section 274(e)(2), then the expense is deductible by the employer as compensation and no amount may be excluded from the employee's gross income as a working condition fringe benefit. See § 1.274–2(f)(2)(iii)(A).

(2) *Treatment of tax-exempt employers.* In the case of an employer exempt from taxation under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code, any reference in this paragraph (s) to a deduction disallowed by section 274(a)(3) shall be treated as a reference to the amount which would be disallowed as a deduction by section 274(a)(3) to the employer if the employer were not exempt from taxation under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code.

(3) *Examples.* The following examples illustrate this paragraph (s):

*Example 1.* Assume that Company *X* provides Employee *B* with a country club membership for which it paid $20,000. B substantiates, within the meaning of paragraph (c) of this section, that the club was used 40 percent for business purposes. The business use of the club (40 percent) may be considered a working condition fringe benefit, notwithstanding that the employer's deduction for the dues allocable to the business use is disallowed by section 274(a)(3), if *X* does not treat the club membership as compensation under section 274(e)(2). Thus, *B* may exclude from gross income $8,000 (40 percent of the club dues, which reflects *B*'s business use). *X* must report $12,000 as wages subject to withholding and payment of employment taxes (60 percent of the value of the club dues, which reflects *B*'s personal use). *B* must include $12,000 in gross income. *X* may deduct as compensation the amount it paid for the club dues which reflects *B*'s personal use provided the amount satisfies the other requirements for a salary or compensation deduction under section 162.

*Example 2.* Assume the same facts as *Example 1* except that Company *X* treats the $20,000 as compensation to *B* under section 274(e)(2). No portion of the $20,000 will be considered a working condition fringe benefit because the section 274(a)(3) disallowance will apply to *B*. Therefore, *B* must include $20,000 in gross income.

(t) *Application of section 274(m)(3)*—(1) *In general.* If an employer's deduction under section 162(a) for amounts paid or incurred for the travel expenses of a spouse, dependent, or other individual accompanying an employee is disallowed by section 274(m)(3), the amount, if any, of the employee's working condition fringe benefit relating to the employer-provided travel is determined without regard to the application of section 274(m)(3). To be excludible as a working condition fringe benefit, however, the amount must otherwise qualify for deduction by the employee under section 162(a). The amount will qualify for deduction and for exclusion as a working condition fringe benefit if it can be adequately shown that the spouse's, dependent's, or other accompanying individual's presence on the employee's business trip has a bona fide business purpose and if the employee substantiates the travel within the meaning of paragraph (c) of this section. If the travel does not qualify as a working condition fringe benefit, the employee must include in gross income as a fringe benefit the value of the employer's payment of travel expenses with respect to a spouse, dependent, or other individual accompanying the employee on business travel. See §§ 1.61–21(a)(4) and 1.162–2(c). If an employer treats as compensation under section 274(e)(2) the amount paid or incurred for the travel expenses of a spouse, dependent, or other individual accompanying an employee, then the expense is deductible by the employer as compensation and no amount may be excluded from the employee's gross income as a working condition fringe benefit. See § 1.274–2(f)(2)(iii)(A).

(2) *Treatment of tax-exempt employers.* In the case of an employer exempt from taxation under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code, any reference in this paragraph (t) to a deduction disallowed by section 274(m)(3) shall be treated as a reference to the amount which would be disallowed as a deduction by section 274(m)(3) to the employer if the employer were not exempt from taxation under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code.

[T.D. 8256, 54 FR 28608, July 6, 1989, as amended by 8451, 57 FR 57669, Dec. 7, 1992; T.D. 8457, 57 FR 62196, Dec. 30, 1992; T.D. 8666, 61 FR 27006, May 30, 1996; T.D. 8933, 66 FR 2244, Jan. 11, 2001]

### § 1.132–5T Working condition fringe—1985 through 1988 (temporary).

(a) *In general*—(1) *Definition.* Gross income does not include the value of a working condition fringe. The term

''working condition fringe'' means any property or service provided to an employee of an employer to the extent that, if the employee paid for the property or service, the amount paid would be allowable as a deduction under section 162 or 167. If, under section 274 or any other section, certain substantiation requirements must be met in order for a deduction under section 162 or 167 to be allowable, those substantiation requirements apply to the determination of a working condition fringe. An amount that would be deductible by the employee under, for example, section 212 is not a working condition fringe.

(2) *Trade or business of the employee.* If the hypothetical payment for the property or service would be allowable as a deduction with respect to a trade or business of the employee other than the employee's trade or business of being an employee of the employer, it cannot be taken into account for purposes of determining the amount, if any, of the working condition fringe. For example, assume that, unrelated to company X's trade or business and unrelated to company X's employee's trade or business of being an employee of company X, the employee is a member of the board of directors of company Y. Assume further that company X provides the employee with air transportation to a company Y board of director's meeting. The employee may not exclude the value of the air transportation to the meeting as a working condition fringe. The employee may, however, deduct such amount under section 162 if the section 162 requirements are satisfied. The result would be the same whether the air transportation was provided in the form of a flight on a commercial airline or a seat on a company X airplane.

(b) *Vehicle allocation rules*—(1) *In general*—(i) *General rule.* In general, with respect to an employer-provided vehicle, the amount excludable as a working condition fringe is the amount that would be allowable as a deduction under section 162 or 167 if the employee paid for the availability of the vehicle. For example, assume that the value of the availability of an employer-provided vehicle for a full year is $2,000, without regard to any working condition fringe (i.e., assuming all personal use). Assume further that the employee drives the vehicle 6,000 miles for his employer's business and 2,000 miles for reasons other than the employer's business. In this situation, the value of the working condition fringe is $2,000 multiplied by a fraction, the numerator of which is the business-use mileage (6,000 miles) and the denominator of which is the total mileage (8,000 miles). Thus, the value of the working condition fringe is $1,500. The total amount includable in the employee's gross income on account of the availability of the vehicle is $500. For purposes of this section, the term ''vehicle'' has the same meaning given the term in §1.61–2T(e)(*2*). Generally, when determining the amount of an employee's working condition fringe, miles accumulated on the vehicle by all employees of the employer during the period in which the vehicle is available to the employee must be considered. For example, assume that an employee of the employer is provided the availability of an automobile for one year. Assume further that during the year, the automobile is regularly used in the employer's business by other employees. All miles accumulated on the automobile by all employees of the employer during the year must be considered. If, however, substantially all the use of the automobile by other employees in the employer's business is permitted during a certain period, such as the last three months of the year, the miles driven by the other employees during that period would not be considered when determining the employee's working condition fringe exclusion.

(ii) *Use by an individual other than the employee.* For purposes of this section, if the availability of a vehicle to an individual would be taxed to an employee, use of the vehicle by the individual is included in references to use by the employee.

(iii) *Provision of an expensive vehicle for personal use.* Assume an employer provides an employee with an expensive vehicle that an employee may use in part for personal purposes. Even though the decision to provide an expensive rather than an inexpensive vehicle is made by the employer for bona

fide noncompensatory business reasons, there is no working condition fringe exclusion with respect to the personal miles driven by the employee. If the employee paid for the availability of the vehicle, he would not be entitled to deduct any part of the payment attributable to personal miles.

(2) *Use of different employer-provided automobiles.* The working condition fringe exclusion must be applied on an automobile by automobile basis. For example, assume that automobile Y is available to employee D for 3 days in January and for 5 days in March, and automobile Z is available to D for a week in July. Assume further that the Daily Lease Value, as defined in §1.61–2T, of each automobile is $50. For the eight days of availability of Y in January and March, D uses Y 90 percent for business (by mileage). During July, D uses Z 60 percent for business (by mileage). The value of the working condition fringe is determined separately for each automobile. Therefore, the working condition fringe for Y is $360 ($400 × .90) leaving an income inclusion of $40. The working condition fringe for Z is $210 ($350 × .60) leaving an income inclusion of $140. If the value of the availability of an automobile is determined under the Annual Lease Value rule for one period and Daily Lease Value rule for a second period (see §1.61–2T), the working condition fringe exclusion must be calculated separately for the two periods.

(c) *Applicability of sections 162 and 274(d)*—(1) *In general.* The value of property or services provided to an employee may not be excluded from the employee's gross income as a working condition fringe, by either the employer or the employee, unless the applicable substantiation requirements of either section 274(d) or section 162 (whichever is applicable) and the regulations thereunder are statisfied. With respect to listed property, the substantiation requirements of section 274(d) and the regulations thereunder do not apply to the determination of an employee's working condition fringe exclusion prior to the date that those requirements apply to the first taxable year of the employer beginning after December 31, 1985. For example, if an employer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1985, begins on July 1, 1986, with respect to listed property, the substantiation requirements of section 274(d) apply as of that date. The substantiation requirements of section 274(d) apply to an employee even if the requirements of section 274 do not apply to the employee's employer for deduction purposes (such as when the employer is a tax-exempt organization or a governmental unit); in these cases, the requirements of section 274(d) apply to the employee as of January 1, 1986.

(2) *Section 274(d) requirements.* The substantiation requirements of section 274(d) are satisfied by ''adequate records or sufficient evidence corroborating the [employee's] own statement''. Therefore, such records or evidence provided by the employee, and relied upon by the employer to the extent permitted by the regulations promulgated under section 274(d), will be sufficient to substantiate a working condition fringe exclusion.

(d) *Safe harbor rules*—(1) *In general.* Section 1.274–6T provides that the substantiation requirements of section 274(d) and the regulations thereunder may be satisfied, in certain circumstances, by using one or more of the safe harbor rules prescribed in §1.274–6T. If the employer uses one of the safe harbor rules prescribed in §1.274–6T during a period with respect to a vehicle (as defined in §1.61–2T), that rule must be used by the employer to substantiate a working condition fringe exclusion with respect to that vehicle during the period. An employer that is exempt from Federal income tax may still use one of the safe harbor rules (if the requirements of that section are otherwise met during a period) to substantiate a working condition fringe exclusion with respect to a vehicle during the period. If the employer uses one of the methods prescribed in §1.274–6T during a period with respect to an employer-provided vehicle, that method may be used by an employee to substantiate a working condition fringe exclusion with respect to the same vehicle during the period, as long as the employee includes in gross income the amount allocated to the employee pursuant to §1.274–6T and this section. (See §1.61–2T(c)(2)(i) for other

rules concerning when an employee must include in income the amount determined by the employer.) If, however, the employer uses the safe harbor rule prescribed in §1.274–6T(a) (2) or (3) and the employee without the employer's knowledge uses the vehicle for purposes other than de minimis personal use (in the case of the rule prescribed in §1.274–6T(a)(2)), or for purposes other than de minimis personal use and commuting (in the case of the rule prescribed in §1.274–6T(a)(3)), then the employee must include additional income for the unauthorized use of the vehicle.

(2) *Period for use of safe harbor rules.* The rules prescribed in this paragraph (d) assume that the safe harbor rules prescribed in §1.274–6T are used for a one-year period. Accordingly, references to the value of the availability of a vehicle, amounts excluded as a working condition fringe, etc., are based on a one-year period. If the safe harbor rules prescribed in §1.274–6T are used for a period of less than a year, the amounts referenced in the previous sentence must be adjusted accordingly. For purposes of this section, the term ''personal use'' has the same meaning as prescribed in §1.274–6T(e)(5).

(e) *Vehicles not available to employees for personal use.* For a vehicle described in §1.274–6T(a)(2) (relating to certain vehicles not used for personal purposes), the working condition fringe exclusion is equal to the value of the availability of the vehicle if the employer uses the method prescribed in §1.274–6T(a)(2).

(f) *Vehicles not available to employees for personal use other than commuting.* For a vehicle described in §1.274–6T(a)(3) (relating to certain vehicles not used for personal purposes other than commuting), the working condition fringe exclusion is equal to the value of the availability of the vehicle for purposes other than commuting if the employer uses the method prescribed in §1.274–6T(a)(3). This rule applies only if the special rule for valuing commuting use, as prescribed in §1.61–2T, is used and the amount determined under the special rule is either included in the employee's income or reimbursed by the employee.

(g) *Vehicles used in connection with the business of farming that are available to employees for personal use*—(1) *In general.* For a vehicle described in §1.274–6T(b) (relating to certain vehicles used in connection with the business of farming), the working condition fringe exclusion is calculated by multiplying the value of the availability of the vehicle by 75 percent.

(2) *Vehicles available to more than one individual.* If the vehicle is available to more than one individual, the employer must allocate the gross income attributable to the vehicle (25 percent of the value of the availability of the vehicle) among the employees (and other individuals whose use would not be attributed to an employee) to whom the vehicle was available. This allocation must be done in a reasonable manner to reflect the personal use of the vehicle by the individuals. An amount that would be allocated to a sole proprietor reduces the amounts that may be allocated to employees but are otherwise to be disregarded for purposes of this paragraph (g). For purposes of this paragraph (g), the value of the availability of a vehicle may be calculated as if the vehicle were available to only one employee continuously and without regard to any working condition fringe exclusion.

(3) *Examples.* The following examples illustrate a reasonable allocation of gross income with respect to an employer-provided vehicle between two employees:

*Example (1).* Assume that two farm employees share the use of a vehicle which for a calendar year is regularly used directly in connection with the business of farming and qualifies for use of the rule in §1.274–6T (b). Employee A uses the vehicle in the morning directly in connection with the business of farming and employee B uses the vehicle in the afternoon directly in connection with the business of farming. Assume further that employee B takes the vehicle home in the evenings and on weekends. The employer should allocate all the income attributable to the availability of the vehicle to employee B.

*Example (2).* Assume that for a calendar year, farm employees C and D share the use of a vehicle that is regularly used directly in connection with the business of farming and qualifies for use of the rule in §1.274–6T (b). Assume further that the employees alternate taking the vehicle home in the evening and alternate the availability of the vehicle for

personal purposes on weekends. The employer should allocate the income attributable to the availability of the vehicle for personal use (25 percent of the value of the availability of the vehicle) equally between the two employees.

*Example (3).* Assume the same facts as in example (2) except that C is the sole proprietor of the farm. Based on these facts, C should allocate the same amount of income to D as was allocated to D in example (2). No other income attributable to the availability of the vehicle for personal use should be allocated.

(h) *Qualified non-personal use vehicles.* Effective January 1, 1985, 100 percent of the value of the use of a qualified nonpersonal use vehicle (as described in §1.274–5T (k)) is excluded from gross income as a working condition fringe, provided that, in the case of a vehicle described in paragraph (k) (3) through (7) of that section, the use of the vehicles conforms to the requirements of that paragraph.

(i) [Reserved]

(j) *Application of section 280F.* In determining the amount, if any, of an employee's working condition fringe, section 280F and the regulations thereunder do not apply. For example, assume that an employee has available for a calendar year an employer-provided automobile with a fair market value of $28,000. Assume further that the special rule provided in §1.61–2T is used and that the Annual Lease Value, as defined in §1.61–2T, is $7,750, and that all of the employee's use of the automobile is in the employer's business. The employee would be entitled to exclude the entire Annual Lease Value as a working condition fringe, despite the fact that if the employee paid for the availability of the automobile, an income inclusion would be required under §1.280F–5T(d)(1). This paragraph (j) does not affect the applicability of section 280F to the employer with respect to such employer-provided automobile, nor does it affect the applicability of section 274. For rules concerning substantiation of an employee's working condition fringe, see paragraph (c) of this section.

(k) *Aircraft allocation rule.* In general, with respect to a flight on an employer-provided aircraft, the amount excludable as a working condition fringe is the amount that would be allowable as a deduction under section 162 or 167 if the employee paid for the flight on the aircraft. For example, if employee P flies on P's employer's airplane primarily for business reasons of P's employer, the value of P's flight is excludable as a working condition fringe. However, if P's spouse and children accompany P on such airplane trip primarily for personal reasons, the value of the flights by P's spouse and children are includable in P's gross income. See §1.61–2T(g) for special rules for valuing personal flights.

(l) [Reserved]

(m) *Employer-provided transportation for security concerns*—(1) *In general.* The amount of a working condition fringe exclusion with respect to employer-provided transportation is the amount that would be allowable as a deduction under section 162 or 167 if the employee paid for the transportation. Generally, if an employee pays for transportation taken for primarily personal purposes, the employee may not deduct any part of the amount paid. Thus, the employee may not generally exclude the value of employer-provided transportation as a working condition fringe if such transportation is primarily personal. If, however, for bona fide business-oriented security concerns, the employee purchases transportation that provides him or her with additional security, the employee may generally deduct the excess of the amount paid for the transportation over the lesser amount the employee would have paid for the same mode of transportation absent the bona fide business-oriented security concerns. With respect to a vehicle, the phrase ''the same mode of transportation'' means use of the same vehicle without the additional security aspects, such as bulletproof glass. With respect to air transportation, the phrase ''the same mode of transportation'' means comparable air transportation. These same rules apply to the determination of an employee's working condition fringe exclusion. For example, if an employer provides an employee with an automobile for commuting and, for bona fide business-oriented security concerns, the automobile is specially designed for security, then the employee may exclude the value of the special

security design as a working condition fringe if the employee's automobile would not have had such security design but for the bona fide business-oriented security concerns. The employee may not exclude the value of the commuting from income as a working condition fringe because commuting is a nondeductible personal expense. Similarly, if an employee travels on a personal trip in an employer-provided aircraft for bona fide business-oriented security concerns, the employee may exclude the excess, if any, of the value of the flight over the amount the employee would have paid for comparable air transportation, but for the bona fide business-oriented security concerns. Because personal travel is a nondeductible expense, the employee may not exclude the total value of the trip as a working condition fringe.

(2) *Demonstration of bona fide business-oriented security concerns*—(i) *In general.* For purposes of this paragraph (m), the existence of a bona fide business-oriented security concern for the furnishing of a specific form of transportation to an employee is determined on the basis of all the facts and circumstances within the following guidelines:

(A) *Services performed outside the United States.* With respect to an employee performing services for an employer in a geographic area other than the United States, a factor indicating a bona fide business-oriented security concern is a recent history of violent terrorist activity in such geographic area (such as bombings or abductions for ransom), unless such activity is focused on a group of individuals which does not include the employee or a similarly situated employee or on a section of the geographic area which does not incude the employee.

(B) *Services performed in the United States.* With respect to an employee performing services for an employer in the United States, a factor indicating a bona fide business-oriented security concern is threats on the life of the employee or on the life of a similarly situated employee because of the employee's status as an employee of the employer.

(ii) *Establishment of overall security program.* Notwithstanding anything in paragraph (m)(2)(i) of this section to the contrary, *no* bona fide business-oriented security concern will be deemed to exist unless the employee's employer establishes an overall security program with respect to the employee involved.

(iii) *Overall security program*—(A) *Definition.* An overall security program is one in which security is provided to protect the employee on a 24-hour basis. The employee must be protected while at the employee's residence, while commuting to and from the employee's workplace, and while at the employee's workplace. In addition, the employee must be protected while traveling, whether for business or personal purposes. An overall security program would include the provision of a bodyguard/driver who is trained in evasive driving techniques; and automobile specially equipped for security; guards, metal detectors, alarms, or similar methods of controling access to the employee's workplace and residence; and, in appropriate cases, flights on the employer's aircraft for business and personal reasons.

(B) *Application.* There is no overall security program when, for example, security is provided at the employee's workplace but not at the employee's residence. In addition, the fact that an employer requires an employee to travel on the employer's aircraft, or in an employer-provided vehicle that contains special security features, does not alone constitute an overall security program. The preceding sentence applies regardless of the existence of a corporate or other resolution requiring the employee to travel in the employer's airplane or vehicle for personal as well as business reasons. Similarly, the existence of an independent security study particular to the employer and its employees, or to the employee involved, does not alone constitute an overall security program.

(iv) *Effect of an independent security study.* An overall security program with respect to an employee is deemed to exist even though security is not provided to an employee on a 24-hour basis if the conditions of this paragraph (m)(2)(iv) are satisfied:

(A) A security study is performed with respect to the employer and the

employee (or a similarly situated employee) by an independent security consultant;

(B) The security study is based on an objective assessment of all the facts and circumstances;

(C) The recommendation of the security study is that an overall security program (as defined in paragraph (m)(2)(iii) of this section) is not necessary and such recommendation is reasonable under the circumstances; and

(D) The employer applies the specific security recommendations contained in the security study to the employee on a consistent basis.

The value of the security provided pursuant to a security study that meets the requirements of this paragraph (m)(2)(iv) may be excluded from income, if the security study conclusions are reasonable and, but for the bona fide business-oriented security concerns, the employee would not have had such security. No exclusion from income applies to security provided by the employer that is not recommended in the security study. Security study conclusions may be reasonable even if, for example, it is recommended that security be limited to certain geographic areas, as in the case where air travel security is provided only in certain foreign countries.

(v) *Application of security rules to spouses and dependents.* The availability of a working condition fringe exclusion based on the existence of a bona fide business-oriented security concern with respect to the spouse and dependents of an employee is determined separately for such spouse and dependents under the rules established in this paragraph (m).

(vi) *Working condition safe harbor.* Under the special rule of this paragraph (m)(2)(vi), if, for a bona fide business-oriented security concern, the employer requires that the employee travel on an employer-provided aircraft for a personal trip, the employer and the employee may exclude, as a working condition fringe, the excess value of the trip over comparable first-class airfare without having to show that but for the bona fide business-oriented security concerns, the employee would have flown first-class on a commercial aircraft. If the special valuation rule provided in § 1.61–2T is used, the excess over the amount determined by multiplying an aircraft multiple of 200-percent by the base aircraft valuation formula may be excluded as a working condition fringe.

(3) *Examples.* The provisions of this paragraph (m) may be illustrated by the following examples:

*Example (1).* Assume that in response to several death threats on the life of A, the president of a multinational company (company X), company X establishes an overall security program for A, including an alarm system at A's home and guards at A's workplace, the use of a vehicle that is specially equipped with alarms, bulletproof glass, and armor plating and a bodyguard/driver who is trained in evasive driving techniques. Assume further that A is driven for both personal and business reasons in the vehicle. Also, assume that but for the bona fide business-oriented security concerns, no part of the overall suecurity program would been provided to A. With respect to the transportation provided for security reasons, A may exclude as a working condition fringe the value of the special security features of the vehicle and the value attributable to the bodyguard/driver. Thus, if the value of the specially equipped vehicle is $40,000, and the value of the vehicle without the security features is $25,000, A may determine A's income attributable to the vehicle as if the vehicle were worth $25,000. A must include in income the value of the availability of the vehicle for personal use.

*Example (2).* Assume that B is the chief executive officer of a multinational corporation (company Y). Assume further that there have been kidnapping attempts and other terrorist activities in the foreign countries in which B performs services and that at least some of such activities have been directed against B or similarly situated employees. In response to these activities, company Y provides B with an overall security program, including an alarm system at B's home and bodyguards at B's workplace, a bodyguard/driver who is trained in evasive driving techniques, and a vehicle specially designed for security during B's overseas travels. In addition, assume that company Y requires B to travel in company Y's airplane for business and personal trips taken to, from, and within these foreign countries. Also, assume that but for bona fide business-oriented security concerns, no part of the overall sucurity program would have been provided to B. B may exclude as a working condition fringe the value of the special security features of the automobile and the value attributable to the bodyguards and the bodyguard/driver. B may also exclude as a

working condition fringe the excess, if any, of the value of personal flights in the company Y airplane over first-class airfare (as determined under the special valuation rule provided in §1.61–2T if the safe harbor described in paragraph (m)(2)(vi) of this section is used). B must include in income the value of the availability of the vehicle for personal use and the lesser of the value of first-class airfare or the value of the flight determined under §1.61–2T for each personal flight taken by B in company Y's airplane.

*Example (3).* Assume the same facts as in example (2) except that company Y also requires B to travel in company Y's airplane within the United States, and provides B with a chauffeur-driven limousine for business and personal travel in the United States. Assume further that company Y also requires B's spouse and dependents to travel in company Y's airplane for personal flights in the United States. If no bona fide business-oriented security concern exists with respect to travel in the United States, B may not exclude any portion of the value of the availability of the driver or limousine for personal use in the United States. Thus, B must include in income the value of the availability of the vehicle and driver for personal use. In addition, B may not exclude any portion of the value attributable to personal flights by B or B's spouse and dependents on company Y's airplane. Thus, B must include in income the value attributable to the personal use of company Y's airplane. See §1.61–2T for rules relating to the valuation of personal flights on employer-provided airplanes.

*Example (4).* Assume that company Z retains an independent security consultant to perform a security study with respect to its chief executive officer. Assume further that, based on an objective assessment of the facts and circumstances, the security consultant reasonably recommends that the employee be provided security at his workplace and for ground transportation, but not for air transportation. If company Z follows the recommendations on a consistent basis, an overall security program will be deemed to exist with respect to the workplace and ground transportation security only.

*Example (5).* Assume the same facts as in example (4) except that company Z only provides the employee security while commuting to and from work, but not for any other ground transportation. Since the recommendations of the independent security study are not applied on a consistent basis, an overall security program will not be deemed to exist.

(n) *Product testing*—(1) *In general.* The fair market value of the use of consumer goods, which are manufactured for sale to nonemployees, for product testing and evaluation by an employee outside the employer's workplace is excludable as a working condition fringe if—

(i) Consumer testing and evaluation of the product is an ordinary and necessary business expense of the employer,

(ii) Business reasons necessitate that the testing and evaluation of the product be performed off the employer's business premises by employees (i.e., the testing and evaluation cannot be carried out adequately in the employer's office or in laboratory testing facilities),

(iii) The product is furnished to the employee for purposes of testing and evaluation,

(iv) The product is made available to the employee for no longer than necessary to test and evaluate its performance and must be returned to the employer at completion of the testing and evaluation period,

(v) The employer imposes limitations of the employee's use of the product which significantly reduce the value of any personal benefit to the employee, and

(vi) The employee must submit detailed reports to the employer on the testing and evaluation.

The length of the testing and evaluation period must be reasonable in relation to the product being tested.

(2) *Employer-imposed limitations.* The requirement of paragraph (n)(1)(v) of this section is satisfied if—

(i) The employer places limitations on the employee's ability to select among different models or varieties of the consumer product that is furnished for testing and evaluation purposes,

(ii) The employer's policy provides for the employee, in appropriate cases, to purchase or lease at his or her own expense the same type of product as that being tested (so that personal use by the employee's family will be limited), and

(iii) The employer generally prohibits use of the product by members of the employee's family.

(3) *Discriminating classifications.* If an employer furnishes products under a testing and evaluation program only to officers, owners, or highly compensated employees, this fact may be considered in a determination of whether the

products are furnished for testing and evaluation purposes or for compensation purposes, unless the employer can show a business reason for the classification of employees to whom the products are furnished (e.g., that automobiles are furnished for testing and evaluation by an automobile manufacturer to its design engineers and supervisory mechanics).

(4) *Factors that negate the existence of a product testing program.* If an employer fails to tabulate and examine the results of the detailed reports within a reasonable period of time after expiration of the testing period, the program will not be considered a product testing program. Existence of one or more of the following factors may also establish that the program is not a bona fide product testing program:

(i) The program is in essence a leasing program under which employees lease the consumer goods from the employer for a fee;

(ii) The nature of the product and other considerations are insufficient to justify the testing program; or

(iii) The expense of the program outweighs the benefits to be gained from testing and evaluation.

(5) *Failure to meet the requirements of this paragraph (n).* The fair market value of the use of property for product testing and evaluation by an employee outside the employee's workplace, under a product testing program that does not meet all of the requirements of this paragraph (n), is not excludable as a working condition fringe.

(6) *Example.* Assume that an employer that manufactures automobiles establishes a product testing program under which 50 of its 5,000 employees test and evaluate the automobiles for 30 days. Assume further that the 50 employees represent a fair cross section of all of the employees of the employer, such employees submit detailed reports to the employer on the testing and evaluation, the employer tabulates and examines the test results within a reasonable time, and the use of the automobiles is restricted to the employees. If the rules of paragraph (n)(2) of this section are also met, the employees may exclude the value of the use of the automobile during the testing and evaluation period.

(o) *Qualified automobile demonstration use*—(1) *In general.* The value of qualified automobile demonstration use is excludable from gross income as a working condition fringe. The term ''qualified automobile demonstration use'' means any use of a demonstration automobile by a full-time automobile salesman in the sales area in which the automobile dealer's sales office is located if—

(i) Such use is provided primarily to facilitate the salesman's performance of services for the employer, and

(ii) There are substantial restrictions on the personal use of the automobile by the salesman.

(2) *Full-time automobile salesman*—(i) *Definition.* The term ''full-time automobile salesman'' means any individual who—

(A) Is employed by an automobile dealer,

(B) Customarily spends substantially all of a normal business day on the sales floor selling automobiles to customers of the automobile dealership,

(C) Customarily works a number of hours considered full-time in the industry (but at a rate not less than 1,000 hours per year), and

(D) Derives at least 85 percent of his or her gross income from the automobile dealership directly as a result of such automobile sales activities.

An individual, such as the general manager of an automobile dealership, who receives a sales commission on the sale of an automobile is not a full-time automobile salesman unless the requirements of this paragraph (o)(2)(i) are met. The exclusion provided in this paragraph (o) is available to an individual who meets the definition of this paragraph (o)(2)(i) regardless of whether the individual performs services in addition to those described in this paragraph (o)(2)(i). For example, an individual who is an owner of the automobile dealership but who otherwise meets the requirements of this paragraph (o)(2)(i) may exclude from gross income the value of qualified automobile demonstration use.

(ii) *Use by an individual other than a full-time automobile salesman.* Personal use of a demonstration automobile by an individual other than a full-time automobile salesman is not treated as

a working condition fringe. Therefore, any personal use, including commuting use, of a demonstration automobile by a part-time salesman, automobile mechanic, manager, or other individual is not ''qualified automobile demonstration use'' and thus not excludable from gross income.

(3) *Demonstration Automobile.* The exclusion provided in this paragraph (o) applies only to qualified use of a demonstration automobile. A demonstration automobile is an automobile that is—

(i) Currently in the inventory of the automobile dealership, and

(ii) Available for test drives by customers during the normal business hours of the employee.

(4) *Substantial restrictions on personal use.* Substantial restrictions on the personal use of demonstration automobiles exist when all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) Use by individuals other than the full-time automobile salesmen (e.g., the salesman's family) is prohibited,

(ii) Use for personal vacation trips is prohibited,

(iii) The storage of personal possessions in the automobile is prohibited, and

(iv) The total use by mileage of the automobile by the salesman outside the salesman's normal working hours is limited.

(5) *Sales area*—(i) *In general.* Qualified automobile demonstration use must be use in the sales area in which the automobile dealer's sales office is located. The sales area is the geographic area surrounding the automobile dealer's sales office from which the office regularly derives customers.

(ii) *Sales area safe harbor.* With respect to a particular full-time salesman, the automobile dealer's sales area may be treated as the larger of the area within a 75 mile radius of the dealer's sales office, or the on-way commuting distance (in miles) of the particular salesman.

(p) *Parking*—(1) *In general.* The value of parking provided to an employee on or near the business premises of the employer is excludable from gross income as a working condition fringe. The working condition fringe exclusion applies whether the employer owns or rents the parking facility or parking space.

(2) *Reimbursement of parking expenses.* Any reimbursement to the employee of the ordinary and necessary expenses of renting a parking space on or near the business premises of the employer is excludable as a working condition fringe. The preceding sentence does not apply, however, to cash payments that are not actually used for renting a parking space. Thus, that part of a general transportation allowance that is not used for parking is not excludable as a working condition fringe under this paragraph (p).

(3) *Parking on residential property.* With respect to an employee, this paragraph (p) does not apply to any parking facility or space located on property owned or leased for residential purposes by the employee.

(q) *Nonapplicability of nondiscrimination rules.* Except to the extent provided in paragraph (n)(3) of this section, the nondiscrimination rules of section 132(h)(1) and §1.132–8T do not apply in determining the amount, if any, of a working condition fringe.

[T.D. 8063, 50 FR 52303, Dec. 23, 1985, as amended by T.D. 8256, 54 FR 28600, July 6, 1989]

### §1.132–6 De minimis fringes.

(a) *In general.* Gross income does not include the value of a de minimis fringe provided to an employee. The term ''de minimis fringe'' means any property or service the value of which is (after taking into account the frequency with which similar fringes are provided by the employer to the employer's employees) so small as to make accounting for it unreasonable or administratively impracticable.

(b) *Frequency*—(1) *Employee-measured frequency.* Generally, the frequency with which similar fringes are provided by the employer to the employer's employees is determined by reference to the frequency with which the employer provides the fringes to each individual employee. For example, if an employer provides a free meal in kind to one employee on a daily basis, but not to any other employee, the value of the meals is not de minimis with respect to that one employee even though with respect