

Taxing Government Contractors In Afghanistan

--By Paul Pompeo and Derrick Williams, Arnold & Porter LLP

Law360, New York (May 11, 2011) -- As recently as April 2011, Afghanistan indicated that it plans to require certain U.S. prime contractors and subcontractors performing work in Afghanistan under U.S. government contracts to pay Afghan income tax.[1]

This requirement could force affected U.S. corporations to either pay significant sums to the Afghan government or risk additional monetary penalty and disruption in business operations, including the loss of a contractor's Afghan business license. Further complicating this issue is that the U.S. government has signaled its position that both U.S. prime contractors and subcontractors operating in Afghanistan are exempt from Afghan taxes pursuant to bilateral agreements known as Status of Forces Agreements (SOFAs).

The U.S. government's position could mean that U.S. corporations that pay the Afghan tax to avoid stiffer Afghan penalties may be unable to recover these payments under their U.S. government contracts. Although this uncertainty poses significant risk, there may be steps that U.S. corporations can take to reduce their potential exposure and protect their bottom line.

Generally, SOFAs establish the legal framework under which military personnel operate in a foreign country, including the imposition of income taxes. Additionally, SOFAs may cover government contractors as well.[2]

Two different agreements implicate the imposition of Afghan income taxes on U.S. corporations doing business in Afghanistan under U.S. government contracts. One is through a 2002/2003 exchange of diplomatic notes related to Operation Enduring Freedom[3] and the other is through a military technical agreement (MTA) related to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization[4].

Although both the diplomatic notes and MTA contain language that can be read to exempt certain covered personnel, including U.S. "contractors and contractor personnel," from Afghan taxes, these agreements do not define the term "contractor" to explain whether it includes subcontractors.

The U.S. government argues that both agreements prohibit the Afghan government from taxing U.S. prime contractors and subcontractors operating thereunder.

The U.S. Department of Defense Office of General Counsel recently issued guidance stating that the tax exemption contained in the agreement established through the exchange of diplomatic notes covers DOD contractors, subcontractors and their U.S. or non-Afghan employees, as well as contractors and contractor personnel[5]. Indeed, since execution of the agreements, the Afghan government had interpreted the tax exemption to apply to subcontractors as well as prime contractors.

Subcontractors have reported receiving tax bills from the Afghan Ministry of Finance (MOF) demanding payment for income tax on profit earned in Afghanistan[6].

In addition, prime contractors are concerned that the Afghan MOF will demand compliance with Article 72 of the 2009 Afghanistan Income Tax Code, which requires prime contractors with an Afghan business license to withhold 2 percent and prime contractors without an Afghan business license to withhold 7 percent from payments to subcontractors[7].

Reports indicate that nonpayment could result in a contractor's loss of its business licenses, as well as restrictions on the contractor's ability to fly in and out of the country or to bring goods into the country[8].

The conundrum presented above is a set of unclear bilateral agreements regarding the application of Afghan taxes to contractors and subcontractors performing work under a U.S. government contract in Afghanistan, and the competing interpretations of the U.S. government and the Afghan government regarding the same.

The Federal Acquisition Regulation provides limited guidance on how to address the issues presented here, however, it is important to note that these provisions may not be applicable in all situations.[9]

For example, although FAR 52.229-6 specifically contemplates recovery for "after-imposed" taxes on a foreign fixed-price contract, where a foreign government changes its position regarding the applicability or exemption of a tax, the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals has denied recovery where it finds that the tax in question is, in fact, not an "after-imposed" tax[10].

Moreover, contractors should be wary of contract terms and direction from the contracting officer regarding a) the necessity to challenge the applicability of the tax and b) the recovery of the costs associated with such a challenge to the MOF[11].

In light of these circumstances, contractors should take the following steps to protect their bottom line:

- Determine whether the contract activities in question are being performed pursuant to U.S. government contracts in association with diplomatic notes and MTA.
- Review all contract provisions that may affect the inclusion of taxes in the contract cost or price.
- Communicate with their contracting officer.
- Consider executing special provisions to address these concerns in existing and future contracts.
- Prepare documentation and consider filing a claim under the disputes clause of the contract.

--By Paul Pompeo (pictured) and Derrick Williams, [Arnold & Porter LLP](#)

[Paul Pompeo](#) is a partner in Arnold & Porter's Washington, D.C., office in the firm's government contracts and litigation practice groups. Derrick Williams is an associate with the firm, admitted in Arkansas, and is practicing law in the District of Columbia during the pendency of his application for admission to the D.C. bar and under the supervision of lawyers of the firm who are members in good standing of the D.C. Bar.

The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the firm, its clients, or Portfolio Media, publisher of Law360. This article is for general information purposes and is not intended to be and should not be taken as legal advice.

[1] Maria Abi-Habib, "Security Firms Threaten to Leave Afghanistan," Wall Street Journal, April 5, 2011; Karen DeYoung and Joshua Partlow, "Afghanistan's push to tax U.S. contractors could renew tensions," [Washington Post](#), Jan. 17, 2011; Rod Nordland, "Conflict on Afghan Efforts to Tax Foreign Contractors," [New York Times](#), Jan. 17, 2011.

[2] Statistically, less than 10 percent of SOFAs address government contractors. G. Ballard and W. Bradley, Beyond Tax Treaties: Status of Forces and USAID Agreements, 17 J. Int'l Tax'n 52, 54 (April 2006).

[3] Agreement regarding the Status of U.S. Military and Civilian Personnel of the U.S. Department of Defense Present in Afghanistan in connection with Cooperative Efforts in Response to Terrorism, Humanitarian and Civic Assistance, Military Training and Exercises, and Other Activities, State Dept. No. 03-67, 2003 WL 21754316 (Treaty) (Diplomatic Notes) ("The government of the United States of America, its military and civilian personnel, contractors and contractor personnel shall not be liable to pay any tax or similar charge assessed within Afghanistan.").

[4] Military Technical Agreement between the ISAF and the Interim Administration of Afghanistan, January 2002.

[5] Department of Defense, Office of General Counsel, Memorandum For Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, March 29, 2011.

[6] Abi-Habib, *supra*.

[7] Article 72 of the Afghanistan Income Tax law of 2009. Article 72 of the Afghanistan Income Tax law of 2009 states that for contractors with a business license this tax is "in lieu of income tax." Conversely, contractors without a business license will treat the withholding as a final tax.

[8] DeYoung & Partlow, *supra* note 7.

[9] See FAR 52.229-6 Taxes — Foreign Fixed-Price Contracts. See also FAR 31.205-41 (taxes cost principle).

[10] See e.g., *Wisser Disentleistungs GmbH*, ASBCA No. 41290, 93-2 BCA ¶ 25682 (denying contractor an increase in contract price where board held that the German tax in question was tantamount to an employment tax and as such was excluded from the definition of after-imposed tax).

[11] See *Morrison-Knudsen Co. Inc.*, ASBCA No. 16483, 72-2 BCA ¶ 9733 (contractor not entitled to recover the costs of challenging the tax assessment, because it did so on its own accord).