

Tax Treaty Entitlement

Editors:

Michael Lang
Pasquale Pistone
Alexander Rust
Josef Schuch
Claus Staringer



Volume 11

WU Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law
European and International Tax Law and Policy Series

Table of Contents

Preface		xiii
Chapter 1: The Relevance of the Preamble for Treaty Entitlement		1
	<i>Claire (Xue) Peng and Josef Schuch</i>	
1.1.	Introduction	1
1.2.	The legal status of the preamble for interpretation	3
1.2.1.	The legal status of the preamble in treaty interpretation	3
1.2.2.	The legal status of the preamble in tax treaty law interpretation	7
1.3.	Stated objectives of tax treaties in the new preamble	14
1.3.1.	Elimination of double taxation	14
1.3.2.	Avoidance of treaty abuse	15
1.3.2.1.	Without creating opportunities for non-taxation or reduced taxation	15
1.3.2.2.	Tax evasion	17
1.3.2.3.	Tax avoidance	18
1.3.2.4.	Treaty-shopping arrangements	19
1.4.	Conclusion	21
Chapter 2: The Application of the Principal Purpose Test under Tax Treaties		23
	<i>Svitlana Buriak</i>	
2.1.	The background and design of the principal purpose test	23
2.1.1.	PPT and recent OECD/G20 and OECD developments	23
2.1.2.	The background to the PPT rule	26
2.1.3.	The tax avoidance situations at which the PPT is aimed	27
2.1.4.	The design of the principal purpose test	29
2.2.	The objective and subjective elements of abuse under the PPT	31

Table of Contents

2.2.1.	“Any arrangement or transaction”	31
2.2.2.	“A benefit” under the tax treaty	31
2.2.3.	The subjective element: “One of the principal purposes”	35
2.2.4.	“Object and purpose of the relevant provisions”	38
2.3.	Procedural aspects of application of the PPT and its legal consequences	42
2.3.1.	Standard of proof and allocation of burden	42
2.3.2.	Lack of legal consequences under the PPT	48
2.3.3.	Separate legal rule or interpretative tool	51
2.4.	Conclusions	52
Chapter 3:	Limitation on Benefits Clauses: Limiting the Entitlement to Treaty Benefits	55
	<i>Lisa Ramharter and Rita Szudoczky</i>	
3.1.	Introduction	55
3.2.	Objective of limitation on benefits clauses and their history	57
3.2.1.	Objective of limitation on benefits clauses: The countering of treaty shopping	57
3.2.2.	Historical background and recent developments	59
3.3.	Mechanism and structure of a limitation on benefits clause	63
3.3.1.	Limiting the entitlement to treaty benefits	63
3.3.2.	Tests of a limitation on benefits clause	64
3.3.3.	Scope, legal consequences and procedural aspects	69
3.4.	Comparison of detailed and simplified limitation on benefits clauses	72
3.4.1.	Preliminary remarks	72
3.4.2.	Entitlement of qualified persons	72
3.4.2.1.	Publicly traded companies and their subsidiaries	72
3.4.2.2.	Companies satisfying the ownership and base erosion test	75
3.4.3.	Entitlement of non-qualified persons	77
3.4.3.1.	Companies owned by equivalent beneficiaries	77
3.4.3.2.	Headquarters companies	80

3.5.	Policy considerations and the relationship between limitation on benefits clauses and the principal purpose test	81
3.5.1.	Limitation on benefits clause <i>versus</i> principal purpose test	81
3.5.2.	Limitation on benefits clause <i>and</i> principal purpose test	83
3.6.	Conclusions	89
Chapter 4:	The Beneficial Ownership Test	91
	<i>Florian Navisotschnigg</i>	
4.1.	Background	91
4.2.	The meaning of beneficial ownership	95
4.2.1.	Beneficial ownership as a broad anti-abuse rule	96
4.2.2.	Beneficial ownership as an attribution-of-income rule	99
4.2.3.	The forwarding approach	104
4.3.	Beneficial ownership without treaty reference	107
4.4.	Beneficial ownership in other treaty articles	109
4.5.	Beneficial ownership as a basic principle	112
4.6.	Conclusion	116
Chapter 5:	Resident Persons According to Article 1(1) of the OECD Model	117
	<i>Claus Staringer and Desiree Auer</i>	
5.1.	General remarks	117
5.2.	The term “person” according to article 1(1)	119
5.2.1.	Relevance of the term “person”	119
5.2.2.	Interpretation of the term “person”	119
5.2.2.1.	General definition of “person” according to article 3(1)	119
5.2.2.2.	Autonomous versus domestic interpretation of the term “person”	120
5.2.2.3.	Qualification conflicts	121

Table of Contents

5.2.2.4.	Terms defined in article 3(1)	122
5.2.3.	The classification of selected entities as persons	124
5.2.3.1.	Application of tax treaties to selected entities	124
5.2.3.2.	Divergent country practice: Explicit inclusion or exclusion of certain entities	129
5.3.	Role and function of article 1(1)	130
5.3.1.	To what extent is article 1(1) necessary?	130
5.3.2.	Interaction with specific articles	132
5.3.2.1.	Article explicitly applicable to non-residents and a special meaning of the term person	133
5.3.2.2.	Articles implicitly applicable to non-residents	135
5.3.2.3.	Articles explicitly applicable to non-residents	145
5.3.3.	Result: Article 1(1) throughout the OECD Model	147
Chapter 6:	Dual Residence and Treaty Entitlement of Individuals	149
	<i>Karol Dziwiński</i>	
6.1.	Introduction: Reasons for the existence of dual residency	149
6.2.	Permanent home	151
6.3.	Centre of vital interest	154
6.4.	Habitual abode	157
6.5.	Nationality	160
6.6.	Mutual agreement procedure	161
6.7.	Article 11(5) and its relation to tiebreaker rules	164
6.8.	Application of the tiebreaker rules in article 15(2) for the determination of the residence of the employer	165
6.9.	Article 24(4) and (5) and potential applicability of tiebreaker rules	167
6.10.	Conclusions	168

Chapter 7:	Dual Residence for Non-Individuals	169
	<i>Peter Bräumann</i>	
7.1.	Introduction: From a tiebreaker to an anti-abuse provision	169
7.2.	Causes of dual residence for entities from a legal and commercial perspective	171
7.2.1.	Dual residence as a tax treaty phenomenon	171
7.2.2.	Motives behind situations of dual residence	173
7.3.	The “traditional” approach: Place of effective management as the tiebreaker for dual resident non-individuals	176
7.3.1.	The place of effective management (POEM) as sole tiebreaking criterion	176
7.3.2.	Limitations and criticism	178
7.3.3.	Reform considerations and divergent country practices	180
7.4.	The “modern” standard: Case-by-case decision and loss of treaty entitlement as an anti-abuse measure	182
7.4.1.	Mutual agreement replaces general tiebreaker rule	182
7.4.2.	Procedure and factors for determining residence under the new provision	185
7.4.3.	Criticism and legal concerns	187
7.4.4.	Practical acceptance as part of the multilateral instrument (MLI)	190
7.5.	Impact on third parties and treaties with third states under the new provision (overview)	191
7.6.	Conclusion	192
Chapter 8:	Tax Treaty Entitlement and Hybrid Entities: Article 1(2) and Article 1(3) of the OECD Model (2017)	195
	<i>Jean-Philippe Van West</i>	
8.1.	Issues related to the application of tax treaties to hybrid entities	195
8.1.1.	The source of issues: Conflicts of allocation	195

Table of Contents

8.1.2.	The OECD Partnership Report	198
8.1.3.	Hybrid entities and the BEPS Project	200
8.2.	Tax treaty entitlement for hybrid entities under article 1(2) of the OECD Model (2017)	201
8.2.1.	Object and purpose of article 1(2) of the OECD Model (2017)	201
8.2.2.	US Model	204
8.2.3.	Interpretation of the terms used in article 1(2) of the OECD Model (2017)	206
8.2.3.1.	“Income”	206
8.2.3.2.	“Derived by or through”	207
8.2.3.3.	“An entity or arrangement”	208
8.2.3.4.	“Wholly or partly fiscally transparent”	210
8.2.3.4.1.	“Fiscally transparent”	210
8.2.3.4.2.	“Wholly or partly”	215
8.2.3.5.	Conclusion regarding the terms used in article 1(2) of the OECD Model (2017)	215
8.3.	Which conflicts of allocation fall under the scope of article 1(2) of the OECD Model (2017)?	216
8.3.1.	Different forms of conflicts of allocation	216
8.3.2.	Not all conflicts of allocation fall under the scope of article 1(2) of the OECD Model (2017)	217
8.3.3.	How to apply tax treaties to conflicts of allocation not covered by article 1(2) of the OECD Model (2017)?	221
8.4.	The influence of article 1(3) of the OECD Model (2017) on the tax treatment of fiscally transparent entities	222
8.4.1.	Object and purpose of article 1(3) of the OECD Model (2017)	222
8.4.2.	The relationship between articles 1(2) and 1(3) of the OECD Model (2017)	224
8.5.	Final conclusions	225

Chapter 9:	Entitlement to Protection against Discriminatory Taxation	227
	<i>Pasquale Pistone and Clement Migai</i>	
9.1.	Introduction	227
9.2.	The nationality-based non-discrimination in article 24(1) and its relationship with article 1(1) of the OECD Model	229
9.2.1.	A national versus a resident of a contracting state: Effect of the different terminology in articles 24(1) and 1(1) of the OECD Model	229
9.2.2.	Entitlement of nationals of a contracting state who are not resident in either contracting state to invoke article 24(1) of the OECD Model and possible effects	234
9.2.3.	Requirement for residence in one or both contracting states and treaties that follow the 1963 OECD Model	238
9.2.4.	Non-discrimination of stateless persons in article 24(2) of the OECD Model and its relationship with article 1(1) of the OECD Model	239
9.3.	The PE non-discrimination provision and the entitlement to the application of a treaty by PEs	242
9.3.1.	The PE non-discrimination provision and article (1) of the OECD Model	242
9.3.2.	Potential extension of treaty benefits to PEs in PE triangular cases under the PE non-discrimination provision	244
9.3.3.	PE non-discrimination provision and partnerships	247
9.4.	Effects of EU law on entitlement to protection against discriminatory taxation	248
9.4.1.	Direct and indirect discrimination	248
9.4.2.	Treaty protection for non-residents	250
9.5.	Conclusions	251

Chapter 10: Personal Scope of the Mutual Agreement Procedure and Arbitration Provisions, and the Mutual Assistance Provisions	253
<i>Sriram Govind</i>	
10.1. Introduction	253
10.2. Personal scope of the tax treaty dispute resolution provisions	254
10.2.1. General overview	254
10.2.2. Personal scope of the MAP provision	257
10.2.2.1. Article 25(1) of the OECD Model: Specific-case MAP	257
10.2.2.2. Article 25(3) of the OECD Model: General MAP	266
10.2.3. Personal scope of the Arbitration provision	267
10.3. Personal scope of the exchange of information provision	269
10.4. Personal scope of mutual assistance in collection provision	272
10.5. Concluding remarks	274
List of Contributors	277