
IRS private letter rulings conflicted on solar tax credits

Provisions state that some aspects of a solar power system must be allocated to structural functions under Section 48

David K. Burton

On Oct. 31, the U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) released Private Letter Ruling (PLR) 201444025, which was addressed to a manufacturer of solar systems that are mounted on real estate. The nature of the real estate, along with many other interesting facts, was redacted from the version of the ruling that was released to the public.

The ruling is a reminder that, with respect to the solar power systems, only “equipment that uses solar energy to generate electricity and includes storage devices, power conditioning equipment, transfer equipment, and parts related to those items” are eligible for the investment tax credit (ITC) provided for under Section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Here’s how the PLR described the solar system made by the manufacturer:

“Every component required to produce solar energy is attached to or housed in a [redacted text]. These [redacted text] are custom designed and are built specifically for the purposes of the solar energy systems. They come in varying heights, specific to the solar access needs of each location. ... The broad bases house the major system operational components, including wiring, conversion equipment, control equipment and energy storage batteries. These customized bases prevent the [redacted text], some of which have solar collection panels attached to the top, from blowing over in inclement weather. The bases also include special locking doors, both for security and so that the solar energy-producing equipment can be readily maintained.”

The PLR went on to add that the parts that are not specifically related to solar energy “are not suitable to be used for purposes other than supporting the solar electricity generation equipment. ... The cost to produce these [redacted text] is much greater than the cost to produce ordinary [redacted text].”

Further, the taxpayer only sells whole systems, so it is not possible to purchase the non-solar parts separately from the solar parts.

Letter of Recommendation

In light of the language about the specialized nature of the equipment and the greater costs associated with the non-solar equipment, a reader of the PLR might have been tempted to think that the IRS was going to rule that all of the tax basis was eligible for the ITC. However, such readers were destined to be disappointed, because the IRS ruled that some portion of the tax basis must be allocated to non-solar functions.

With respect to the non-solar functions, the PLR concludes that some of the equipment that provides “structural support for solar collectors, may also provide structural support for

lights, surveillance equipment, motion detectors, two-way transmission systems and other attachments not used for the generation of electricity from solar energy and will also protect the equipment from damaging weather and general degradation. [The] tax-payer should allocate some portion of the basis of [redacted text] (to the extent it performs another function) to non-energy property.”

The PLR fails to answer a critical issue: What is the methodology for allocating the tax basis between ITC and non-ITC eligible functions? Thus, taxpayers and their advisors are left guessing with respect as to how to perform this allocation.

Three years earlier, the IRS reached a similar conclusion in PLR 201121005. That ruling says a roof-mounted solar power system “constitutes energy property under Section 48(a)(3) except to the extent that Treasury Regulation Section 1.48-9 requires a portion of the basis of the property is allocable to any portion of such property that performs a function of a roof, e.g., protection from rain, snow, wind, sun, hot or cold temperatures, or that provides structural support or insulation.”

And, like its predecessor, the 2011 PLR did not provide any guidance as to how to perform that allocation.

Solar companies should note that, in this respect, the tax credit provided for in Section 25D for homeowners who install solar on their own homes is actually more accommodating than the credit provided for in Section 48 for investors in solar power systems.

Norton Rose Fulbright

Norton Rose Fulbright is a global law firm. We provide the world’s preeminent corporations and financial institutions with a full business law service. We have more than 4000 lawyers and other legal staff based in more than 50 cities across Europe, the United States, Canada, Latin America, Asia, Australia, Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia.

Recognized for our industry focus, we are strong across all the key industry sectors: financial institutions; energy; infrastructure, mining and commodities; transport; technology and innovation; and life sciences and healthcare. Through our global risk advisory group, we leverage our industry experience with our knowledge of legal, regulatory, compliance and governance issues to provide our clients with practical solutions to the legal and regulatory risks facing their businesses.

Wherever we are, we operate in accordance with our global business principles of quality, unity and integrity. We aim to provide the highest possible standard of legal service in each of our offices and to maintain that level of quality at every point of contact.

Norton Rose Fulbright Verein, a Swiss Verein, helps coordinate the activities of Norton Rose Fulbright members but does not itself provide legal services to clients. Norton Rose Fulbright has offices in more than 50 cities worldwide, including London, Houston, New York, Toronto, Mexico City, Hong Kong, Sydney and Johannesburg. For more information, see nortonrosefulbright.com/legal-notices.

The purpose of this communication is to provide information as to developments in the law. It does not contain a full analysis of the law nor does it constitute an opinion of any Norton Rose Fulbright entity on the points of law discussed. You must take specific legal advice on any particular matter which concerns you. If you require any advice or further information, please speak to your usual contact at Norton Rose Fulbright.

Specifically, Section 25D(e)(2) provides that “no expenditure relating to a solar panel or other property installed as a roof (or portion thereof) shall fail to be treated as [tax credit eligible] solely because it constitutes a structural component of the structure on which it is installed.”

If this language from Section 25D(e)(2) was in Section 48 or the regulations under it, these two PLRs would have had different holdings.

Thus, manufacturers of roof-mounted solar systems with significant parts that serve a non-solar function may want to consider recommending that their residential customers borrow - or pay cash - to acquire the system.

This way, the residential system owner can claim the tax credit under Section 25D. That credit may be larger than the tax credit under Section 48 after the allocation of tax basis to structural functions, as required by these PLRs.

For more information, please contact

David . Burton

Partner

+1 212 318 3311

david.burton@nortonrosefulbright.com