

F.No. CBIC-20001/8/2021-GST
Government of India
Ministry of Finance
Department of Revenue
Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs
GST Policy Wing

New Delhi, dated the 20th September, 2021

To,

The Principal Chief Commissioners/ Chief Commissioners/ Principal Commissioners/
Commissioners of Central Tax (All)

The Principal Directors General/ Directors General (All)

Madam/Sir,

Subject: Clarification on doubts related to scope of “Intermediary”–reg.

Representations have been received citing ambiguity caused in interpretation of the scope of “Intermediary services” in the GST Law. The matter has been examined. In view of the difficulties being faced by the trade and industry and to ensure uniformity in the implementation of the provisions of the law across field formations, the Board, in exercise of its powers conferred by section 168 (1) of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as “CGST Act”), hereby clarifies the issues in succeeding paragraphs.

2. Scope of Intermediary services

2.1 ‘Intermediary’ has been defined in the sub-section (13) of section 2 of the Integrated Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as “IGST” Act) as under–

“Intermediary means a broker, an agent or any other person, by whatever name called, who arranges or facilitates the supply of goods or services or both, or securities, between two or more persons, but does not include a person who supplies such goods or services or both or securities on his own account.”

2.2 The concept of ‘intermediary’ was borrowed in GST from the Service Tax Regime. The definition of ‘intermediary’ in the Service Tax law as given in Rule 2(f) of Place of Provision of Services Rules, 2012 issued vide notification No. 28/2012-ST, dated 20-6-2012 was as follows:

“intermediary” means a broker, an agent or any other person, by whatever name called, who arranges or facilitates a provision of a service (hereinafter called the ‘main’ service) or a

supply of goods, between two or more persons, but does not include a person who provides the main service or supplies the goods on his account;”

2.3 From the perusal of the definition of “intermediary” under IGST Act as well as under Service Tax law, it is evident that there is broadly no change in the scope of intermediary services in the GST regime vis-à-vis the Service Tax regime, except addition of supply of securities in the definition of intermediary in the GST Law.

3. Primary Requirements for intermediary services

The concept of intermediary services, as defined above, requires some basic pre-requisites, which are discussed below:

3.1 Minimum of Three Parties: By definition, an intermediary is someone who arranges or facilitates the supplies of goods or services or securities between two or more persons. It is thus a natural corollary that the arrangement requires a minimum of three parties, two of them transacting in the supply of goods or services or securities (the main supply) and one arranging or facilitating (the ancillary supply) the said main supply. An activity between only two parties can, therefore, NOT be considered as an intermediary service. An intermediary essentially “arranges or facilitates” another supply (the “main supply”) between two or more other persons and, does not himself provide the main supply.

3.2 Two distinct supplies: As discussed above, there are two distinct supplies in case of provision of intermediary services;

(1) Main supply, between the two principals, which can be a supply of goods or services or securities;

(2) Ancillary supply, which is the service of facilitating or arranging the main supply between the two principals. This ancillary supply is supply of intermediary service and is clearly identifiable and distinguished from the main supply.

A person involved in supply of main supply on principal to principal basis to another person cannot be considered as supplier of intermediary service.

3.3 Intermediary service provider to have the character of an agent, broker or any other similar person: The definition of “intermediary” itself provides that intermediary service provider *means a broker, an agent or any other person, by whatever name called....*”. This part of the definition is not inclusive but uses the expression “means” and does not expand the definition by any known expression of expansion such as “and includes”. The use of the expression “arranges or facilitates” in the definition of “intermediary” suggests a subsidiary role for the intermediary. It must arrange or facilitate some other supply, which is the main supply, and does not himself provides the main supply. Thus, the role of intermediary is only supportive.

3.4 Does not include a person who supplies such goods or services or both or securities on his own account: The definition of intermediary services specifically mentions

that intermediary “does not include a person who supplies **such** goods or services or both or securities on his own account”. Use of word “**such**” in the definition with reference to supply of goods or services refers to the main supply of goods or services or both, or securities, between two or more persons, which are arranged or facilitated by the intermediary. It implies that in cases wherein the person supplies the main supply, either fully or partly, on principal to principal basis, the said supply cannot be covered under the scope of “intermediary”.

3.5 Sub-contracting for a service is not an intermediary service: An important exclusion from intermediary is sub-contracting. The supplier of main service may decide to outsource the supply of the main service, either fully or partly, to one or more sub-contractors. Such sub-contractor provides the main supply, either fully or a part thereof, and does not merely arrange or facilitate the main supply between the principal supplier and his customers, and therefore, clearly is not an intermediary. For instance, ‘A’ and ‘B’ have entered into a contract as per which ‘A’ needs to provide a service of, say, Annual Maintenance of tools and machinery to ‘B’. ‘A’ subcontracts a part or whole of it to ‘C’. Accordingly, ‘C’ provides the service of annual maintenance to ‘A’ as part of such sub-contract, by providing annual maintenance of tools and machinery to the customer of ‘A’, i.e. to ‘B’ on behalf of ‘A’. Though ‘C’ is dealing with the customer of ‘A’, but ‘C’ is providing main supply of Annual Maintenance Service to ‘A’ on his own account, i.e. on principal to principal basis. In this case, ‘A’ is providing supply of Annual Maintenance Service to ‘B’, whereas ‘C’ is supplying the same service to ‘A’. Thus, supply of service by ‘C’ in this case will not be considered as an intermediary.

3.6 The specific provision of place of supply of ‘intermediary services’ under section 13 of the IGST Act shall be invoked **only when** either the location of supplier of intermediary services or location of the recipient of intermediary services is outside India.

4. Applying the abovementioned guiding principles, the issue of intermediary services is clarified through the following illustrations:

Illustration 1

‘A’ is a manufacturer and supplier of a machine. ‘C’ helps ‘A’ in selling the machine by identifying client ‘B’ who wants to purchase this machine and helps in finalizing the contract of supply of machine by ‘A’ to ‘B’. ‘C’ charges ‘A’ for his services of locating ‘B’ and helping in finalizing the sale of machine between ‘A’ and ‘B’, for which ‘C’ invoices ‘A’ and is paid by ‘A’ for the same. While ‘A’ and ‘B’ are involved in the main supply of the machinery, ‘C’, is facilitating the supply of machine between ‘A’ and ‘B’. In this arrangement, ‘C’ is providing the ancillary supply of arranging or facilitating the ‘main supply’ of machinery between ‘A’ and ‘B’ and therefore, ‘C’ is an intermediary and is providing intermediary service to ‘A’.

Illustration 2

‘A’ is a software company which develops software for the clients as per their requirement. ‘A’ has a contract with ‘B’ for providing some customized software for its business operations.

‘A’ outsources the task of design and development of a particular module of the software to ‘C’, for which ‘C’ may have to interact with ‘B’, to know their specific requirements. In this case, ‘C’ is providing main supply of service of design and development of software to ‘A’, and thus, ‘C’ is not an intermediary in this case.

Illustration 3

An insurance company ‘P’, located outside India, requires to process insurance claims of its clients in respect of the insurance service being provided by ‘P’ to the clients. For processing insurance claims, ‘P’ decides to outsource this work to some other firm. For this purpose, he approaches ‘Q’, located in India, for arranging insurance claims processing service from other service providers in India. ‘Q’ contacts ‘R’, who is in business of providing such insurance claims processing service, and arranges supply of insurance claims processing service by ‘R’ to ‘P’. ‘Q’ charges P a commission or service charge of 1% of the contract value of insurance claims processing service provided by ‘R’ to ‘P’. In such a case, main supply of insurance claims processing service is between ‘P’ and ‘R’, while ‘Q’ is merely arranging or facilitating the supply of services between ‘P’ and ‘R’, and not himself providing the main supply of services. Accordingly, in this case, ‘Q’ acts as an intermediary as per definition of sub-section (13) of section 2 of the IGST Act.

Illustration 4

‘A’ is a manufacturer and supplier of computers based in USA and supplies its goods all over the world. As a part of this supply, ‘A’ is also required to provide customer care service to its customers to address their queries and complains related to the said supply of computers. ‘A’ decides to outsource the task of providing customer care services to a BPO firm, ‘B’. ‘B’ provides customer care service to ‘A’ by interacting with the customers of ‘A’ and addressing / processing their queries / complains. ‘B’ charges ‘A’ for this service. ‘B’ is involved in supply of main service ‘customer care service’ to ‘A’, and therefore, ‘B’ is not an intermediary.

5. The illustrations given in para 4 above are only indicative and not exhaustive. The illustrations are also generic in nature and should not be interpreted to mean that the service categories mentioned therein are inherently either intermediary services or otherwise. Whether or not, a specific service would fall under intermediary services within the meaning of sub-section (13) of section 2 of the IGST Act, would depend upon the facts of the specific case. While examining the facts of the case and the terms of contract, the basic characteristics of intermediary services, as discussed in para 3 above, should be kept in consideration.

6. It is requested that suitable trade notices may be issued to publicize the contents of this Circular.

7. Difficulty, if any, in the implementation of this Circular may be brought to the notice of the Board. Hindi version will follow.

(Sanjay Mangal)
Principal Commissioner (GST)

F. No. CBIC-20001/8/2021-GST
Government of India
Ministry of Finance
Department of Revenue
Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs
GST Policy Wing

New Delhi, dated the 20th September, 2021

To

The Pr. Chief Commissioners / Chief Commissioners / Principal Commissioners /
Commissioners of Central Tax (All)
The Principal Directors General / Directors General (All)

Madam / Sir,

Subject: Clarification in respect of certain GST related issues - reg.

Various representations have been received from taxpayers and other stakeholders seeking clarification in respect of certain issues pertaining to GST laws. The issues have been examined. In order to ensure uniformity in the implementation of the provisions of the law across field formations, the Board, in exercise of its powers conferred by section 168(1) of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as “CGST Act”), hereby clarifies each of these issues as under:

S. No.	Issue	Clarification
1.	Section 16 (4), as amended with effect from 01.01.2021, provides that a registered person shall not be entitled to take input tax credit in respect of any invoice or debit note for supply of goods or services or both after the due date of furnishing of the return under section 39 for the month of September following the end of financial year to which such	1. With effect from 01.01.2021, section 16(4) of the CGST Act, 2017 was amended <i>vide</i> the Finance Act, 2020, so as to delink the date of issuance of debit note from the date of issuance of the underlying invoice for purposes of availing input tax credit. The amendment made is shown as below: <i>“A registered person shall not be entitled to take input tax credit in respect of any invoice or debit note for supply of goods or services or both</i>

<p>invoice or debit note pertains or furnishing of the relevant annual return, whichever is earlier.</p> <p>Doubts have been raised seeking following clarification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which of the following dates are relevant to determine the ‘financial year’ for the purpose of section 16(4): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) date of issuance of debit note, or (b) date of issuance of underlying invoice. 2. Whether any availment of input tax credit, on or after 01.01.2021, in respect of debit notes issued either prior to or after 01.01.2021, will be governed by the provisions of the amended section 16(4), or the amended provision will be applicable only in respect of the debit notes issued after 01.01.2021? 	<p align="center"><i>after the due date of furnishing of the return under section 39 for the month of September following the end of financial year to which such invoice or invoice relating to such debit note pertains or furnishing of the relevant annual return, whichever is earlier.”</i></p> <p>As can be seen, the words “invoice relating to such” were omitted w.e.f. 01.01.2021.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The intent of law as specified in the Memorandum explaining the Finance Bill, 2020 states that “<i>Clause 118 of the Bill seeks to amend sub-section (4) of section 16 of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act so as to delink the date of issuance of debit note from the date of issuance of the underlying invoice for purposes of availing input tax credit.</i>” 3. Accordingly, it is clarified that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) w.e.f. 01.01.2021, in case of debit notes, the date of issuance of debit note (not the date of underlying invoice) shall determine the relevant financial year for the purpose of section 16(4) of the CGST Act. b) The availment of ITC on debit notes in respect of amended provision shall be applicable from 01.01.2021. Accordingly, for availment of ITC on or after 01.01.2021, in respect of debit notes issued either prior to or after 01.01.2021, the eligibility for availment of ITC will be governed by the amended provision of section 16(4), whereas any ITC availed prior to 01.01.2021, in respect of debit notes, shall be governed under the
---	--

		<p>provisions of section 16(4), as it existed before the said amendment on 01.01.2021.</p> <p>Illustration 1. A debit note dated 07.07.2021 is issued in respect of the original invoice dated 16.03.2021. As the invoice pertains to F.Y. 2020-21, the relevant financial year for availment of ITC in respect of the said invoice in terms of section 16(4) of the CGST shall be 2020-21. However, as the debit note has been issued in FY 2021-22, the relevant financial year for availment of ITC in respect of the said debit note shall be 2021-22 in terms of amended provision of section 16(4) of the CGST Act.</p> <p>Illustration 2. A debit note has been issued on 10.11.2020 in respect an invoice dated 15.07.2019. As per amended provision of section 16(4), the relevant financial year for availment of input tax credit on the said debit note, on or after 01.01.2021, will be FY 2020-21 and accordingly, the registered person can avail ITC on the same till due date of furnishing of FORM GSTR-3B for the month of September, 2021 or furnishing of the annual return for FY 2020-21, whichever is earlier.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Whether carrying physical copy of invoice is compulsory during movement of goods in cases where suppliers have issued invoices in the manner prescribed under rule 48 (4) of the CGST Rules, 2017 (i.e. in cases of e-invoice).</p>	<p>1. Rule 138A (1) of the CGST Rules, 2017 <i>inter-alia</i>, provides that the person in charge of a conveyance shall carry— (a) the invoice or bill of supply or delivery challan, as the case may be; and (b) a copy of the e-way bill or the e-way bill number, either physically or mapped to a Radio Frequency Identification Device embedded on to the conveyance in such manner as may be notified by the Commissioner.</p> <p>2. Further, rule 138A (2) of CGST Rules, after being amended <i>vide</i> notification No. 72/2020-Central Tax dated 30.09.2020,</p>

		<p>states that <i>“In case, invoice is issued in the manner prescribed under sub-rule (4) of rule 48, the Quick Reference (QR) code having an embedded Invoice Reference Number (IRN) in it, may be produced electronically, for verification by the proper officer in lieu of the physical copy of such tax invoice”</i></p> <p>3. A conjoint reading of rules 138A (1) and 138A (2) of CGST Rules, 2017 clearly indicates that there is no requirement to carry the physical copy of tax invoice in cases where e-invoice has been generated by the supplier. After amendment, the revised rule 138A (2) states in unambiguous words that whenever e-invoice has been generated, the Quick Reference (QR) code, having an embedded Invoice Reference Number (IRN) in it, may be produced electronically for verification by the proper officer in lieu of the physical copy of such tax invoice.</p> <p>4. Accordingly, it is clarified that there is no need to carry the physical copy of tax invoice in cases where invoice has been generated by the supplier in the manner prescribed under rule 48(4) of the CGST Rules and production of the Quick Response (QR) code having an embedded Invoice Reference Number (IRN) electronically, for verification by the proper officer, would suffice.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Whether the first proviso to section 54(3) of CGST / SGST Act, prohibiting refund of unutilized ITC is applicable in case of exports of goods which</p>	<p>1. The term ‘subjected to export duty’ used in first proviso to section 54(3) of the CGST Act, 2017 means where the goods are actually leviable to export duty and suffering export duty at the time of export. Therefore, goods in respect of which either NIL rate is</p>

	<p>are having NIL rate of export duty.</p>	<p>specified in Second Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 or which are fully exempted from payment of export duty by virtue of any customs notification or which are not covered under Second Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975, cannot be considered to be subjected to any export duty under Customs Tariff Act, 1975.</p> <p>2. Accordingly, it is clarified that only those goods which are actually subjected to export duty i.e., on which some export duty has to be paid at the time of export, will be covered under the restriction imposed under section 54(3) from availment of refund of accumulated ITC. Goods, which are not subject to any export duty and in respect of which either NIL rate is specified in Second Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 or which are fully exempted from payment of export duty by virtue of any customs notification or which are not covered under Second Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975, would not be covered by the restriction imposed under the first proviso to section 54(3) of the CGST Act for the purpose of availment of refund of accumulated ITC.</p>
--	--	---

2. It is requested that suitable trade notices may be issued to publicize the contents of this Circular.

3. Difficulty, if any, in the implementation of this Circular may be brought to the notice of the Board. Hindi version will follow.

(Sanjay Mangal)
Principal Commissioner

F. No. CBIC-20001/8/2021–GST
Government of India
Ministry of Finance
Department of Revenue
Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs
GST Policy Wing

New Delhi, dated the 20th September, 2021

To

The Pr. Chief Commissioners / Chief Commissioners / Principal Commissioners /
Commissioners of Central Tax (All)
The Principal Directors General / Directors General (All)

Madam / Sir,

Subject: Clarification relating to export of services-condition (v) of section 2(6) of the IGST Act 2017–reg.

Various representations have been received citing ambiguity caused in interpretation of the Explanation 1 under section 8 of the IGST Act 2017 in relation to condition (v) of export of services as mentioned in sub-section (6) of the section 2 of the IGST Act 2017. Doubts have been raised whether the supply of service by a subsidiary/ sister concern/ group concern, etc. of a foreign company in India, which is incorporated under the laws in India, to the foreign company incorporated under laws of a country outside India, will hit by condition (v) of sub-section (6) of section 2 of IGST Act.

2. The matter has been examined. In view of the difficulties being faced by the trade and industry and to ensure uniformity in the implementation of the provisions of the law across field formations, the Board, in exercise of its powers conferred by section 168 (1) of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as “CGST Act”), hereby clarifies the issue in succeeding paragraphs.

Relevant legal provisions:

3.1 The export of services has been defined in sub-section (6) of the section 2 of the IGST Act 2017 as under:

(6) “*export of services*” means the supply of any service when,—
(i) *the supplier of service is located in India;*

- (ii) the recipient of service is located outside India;*
- (iii) the place of supply of service is outside India;*
- (iv) the payment for such service has been received by the supplier of service in convertible foreign exchange; and*
- (v) the supplier of service and the recipient of service are not merely establishments of a distinct person in accordance with Explanation 1 in section 8;***

3.2 Explanation 1 of the Section 8 of the IGST Act provides for the conditions wherein establishments of a person would be treated as establishments of distinct persons, which is reproduced as under:

Explanation 1.—For the purposes of this Act, where a person has,—

- (i) an establishment in India and any other establishment outside India;*
- (ii) an establishment in a State or Union territory and any other establishment outside that State or Union territory; or*
- (iii) an establishment in a State or Union territory and any other establishment being a business vertical registered within that State or Union territory, then such establishments shall be treated as establishments of distinct persons.*

As per the above Explanation, an establishment of a person in India and another establishment of the said person outside India are considered as establishments of distinct persons.

3.3 Reference is also invited to the Explanation 2 of Section 8 of IGST Act, which is reproduced below:

“Explanation 2.—A person carrying on a business through a branch or an agency or a representational office in any territory shall be treated as having an establishment in that territory.”

3.4 Reference is also invited to the definition of “person” as provided under CGST Act 2017, made applicable to IGST Act vide section 2(24) of IGST Act 2017. “Person” has been defined under sub-section (84) of the section 2 of the CGST Act 2017, as under:

(84) “person” includes—

- (a) an individual;*
- (b) a Hindu Undivided Family;*
- (c) a company;***
- (d) a firm;*
- (e) a Limited Liability Partnership;*
- (f) an association of persons or a body of individuals, whether incorporated or not, in India or outside India;*

(g) any corporation established by or under any Central Act, State Act or Provincial Act or a Government company as defined in clause (45) of section 2 of the Companies Act, 2013;

(h) any body corporate incorporated by or under the laws of a country outside India;

(i) a co-operative society registered under any law relating to co-operative societies;

(j) a local authority;

(k) Central Government or a State Government;

(l) society as defined under the Societies Registration Act, 1860;

(m) trust; and

(n) every artificial juridical person, not falling within any of the above;

3.5. The definitions of company and foreign company have been provided under section 2 of Companies Act 2013, as under:

(20) “company” means a company incorporated under this Act or under any previous company law;

(42) “foreign company” means any company or body corporate incorporated outside India which—

(a) has a place of business in India whether by itself or through an agent, physically or through electronic mode; and

(b) conducts any business activity in India in any other manner.

Analysis of the issue:

4.1 Clause (v) of sub-section (6) of section 2 of IGST Act, which defines “export of services”, places a condition that the services provided by one establishment of **a person to another establishment of the same person, considered as establishments of distinct persons as per Explanation 1 of section 8 of IGST Act**, cannot be treated as export. In other words, any supply of services by an establishment of a foreign company in India to any other establishment of the said foreign company outside India will not be covered under definition of export of services.

4.2 Further, perusal of the Explanation 2 to section 8 of the IGST Act suggests that if a foreign company is conducting business in India through a branch or an agency or a representational office, then the said branch or agency or representational office of the foreign company, located in India, shall be treated as establishment of the said foreign company in India. Similarly, if any company incorporated in India, is operating through a branch or an agency or a representational office in any country outside India, then that branch or agency or representational office shall be treated as the establishment of the said company in the said country.

4.3. In view of the above, it can be stated that supply of services made by a branch or an agency or representational office of a foreign company, not incorporated in India, to any establishment of the said foreign company outside India, shall be treated as supply between establishments of distinct persons and shall not be considered as “export of services” in view of condition (v) of sub-section (6) of section 2 of IGST Act. Similarly, any supply of service by a company incorporated in India to its branch or agency or representational office, located in any other country and not incorporated under the laws of the said country, shall also be considered as supply between establishments of distinct persons and cannot be treated as export of services.

4.4 From the perusal of the definition of “person” under sub-section (84) of section 2 of the CGST Act, 2017 and the definitions of “company” and “foreign company” under Section 2 of the Companies Act, 2013, it is observed that a company incorporated in India and a foreign company incorporated outside India, are separate “person” under the provisions of CGST Act and accordingly, are separate legal entities. Thus, a subsidiary/ sister concern/ group concern of any foreign company which is incorporated in India, then the said company incorporated in India will be considered as a separate “person” under the provisions of CGST Act and accordingly, would be considered as a separate legal entity than the foreign company.

Clarification:

5.1 In view of the above, it is clarified that a company incorporated in India and a body corporate incorporated by or under the laws of a country outside India, which is also referred to as foreign company under Companies Act, are separate **persons** under CGST Act, and thus are separate legal entities. Accordingly, these two separate persons would not be considered as “merely establishments of a distinct person in accordance with Explanation 1 in section 8”.

5.2 Therefore, supply of services by a subsidiary/ sister concern/ group concern, etc. of a foreign company, which is incorporated in India under the Companies Act, 2013 (and thus qualifies as a ‘company’ in India as per Companies Act), to the establishments of the said foreign company located outside India (incorporated outside India), would not be barred by the condition (v) of the sub-section (6) of the section 2 of the IGST Act 2017 for being considered as export of services, as it would not be treated as supply between merely establishments of distinct persons under Explanation 1 of section 8 of IGST Act 2017. Similarly, the supply from a company incorporated in India to its related establishments outside India, which are incorporated under the laws outside India, would not be treated as supply to merely establishments of distinct person under Explanation 1 of section 8 of IGST Act 2017. Such supplies, therefore, would qualify as ‘export of services’, subject to fulfilment of other conditions as provided under sub-section (6) of section 2 of IGST Act.

6. It is requested that suitable trade notices may be issued to publicize the contents of this Circular.

7. Difficulty, if any, in the implementation of this Circular may be brought to the notice of the Board. Hindi version will follow.

(Sanjay Mangal)
Principal Commissioner