# **New Zealand**

## **Overview of CbC reporting requirements**

First reporting fiscal year: Commencing on or after 1 January 2016 Consolidated group revenue threshold: EUR 750 million Filing deadline: 12 months following the end of the reporting fiscal year Local filing required: No Surrogate parent entity filing permitted: Yes First review of the domestic legal framework: 2017/2018

### **Summary of recommendations**

Area of implementation	Recommendations for improvement
Domestic legal and administrative framework	None.
Exchange of information framework	None.
Appropriate use	None.

### The domestic legal and administrative framework

New Zealand confirms that its rules have not changed and continue to be applied effectively. New Zealand continues to meet all terms of reference.<sup>1 2 3</sup>

### The exchange of information framework

New Zealand confirms that its rules have not changed and continue to be applied effectively. New Zealand continues to meet all terms of reference.

### Appropriate use of CbC reports

New Zealand confirms that its rules have not changed and continue to be applied effectively. New Zealand continues to meet all terms of reference.

#### **Notes**

<sup>1</sup> New Zealand's 2017/2018 peer review included a monitoring point referring to the definition of a "large multinational group" in its legislation does which not include the "deemed listing provision" as required under the terms of reference. However, New Zealand notes that the financial reporting requirements in New Zealand apply to large entities (including companies, partnerships and limited partnerships) regardless of whether they are listed on a stock exchange. A "large entity" is defined in the Financial Reporting Act 2013 as an entity that earns over NZD 30m of consolidated revenues (which is much lower than EUR 750m) or that have over NZD 60m of consolidated assets in the previous two years. New Zealand also confirms that in the very unlikely event that an entity did not prepare consolidated financial statements and would be considered as an "Ultimate Parent Entity" further to the "deemed listing provision" (as per paragraph 18.i. of the terms of reference), the existing powers of Section 17 of the Tax Administration Act 1994 will be relied on to request the information. This monitoring point remains in place.

<sup>2</sup> As New Zealand continues to rely on existing powers in the Tax Administration Act 1994 until legislation is finalised, and because the effectiveness of this system still relies on the fact that the Inland Revenue correctly identifies all New Zealand resident entities that are the Ultimate Parent Entity of an MNE Group within the scope of CbC Reporting and issues a notification, the monitoring point in the 2017/2018 peer review relating to New Zealand's framework remains in place.

<sup>3</sup> New Zealand's 2017/2018 peer review included a general monitoring point relating to a specific process that would allow New Zealand to take appropriate measures in case New Zealand is notified by another jurisdiction that such other jurisdiction has reason to believe that an error may have led to incorrect or incomplete information reporting by a Reporting Entity or that there is non-compliance of a Reporting Entity with respect to its obligation to file a CbC report. This monitoring point remains in place.



# From: Country-by-Country Reporting – Compilation of 2022 Peer Review Reports

Inclusive Framework on BEPS: Action 13

Access the complete publication at: https://doi.org/10.1787/5ea2ba65-en

#### Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2022), "New Zealand", in *Country-by-Country Reporting – Compilation of 2022 Peer Review Reports: Inclusive Framework on BEPS: Action 13*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/eda9270d-en

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area. Extracts from publications may be subject to additional disclaimers, which are set out in the complete version of the publication, available at the link provided.

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at <u>http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions</u>.

