

International Tax Planning and Prevention of Abuse

A Study under Domestic Tax Law, Tax Treaties and EC Law in relation to Conduit and Base Companies

Table of Contents

PART ONE: THE USE OF CONDUIT & BASE COMPANIES IN INTERNATIONAL TAX PLANNING

1. CONDUIT COMPANIES

1.1. Treaty shopping

1.1.1. Description of the term “Treaty shopping” in relation to conduit companies

1.1.2. Basic features of “Treaty Shopping” in relation to conduit companies

1.1.2.1. Form of the conduit: company or partnership ?

1.1.2.2. Tax considerations in setting up the conduit

1.2. Directive shopping

1.2.1. Description of the term “Directive shopping in relation to conduit companies

1.2.2. Basic features of “Directive shopping” in relation to conduit companies

1.2.2.1. Conditions to be eligible for the benefits of the Directives

1.2.2.2. Tax considerations in setting up the conduit

1.3. Illustration

1.3.1. Conduit structures set up to claim tax benefits in the Source State

1.3.1.1. Directive shopping to organize an EU-Exit/Belgium: Source State

1.3.1.2. Treaty shopping/Belgium: Source State

1.3.1.3. Directive shopping to organize an EU-Exit/Belgium: Conduit State

1.3.1.4. Directive or Treaty Shopping: Same country holding-structure/
Belgium: Conduit State

1.3.1.5. Treaty shopping/Belgium: Residence State

1.3.2. Conduit structures set up to claim tax benefits in the Residence State

1.3.2.1. Directive Shopping/Belgium: Conduit State

1.3.2.2. Directive Shopping to organize an EU-Entry/Belgium: residence State

1.3.3. Conduit structures set up to claim tax benefits in the Conduit State (“Treaty shopping”)

2. BASE COMPANIES

2.1. Characteristics of a “Base company” and of a “Base State”

2.1.1. Characteristics of a “Base company”

2.1.1.1. General

2.1.1.2. Base company: company or partnership?

2.1.2. Characteristics of a “Base State”

- 2.2. Use of base companies
- 2.3. Tax advantages aimed at by setting up a base company
 - 2.3.1. Sheltering of income in a low tax regime
 - 2.3.2. Tax deferral
 - 2.3.3. Recharacterization of the income upon repatriation/Secondary sheltering

3. ILLUSTRATION

- 3.1. Belgium: Residence State of the controlling shareholders of the base company
- 3.2. Belgium: Source State of income flows to the base company

PART TWO: PREVENTION OF ABUSE UNDER BELGIAN DOMESTIC LAW

INTRODUCTION: SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1. THE (NON)-RECOGNITION OF A BELGIAN OR FOREIGN COMPANY OR OF ITS LEGAL ACTS FOR BELGIAN INCOME TAX PURPOSES

2. APPLICATION OF ANTI-AVOIDANCE PROVISIONS

- 2.1. Specific anti-avoidance provisions aimed at international tax avoidance
 - 2.1.1. Transfer pricing adjustments (Art. 26, Art. 207 and Art. 185 (2) BITC)
 - 2.1.1.1. Article 26 BITC (profit adjustment for abnormal or gratuitous advantages)
 - 2.1.1.2. Art. 185 (2) BITC (“Arm’s length”-principle)
 - 2.1.2. Disallowance of expenses/thin capitalization-rules
 - 2.1.2.1. Disallowance of deduction of certain payments to residents of tax havens or to beneficiaries of foreign preferential tax regimes (Art. 54 BITC)
 - 2.1.2.2. Thin capitalization-rules
 - 2.1.2.2.1. Art. 198, 11° BITC (interest paid to lenders enjoying a preferential tax regime)
 - 2.1.2.2.2. Art. 18, 4° BITC (interest paid to certain shareholders and directors)
 - 2.1.3. The disregarding of asset transfers to low tax-jurisdictions (Art. 344 (2) BITC)
 - 2.1.4. Anti-avoidance provisions relating to the participation exemption (Art. 202 and 203 BITC)
 - 2.1.4.1. Conditions relating to the shareholding in the subsidiary
 - 2.1.4.2. “Subject to tax”-requirement/Anti-avoidance provisions
 - 2.1.4.2.1. Test one: The basic “subject to tax”-requirement
 - 2.1.4.2.2. Test two: A company based in a country whose general tax regime is considerably more favorable than the Belgian tax regime
 - 2.1.4.2.3. Test three: Financing, treasury and investment companies
 - 2.1.4.2.4. Test four: Companies with offshore income
 - 2.1.4.2.5. Test five: Companies with foreign branches
 - 2.1.4.2.6. Test six: Conduit companies
 - 2.1.5. Anti-avoidance provision relating to the interest withholding tax exemption (Art. 107 (2) 10° RDBITC)
- 2.2. The Belgian General Anti-Avoidance Rule (“the Belgian GAAR”)

- 2.2.1. Text and purpose of the Belgian General Anti-Avoidance Rule
- 2.2.2. Scope of application of the Belgian General Anti-Avoidance Rule
- 2.2.3. Interpretation of the Belgian General Anti-Avoidance Rule
 - 2.2.3.1. General: Overview of possible interpretations
 - 2.2.3.2. Textual interpretation
 - 2.2.3.2.1. “Act or separate acts which together realize the same operation”
 - 2.2.3.2.2. “The legal characterization given by the parties to an act or to separate acts (...)”
 - 2.2.3.2.3. “The legal characterization (...) to an act (...) is not binding on the tax authorities (...)”
 - 2.2.3.2.4. “When that administration determines, by means of presumption or other proof admitted by Art. 340, that this characterization aims at avoiding taxes”
 - 2.2.3.2.5. Recharacterization of the legal act(s)
 - 2.2.3.2.6. Burden of proof of the taxpayer: “Legitimate needs of a financial or economic nature”

PART THREE: CONDUIT & BASE COMPANIES PREVENTION OF ABUSE UNDER BELGIAN TAX TREATIES

INTRODUCTION: SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TREATIES AND DOMESTIC LAW IN BELGIUM

- 1.1. Belgium: a “monistic country”
- 1.2. International law prevails over domestic law: effect

2. THE INTERPRETATION OF BELGIAN TAX TREATIES

- 2.1. International law rules on treaty interpretation
 - 2.1.1. The Vienna Convention on the law of treaties: application in Belgium
 - 2.1.2. Article 31 VC: The general rule on treaty interpretation
 - 2.1.2.1. Art. 31 VC: Three interpretation principles/one integrated Interpretation method
 - 2.1.2.2. The three principles laid down in Art. 31 VC
 - 2.1.2.2.1. Interpretation in good faith
 - 2.1.2.2.2. Textual interpretation in accordance with the “ordinary meaning” is not a synonym for literal interpretation
 - 2.1.2.2.3. The requirement to take into consideration the treaty’s “object and purpose” does not justify a teleological interpretation
 - 2.1.3. Article 32: Supplementary means of interpretation
 - 2.1.4. Art. 31 and 32 VC: No numerus clausus
 - 2.1.5. Conclusion
- 2.2. Application of domestic law to tax treaties
 - 2.2.1. Art. 3 (2) OECD MC: A rule on treaty interpretation included in the OECD MC
 - 2.2.1.1. Meaning of some of the expressions used in Art. 3 (2) OECD
 - 2.2.1.1.1. “Any term not defined herein”

- 2.2.1.1.2. The meaning of the undefined treaty term under the law of the State applying the treaty
- 2.2.1.1.3. Static v. ambulatory interpretation?
- 2.2.1.1.4. Limits to ambulatory interpretation: “good faith” and “unless the context otherwise requires”
- 2.2.2. The relationship between Art. 3 (2) OECD MC and domestic anti-avoidance rules
- 2.3. Relevance of the OECD Commentary for the interpretation of tax treaties
 - 2.3.1. Position of the OECD
 - 2.3.2. Personal view
 - 2.3.2.1. Current Commentary
 - 2.3.2.2. Later Commentary
 - 2.3.3. Case law

3. DO TAX TREATIES AND THE BELGIAN TAX TREATIES IN PARTICULAR INCLUDE AN IMPLIED ANTI-ABUSE RULE OF GENERAL APPLICATION OR AN INTERPRETATION PRINCIPLE ACCORDING TO WHICH TREATY BENEFITS SHOULD NOT BE CONFERRED IN ABUSIVE CASES?

- 3.1. Art. 26 VC: a legal basis for construing an implied anti-abuse rule?
 - 3.1.1. Abuse of rights under international public law
 - 3.1.2. Tax treaties
- 3.2. Anti-abuse rule in tax matters: a general principle of international law?
- 3.3. An interpretation principle within Art. 31 VC according to which treaty benefits should not be conferred in abusive cases?
 - 3.3.1. The “Guiding Principle” formulated by the OECD
 - 3.3.1.1. The first component of the OECD’s guiding principle: “a main purpose of the transaction is to secure a tax benefit under a tax treaty”
 - 3.3.1.2. The second component of the OECD’s guiding principle: “obtaining that more favourable treatment in these circumstances would be contrary to the object and purpose of the relevant provision of the treaty”
 - 3.3.1.2.1. The object and purpose of the OECD MC and tax treaties following the OECD MC
 - 3.3.1.2.2. The prevention of tax evasion and tax avoidance: an object and purpose of tax treaties?
 - 3.3.1.2.3. Observations and conclusion
 - 3.3.2. The stated object and purpose of Belgian tax treaties
 - 3.3.3. Object and purpose of the relevant treaty provisions
 - 3.3.3.1. Determination of the policy motives of Contracting States: some issues
 - 3.3.3.2. Each State sets its own policy
 - 3.3.3.3. Reciprocity: a fundamental principle of tax treaties policy
 - 3.3.3.4. Different State policies towards the same issue: the case of treaty shopping
 - 3.3.3.5. Belgium’s policy towards treaty shopping
 - 3.3.3.6. Prevention of double non-taxation is, absent specific provisions, not a treaty purpose
 - 3.3.4. Analysis of international case law

- 3.3.4.1. Canada
- 3.3.4.2. Australia
- 3.3.4.3. The Netherlands & Switzerland
- 3.3.5. Conclusions

4. APPLICATION OF DOMESTIC ANTI-AVOIDANCE RULES TO TAX TREATIES: POSITION OF THE OECD AND ANALYSIS OF CASE LAW

- 4.1. Position of the OECD
 - 4.1.1. OECD Commentary 1977 until 2003
 - 4.1.2. OECD Commentary 2003
 - 4.1.3. Conclusion
- 4.2. Analysis of international case law
 - 4.2.1. Belgium
 - 4.2.2. France
 - 4.2.3. The Netherlands
 - 4.2.4. Germany
 - 4.2.5. United States
 - 4.2.6. Canada
 - 4.2.7. Switzerland
 - 4.2.8. Austria
 - 4.2.9. Finland
 - 4.2.10. Conclusion

5. APPLICATION OF BELGIAN DOMESTIC ANTI-AVOIDANCE PROVISIONS TO TAX TREATIES: GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- 5.1. Belgian tax treaties expressly allowing the application of domestic anti-avoidance provisions
- 5.2. Belgian tax treaties not expressly allowing the application of domestic anti-avoidance provisions: Negative implication ?

6. APPLICATION OF BELGIAN DOMESTIC ANTI-AVOIDANCE PROVISIONS TO TAX TREATIES: DISCUSSION OF THE PROVISIONS

- 6.1. The Belgian GAAR
 - 6.1.1. Discussion of hypothetical cases
 - 6.1.1.1. Premeditated sale and repurchase of minority shares
 - 6.1.1.2. Earnings stripping and holding structures
 - 6.1.1.3. Conduit company
 - 6.1.1.4. Exemption of low or non-taxed foreign source income
 - 6.1.2. Ambulatory and concordant interpretation/subsequent practice
- 6.2. "Thin capitalization"-rules
 - 6.2.1. Compatibility of "thin capitalization"-rules with Art. 9 OECD MC
 - 6.2.1.1. The relevance of Art. 9 OECD MC for the issue of "thin capitalization"
 - 6.2.1.2. The consequences of Art. 9 (1) OECD MC being relevant
 - 6.2.1.3. The relationship between Art. 9 (1) OECD MC and Art. 10 and 11 OECD MC
 - 6.2.1.4. Testing the Belgian provisions against Art. 9 OECD MC
 - 6.2.1.4.1. Art. 26 BITC

- 6.2.1.4.2. Art. 18, 4° BITC
- 6.2.1.4.3. Art. 54 BITC
- 6.2.1.4.4. Art. 198, 11° BITC
- 6.2.1.4.5. The Belgian GAAR
- 6.2.2. Compatibility of “thin capitalization”-rules with Art. 10 (3) and 11 (3) OECD MC
 - 6.2.2.1. Analysis of Art. 10 (3) and 11 (3) OECD MC
 - 6.2.2.2. Testing the Belgian “thin capitalization”-rules against Art. 10 (3) and 11 (3) OECD MC
 - 6.2.2.2.1. Art. 18, 4° BITC
 - 6.2.2.2.2. Art. 26, 54 & 198, 11° BITC
 - 6.2.2.2.3. The Belgian GAAR
- 6.2.3. Compatibility of “thin capitalization”-rules with Art. 11 (6) OECD MC
 - 6.2.3.1. Object and purpose of Art. 11 (6) OECD MC
 - 6.2.3.2. Testing the Belgian “thin capitalization”-rules against Art. 11 (6) OECD MC
 - 6.2.3.2.1. Art. 18, 4° BITC (excessive interest)
 - 6.2.3.2.2. Art. 26 and 54 BITC
 - 6.2.3.2.3. Art. 198, 11° BITC
- 6.2.4. Compatibility of “thin capitalization”-rules with Art. 24 (4) and (5) OECD MC
 - 6.2.4.1. Discussion of Art. 24 (4) and (5) of the OECD MC
 - 6.2.4.1.1. Art. 24 (4) OECD MC
 - 6.2.4.1.2. Art. 24 (5) OECD MC
 - 6.2.4.2. Discussion of the Belgian tax treaties
 - 6.2.4.2.1. Art. 24 (4) and (5) in Belgian tax treaties
 - 6.2.4.2.2. Testing of the Belgian “thin capitalization”-provisions against Art. 24 (4) and (5) of the Belgian tax treaties
- 6.3. CFC-legislation and Art. 344 (2) BITC
 - 6.3.1. Arguments for consistency of CFC-legislation with tax treaties
 - 6.3.1.1. The 1987 OECD Base Companies Report
 - 6.3.1.2. The 1992 OECD Commentary
 - 6.3.1.3. The 2003 OECD Commentary
 - 6.3.2. Arguments for inconsistency of CFC-legislation with tax treaties
 - 6.3.3. Court decisions on the questions of consistency of CFC-legislation with tax treaties
 - 6.3.3.1. United Kingdom
 - 6.3.3.2. France
 - 6.3.3.3. Finland
 - 6.3.3.4. Conclusion
 - 6.3.4. Personal view
 - 6.3.4.1. Entity method
 - 6.3.4.1.1. Fiction of earned income (transparency-approach)
 - 6.3.4.1.2. Fiction of a dividend distribution (Art. 10 OECD MC)
 - 6.3.4.2. Transactional method
 - 6.3.4.2.1. Attribution of tainted income (not as a deemed dividend)
 - 6.3.4.2.2. Attribution of a deemed dividend
 - 6.3.4.3. General conclusion

- 6.3.5. Art. 344 (2) BITC
 - 6.3.5.1. General observation
 - 6.3.5.2. Technical discussion
 - 6.3.5.2.1. Conflict with Art. 9 OECD MC?
 - 6.3.5.2.2. Conflict with Art. 7, 10-12 or 21 OECD MC?
 - 6.4. Participation exemption
 - 6.4.1. OECD MC
 - 6.4.2. Belgian tax treaties
 - 6.5. Art. 107 (2) 10° RD BITC
7. TREATY PROVISIONS PREVENTING ABUSE OF TREATIES
- 7.1. The “Beneficial ownership”-Limitation
 - 7.1.1. Interpretation of the term “paid to”
 - 7.1.1.1. OECD Commentary
 - 7.1.1.2. Domestic law meaning under Art. 3 (2) OECD MC
 - 7.1.2. Interpretation of the term “Beneficial owner”
 - 7.1.2.1. History and background
 - 7.1.2.2. Domestic law meaning of “beneficial owner”?
 - 7.1.2.3. Treaty meaning of “beneficial owner”?
 - 7.1.2.3.1. The treaty meaning = the common law meaning
 - 7.1.2.3.2. The treaty meaning = the meaning emerging from the OECD Commentary
 - 7.1.2.3.3. The treaty meaning = the person to whom the income is attributed for tax purposes
 - 7.1.2.4. International case law
 - 7.1.2.4.1. The Netherlands
 - 7.1.2.4.2. France
 - 7.1.2.4.3. Switzerland
 - 7.1.2.4.4. United Kingdom
 - 7.1.2.4.5. Conclusion
 - 7.1.2.5. Personal view: how should a Belgian Court construe the term “beneficial owner”?
 - 7.2. “Limitation on Benefit”-clauses
 - 7.2.1. 2003 OECD Commentary
 - 7.2.1.1. “Look-through”-approach
 - 7.2.1.2. “Subject to tax”-approach
 - 7.2.1.3. “Channeling”-approach
 - 7.2.1.4. “Exclusion”-approach
 - 7.2.1.5. Bona fide (safe harbour) provisions
 - 7.2.1.6. Comprehensive “Limitation of Benefits”-clause
 - 7.2.1.7. Anti-abuse provision dealing with source taxation of specific types of income (“main purpose”-test)
 - 7.2.2. Belgian tax treaties
 - 7.2.2.1. Belgium/Switzerland treaty
 - 7.2.2.2. Belgium/US tax treaty
 - 7.2.2.3. Belgium/Spain tax treaty
 - 7.2.2.4. Belgium/Estonia; Latvia; Lithuania and Taiwan tax treaties

- 7.2.2.5. Belgium/Canada tax treaty
- 7.2.2.6. Belgian/Venezuela tax treaty
- 7.2.2.7. Relationship between the “Beneficial ownership”-requirement and the “Limitation of Benefits”-provisions

PART FOUR: CONDUIT & BASE COMPANIES PREVENTION OF ABUSE UNDER COMMUNITY LAW

INTRODUCTION: SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1. ABUSE OF COMMUNITY LAW IN MATTERS NOT INVOLVING DIRECT TAXATION: ANALYSIS OF THE ECJ CASE LAW

- 1.1. Summary of the ECJ case law
- 1.2. Abuse of Community law: content of the concept
 - 1.2.1. Discussion of the ECJ’s case law leading to Emsland Stärke
 - 1.2.1.1. General discussion
 - 1.2.1.2. The objective element
 - 1.2.1.3. The subjective element
 - 1.2.1.4. Conclusion
 - 1.2.2. Beyond Emsland Stärke: the ECJ’s judgment in Halifax
 - 1.2.3. Testing the objective circumstances of the case against the objectives of the Community law-provision allegedly abused
 - 1.2.4. Conclusion
- 1.3. Prevention of abuse of Community law: Requirements set by ECJ case law to national anti-abuse provisions

2. ABUSE OF COMMUNITY LAW IN RELATION TO TAX AVOIDANCE: ANALYSIS OF THE ECJ’S CASE LAW

- 2.1. Introduction
- 2.2. Abuse of Community law in relation to tax avoidance and circumvention of national tax rules: scope of the concepts of “abuse of Community law” and of “tax avoidance”
 - 2.2.1. Discussion of the ECJ’s case law
 - 2.2.1.1. The case law up to Marks & Spencer (2005) and Cadbury Schweppes (2006)
 - 2.2.1.2. The Cadbury Schweppes-case (2006)
 - 2.2.1.3. The Marks & Spencer-case (2005) and OYAA-case (2007)
 - 2.2.1.4. Conclusions
- 2.3. Abuse of Community law: a general principle of Community law to prevent income tax avoidance?

3. THE METHODOLOGY OF THE ECJ IN HANDLING CASES OF ABUSE OF COMMUNITY LAW (IN PARTICULAR IN RELATION TO TAX AVOIDANCE)

- 3.1. The alleged abuser has access to the EC Treaty provisions on the freedoms
- 3.2. Examination of the substantive conditions for the application of the relevant Treaty freedom
 - 3.2.1. The freedom of establishment (Art. 43-48 EC Treaty)

- 3.2.1.1. Personal scope of the freedom
- 3.2.1.2. Material scope of the freedom: meaning of the term “establishment”
 - 3.2.1.2.1. “Actual pursuit of an economic activity”
 - 3.2.1.2.2. “Fixed establishment”
 - 3.2.1.2.3. “An indefinite period”
 - 3.2.1.2.4. “In another Member State”
 - 3.2.1.2.5. Conclusion
 - 3.2.1.2.6. Passive investment companies, brass-plate and letter-box companies: further observations
- 3.2.2. Free capital movements (Art. 56-60 EC Treaty)
- 3.3. The domestic anti-avoidance measures is discriminatory or restricts the exercise of the Treaty freedom
 - 3.3.1. Discrimination and restriction
 - 3.3.2. Discriminatory and restrictive measures: different grounds of justification
- 3.4. Justification of the restriction to exercise the Treaty freedom because of abuse of Community law and/or the prevention of tax avoidance
 - 3.4.1. General observations
 - 3.4.2. Does the prevention of abuse (tax avoidance) fall within the express treaty exceptions?
 - 3.4.3. Prevention of abuse (tax avoidance): an “overriding reason of general interest” or an autonomous treaty exception?
 - 3.4.3.1. Overriding reasons of general interest: application in matters of direct taxation
 - 3.4.3.2. The ECJ’s abuse-doctrine and the prevention of tax avoidance: an autonomous Treaty exception or an overriding reason of general interest? Discussion of the ECJ’s case law
 - 3.4.3.2.1. The case law in non-income tax matters
 - 3.4.3.2.2. The case law in income tax matters
 - 3.4.3.2.3. Position

4. REQUIREMENTS SET BY ECJ CASE LAW TO NATIONAL ANTI-AVOIDANCE MEASURES IN INCOME TAX MATTERS

- 4.1. Proof of illegitimate tax avoidance
- 4.2. Anti-avoidance rules applicable in individual cases
- 4.3. General irrebuttable presumptions of tax avoidance
- 4.4. Specific irrebuttable presumptions of tax avoidance
- 4.5. Rebuttable presumptions of tax avoidance
- 4.6. Compensatory taxation; Filling up of a tax vacuum (prevention of double non taxation)
- 4.7. Other criteria to be satisfied by national anti-avoidance rules in income tax matters
 - 4.7.1. The national tax rule to be protected must comply with Community law
 - 4.7.2. No arbitrary criteria to establish tax avoidance
 - 4.7.3. Application of the national anti-avoidance rule subject to judicial control
- 4.8. State aid and Code of Conduct
- 4.9. Conclusion

5. TESTING THE BELGIAN ANTI-AVOIDANCE MEASURES AGAINST THE IMPERATIVES OF COMMUNITY LAW

5.1. The Belgian GAAR

5.2. Thin capitalization

5.2.1. ECJ case law

5.2.2. The Belgian “*thin capitalization*”-provisions

5.2.2.1. Art. 18, 4° BITC

5.2.2.1.1. Indirect discrimination

5.2.2.1.2. Justifications?

5.2.2.1.3. Does the fact that the residence State of the lender does not relieve the double taxation affect the discussion on the restriction of the Treaty freedoms and the justification for such restriction?

5.2.2.1.4. Free movement of capital and third States

5.2.2.1.5. Compatibility of Art. 18, 4° BITC with secondary Community law

5.2.2.2. Art. 198, 11° BITC

5.2.2.2.1. Compatibility with primary Community law

5.2.2.2.2. Compatibility with secondary Community law

5.2.2.3. Art. 26 BITC

5.2.2.3.1. Indirect discrimination

5.2.2.3.2. Justification?

5.2.2.3.3. Compatibility with secondary Community law

5.2.2.4. Art. 54 BITC

5.2.2.4.1. Restriction of the exercise of the Treaty freedoms

5.2.2.4.2. Justification?

5.2.2.5. Conclusion

5.3. CFC-Legislation and Art. 344 (2) BITC

5.3.1. CFC-Legislation

5.3.2. Art. 344 (2) BITC

5.4. Abuse of the Parent/Subsidiary and Interest & Royalty Directives

5.4.1. National or treaty based measures to prevent abuse of Directives: General discussion

5.4.2. Belgian measures to prevent abuse of the Parent/Subsidiary and Interest & Royalty Directives

5.4.2.1. Belgium : Residence State of the company receiving dividends

5.4.2.2. Belgium : Source State of the company paying dividends, interest or royalties

5.4.2.2.1. Abuse of the Directives from the perspective of the Source State: General discussion

5.4.2.2.2. Anti-avoidance provisions included in the Directives

5.4.2.2.3. Application of Belgian anti-avoidance provisions

5.4.2.2.4. Application of Belgian treaty based anti-avoidance provisions

5.4.2.2.5. Can a Member State that has no or inadequate anti-avoidance provisions deny the benefits in case of abuse of the Directives ?

5.5. The prevention of treaty shopping by “Limitation on Benefits”-clauses

5.5.1. General discussion/Delineation of the subject

5.5.2. The “Limitation on Benefits”-provisions in the Belgian tax treaties with EC Member States

- 5.5.2.1. The Belgium/Spain tax treaty
 - 5.5.2.1.1. Personal view
 - 5.5.2.1.2. The ECJ's case law (Gilly, D and Class IV ACT)
 - 5.5.2.1.3. Critical view of the ECJ's case law
- 5.5.2.2. The Belgian treaties with Estonia; Latvia and Lithuania
- 5.5.2.3. Conclusion: "Limitation on Benefits"-clause in treaties between EC Member States