natural resources include places located outside Italian territorial waters over which Italy may exercise exploitation rights in accordance with domestic or international law.

Definition of Building Site

Article 162(3) provides rules to determine whether a building, assembly, or installation site constitutes a PE and states that the site does not create a PE unless it lasts for more than three months. In contrast article 5(3) of the OECD model provides a threshold of 12 months.

The Italian statute includes supervisory activities connected to the site as part of the activities potentially giving rise to a PE. While the plain text of OECD model article 5(3) does not contemplate supervisory activities connected to the site as activities potentially giving rise to a PE, paragraph 17 of the OECD model commentary to article 5 indicates that onsite planning and supervision of the erection of a building are covered activities.

E-Commerce Exception

Article 162(5) provides that a foreign person having at its disposal computers and auxiliary equipment located within the Italian territory that enable it to collect and transmit data and information for selling goods or services does not per se create a PE. The plain language of the statute would seem to grant a rather broad exemption from PE status to foreign persons doing business in Italy through computer equipment, as compared to the exemption provided under the OECD

model. The commentary to the OECD model⁶ does not exclude the possibility that a PE may exist through the mere use of computer equipment located at a fixed place in the host state that is at the disposal of the foreign person.

Purchasing Agent Exception

Consistent with the OECD model, the Italian statute provides that a dependent agent of an enterprise is deemed to be a PE of the enterprise if the agent has, and habitually exercises, an authority to conclude contracts in the name of the enterprise. However, article 162(6) provides that if the agent's activities are limited to the purchase of goods or merchandise for the enterprise, the agent is not a PE of the enterprise.

The way that exception is formulated is narrower than the OECD model's. The latter provides that the agent is not a PE of the enterprise if its activities are limited to the exempt activities, which, if exercised through a fixed place of business, would not make this fixed place of business a PE. The exempt activities include *but are not limited to* the purchase of goods or merchandise for the enterprise.

Maritime Agent Exception

Consistent with the OECD model, articles 162(6) and (7) specify when activities carried on by an agent on behalf of a foreign person create or do not create a PE of that foreign person.

Article 162(8) provides that a foreign person is not deemed to have a PE in Italy merely because it carries on business in Italy through maritime brokers or representatives as defined under Italian law. That provision departs from the OECD model and from all Italian tax treaties.

Consistent with article 8 (shipping and air transport) of the OECD model, Italy's income tax treaties generally contain provisions under which profits derived by an enterprise of one country from the operation in international traffic of ships or aircraft are taxable only in that country, regardless of the existence of a PE in the other country. The maritime agent exception to the PE definition contained in the Italian statute seems to have a different and, in some ways, broader scope than article 8 of the OECD model. While the

 $^{^6}See$ paragraphs 42.1 through 42.10 of the commentary to article 5.

⁷The statute exempts activities carried out through a raccomandatario marittimo, within the meaning of Law 135 dated 4 April 1977, or through a mediatore marittimo, within the meaning of Law 478 dated 12 March 1968.

latter applies only to income from the operation of ships (or aircraft) in *international* traffic, Italy's domestic law exemption from PE status for certain categories of maritime agents would seem to apply to *domestic* traffic as well.

Conclusions

Italy's domestic definition of PE provides a few departures from the OECD model. As discussed above some domestic exemptions from PE status are broader and others are narrower than the ones provided by the OECD model. To the extent the domestic exceptions from the definition of PE are broader than the ones provided under the OECD model, Italy's negotiating power is diminished to current and prospective treaty partners. By the same token, a narrow domestic definition of PE may provide an incentive for foreign busi-

nesses that do not have a presence in Italy to locate assets or activities there.

As under prior law, the new law has the effect of granting nontreaty investors the benefit of a similar threshold level for taxation as the one granted to treaty investors. To the extent domestic exemptions from PE status are broader than the ones provided under the applicable tax treaty, a treaty investor will seek to apply the more favorable domestic provisions.⁸

Tax Notes International 26 April 2004 • 359

⁸Article 162(1) states that the definition of PE is subject to the provisions of article 169, which provides that if the domestic law of Italy provides a more favorable treatment than a tax treaty, the taxpayer may apply the provisions of domestic law.