THE MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS (MICPA)

CHARTERED TAX INSTITUTE OF MALAYSIA (CTIM)

JOINT MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED TAX TREATMENT FOR LLPs IN MALAYSIA

PREAMBLE

In response to the invitation by the Companies Commission of Malaysia (SSM), The Malaysian Institute of Certified Public Accountants (MICPA) and Chartered Tax Institute of Malaysia (CTIM) are pleased to submit this Joint Memorandum on Proposed Tax Treatment for LLPs in Malaysia for the SSM's consideration. We hope that our joint memorandum will contribute towards the preparation of the tax legislation for LLPs in Malaysia.

In this Memorandum, the Institutes have identified and analysed the tax treatment of LLPs in Malaysia for several proposed alternative perspectives. Each proposed tax treatment may require various amendments to the current tax legislation. We propose that the LLP legislation should be introduced together with the relevant changes in tax legislation to ensure smooth implementation.

ANALYSIS

Our analysis of the various tax treatments which may apply to LLPs in Malaysia is set out as follows:-

| | | Α | В | С | D | E |
|----|--------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | Treat as partnership (current partnership treatment) | Treat as company | Treat as flow through corporate entity (hybrid) | Treat as club | Treat as a special entity with tax incentives |
| 1. | Taxation of an LLP | Partnership not taxable | Partnership taxable as a company | Partnership taxable as a company but the tax paid is treated as a tax credit for the partners | Partnership taxable but at individual tax rates. Not a flow through vehicle. | Partnership taxed at scale rates. Not a flow through vehicle. |
| | a) Tax rate | Not Applicable (N/A) | Corporate tax rate | Corporate tax rate | Individual scale rates | Co-operative society rates or special rate eg 15% |
| | b) Tax incentives | Yes for double deductions, reinvestment allowance and Allowance for Increased Exports | Yes | Yes | No | Yes (Subject to MOF's policy decision) |
| 2. | Taxation of the partners | Partners are taxable on their share of profits less capital allowances from the | Partners are not taxable | Partners are taxable on a share of their profits from the partnership but receive a credit | Partners are not taxable | Partners are not taxable |

| | | Α | В | С | D | E |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Treat as partnership (current partnership treatment) | Treat as company | Treat as flow through corporate entity (hybrid) | Treat as club | Treat as a special entity with tax incentives |
| | | partnership. Partners enjoy individual rates and personal relief | | for the tax paid by the partnership | | |
| 3. | Taxation of profit distributions | N/A | Not taxable | Taxable (see item 2 above) | Not taxable | Not taxable |
| 4. | RPGT, Income tax and stamp duty on conversion from existing partnership to LLP | Control transfer – no income tax implications. Stamp duty on transfer of receivables, etc. RPGT on transfer of real property. | Control transfer – no income tax implications. Stamp duty on transfer of receivables, etc. RPGT on transfer of real property. | Control transfer – no income tax implications. Stamp duty on transfer of receivables, etc. RPGT on transfer of real property. | Control transfer – no income tax implications. Stamp duty on transfer of receivables, etc. RPGT on transfer of real property. | Control transfer – no income tax implications. Stamp duty on transfer of receivables, etc. RPGT on transfer of real property. |
| 5. | Basis period | Calendar year | Probably 12 months financial period | Probably 12 months financial period | Calendar year | Probably 12 months financial period |
| 6. | Is this method tax neutral? | Yes | No – taxed as a company | Yes except that LLP pays tax in advance | No, but may be more advantageous and | No, but may be more advantageous and |

| | | Α | В | С | D | E |
|----|---------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | Treat as partnership (current partnership treatment) | Treat as company | Treat as flow through corporate entity (hybrid) | Treat as club | Treat as a special entity with tax incentives |
| | | | | | administratively efficient | administratively efficient |
| 7. | Advantages | Many other countries adopt this method. Good vehicle for high risk investments as losses incurred may be eligible for tax deduction in partner's home country | Simple administration | Caters to many different types of partnerships and tax neutral | Simple to administer and has some benefits to small partnerships | Simple to administer and has some benefits to small partnerships. Use as special vehicle to stimulate business |
| 8. | Disadvantages | Nil – mere change from a normal partnership to a partnership with limited liability | Not commonly adopted in other countries. Partners cannot get deduction of interest expense incurred to acquire a stake in the | Complicated to administer | Not tax neutral. Partners cannot get deduction of interest expense incurred to acquire a stake in the partnership. Partners cannot enjoy | Not tax neutral. Partners cannot get deduction of interest expense incurred to acquire a stake in the partnership. Partners cannot enjoy personal reliefs on the |

| | | Α | В | С | D | E |
|----|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | Treat as partnership (current partnership treatment) | Treat as company | Treat as flow through corporate entity (hybrid) | Treat as club | Treat as a special entity with tax incentives |
| | | | partnership. Partners cannot enjoy personal reliefs on the partnership income. How will the partners' salaries be treated – as employee? Will there be tax deduction for EPF on partners' salaries? | | personal reliefs on the partnership income. How will the partners' salaries be treated – as employee? Will there be tax deduction for EPF on partners' salaries? | partnership income. How will the partners' salaries be treated – as employee? Will there be tax deduction for EPF on partners' salaries? |
| 9. | Who will most benefit from this tax treatment | Small partnerships, high risk investments eg film industry. | Large partnerships, IRB | Both small and large partnerships but cumbersome | IRB and small partnerships | All LLPs |

PROPOSAL

The Institutes propose that an LLP be treated as a partnership (Method A above) or treated as a company (Method B above). The Institutes further propose that an LLP be given an option to elect the most suitable tax treatment for itself i.e. either as a partnership or as a company at the incorporation or conversion to an LLP. This election should be irrevocable unless allowed by the IRB on good business grounds.

A summary of the Institutes' additional suggestions in relation to the above is provided in the table below:

| | The Institutes' suggestions | A. Treat as partnership (current partnership treatment) | B. Treat as company |
|----|--|---|---------------------|
| a) | To be taxed at SME tax rate of 20% for the first RM500,000 chargeable income. | N/A | Yes |
| b) | Existing tax incentives for partnerships to be extended to LLPs. | Yes | Yes |
| c) | Allow election for partnership or company tax treatment. However, election is irrevocable unless allowed by the IRB on good business grounds | Yes | Yes |
| d) | Partners be treated as employees | No | Yes |
| e) | Deduction for EPF of partners by the LLP | No | Yes |
| f) | RPGT, income tax, stamp duty and indirect tax neutrality / exemption on conversion to LLP. | Yes | Yes |

| | The Institutes' suggestions | A. Treat as partnership (current partnership treatment) | B. Treat as company |
|----|--|---|---------------------|
| g) | All unutilised allowances, losses and tax benefits of the transferor should be transferred to the LLP. | Yes | Yes |
| h) | Profit distributions are not taxable | N/A | Yes |
| i) | Basis period should follow companies and not restricted to calendar year | Yes | Yes |

CONCLUSION

We wish to thank the SSM for inviting the Institutes to submit our proposed tax treatments for LLPs in Malaysia. We hope that the SSM will give due consideration to our proposals.