

EDITOR
FLORIAN HAASE



TAXATION OF INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

IBFD

Taxation of International Partnerships

Why this book?

The taxation of partnerships in an international context is undoubtedly one of the most complex areas of (international) tax law. It is also of great importance from a practical point of view. This is particularly due to two conflicting principles: some countries treat partnerships as taxable entities, while others treat them as opaque or transparent and only see the partners as taxpayers for tax purposes. This difference in approach can lead to double taxation as well as double non-taxation. In addition, specific problems can arise in the case of triangular situations.

The tax treatment of partnerships is so difficult and so important from a practical as well as an academic/theoretical point of view that the OECD, back in 1999, published an extensive report on this subject, the so-called “OECD Partnership Report”. This document set forth in great detail the view of the OECD with respect to the taxation of international partnerships from the perspective of the state of source as well as the state of residence. The Report contained some general remarks on the taxation of partnerships, but was mainly built on examples of specific cases and their tax treatment.

In 2014, the OECD Partnership Report celebrates its 15th anniversary. Consequently, it is high time to investigate if and how the ideas of the OECD have been adopted by various jurisdictions. This book aims first to give a short introduction on the taxation of international partnerships in individual jurisdictions, and then to answer the problems posed in the examples in the Partnership Report from each jurisdiction’s perspective. To get the full picture, the jurisdictions covered include the economically most important EU Member States and other European countries like Switzerland, next to Australia, Brazil, China and the United States.

Title:	Taxation of International Partnerships
Subtitle:	15 Years OECD Partnership Report: Past, Present and Future
Editor(s):	Florian Haase
Date of publication:	September 2014
ISBN:	978-90-8722-255-0
Type of publication:	Print book
Number of pages:	604
Terms:	Shipping fees apply. Shipping information is available on our website
Price:	EUR 120 / USD 155 (VAT excl.)

Order information

To order the book, please visit www.ibfd.org/IBFD-Products/shop. You can purchase a copy of the book by means of your credit card, or on the basis of an invoice. Our books encompass a wide variety of topics, and are available in one or more of the following formats:

- IBFD Print books
- IBFD eBooks – downloadable on a variety of electronic devices
- IBFD Online books – accessible online through the IBFD Tax Research Platform



IBFD, Your Portal to Cross-Border Tax Expertise

Table of contents

List of Authors	xxi
------------------------	-----

Part One

Taxation of International Partnerships

Chapter 1: Introduction	3
<i>Florian Haase</i>	
1.1. An overview and brief history	3
1.2. A myriad of legal rules ... and questions	7
1.3. Chapter specifics and guidelines	9
1.3.1. Country survey guidelines	10
Chapter 2: General Concepts of Partnership Taxation	13
<i>Florian Haase</i>	
2.1. Main concepts	13
2.1.1. Flow-through taxation	13
2.1.2. Separate entity approach	14
2.1.3. Elective regulations	14
2.2. Treaty entitlement as the core issue	15
2.3. OECD Partnership Report 1999	22

Part Two

Country Surveys

Chapter 3: Australia	27
<i>Michael Dirkis</i>	
3.1. General	27
3.2. Domestic law	28
3.2.1. Legal aspects	29
3.2.1.1. General partnership	29
3.2.1.2. "Tax law" partnership	30
3.2.1.3. Limited partnership	31
3.2.1.4. Venture capital partnerships	32
3.2.1.5. Incorporated limited partnership	33
3.3. Tax subject	34

3.3.1.	Taxation of domestic partnerships	35
3.3.1.1.	General and tax partnerships	35
3.3.1.2.	Limited partnership	39
3.3.1.3.	Venture capital partnership	40
3.3.1.4.	Treatment of Australian interests in foreign hybrids	42
3.3.2.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	43
3.4.	Tax treaty issues	45
3.4.1.	Treaty entitlement	46
3.4.2.	Australia as the State of Residence	47
3.4.3.	Australia as the State of Source	48
3.4.4.	Triangular cases	49
3.5.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	49
3.5.1.	Example 1	50
3.5.2.	Example 2	51
3.5.3.	Example 3	52
3.5.4.	Example 4	53
3.5.5.	Example 5	54
3.5.6.	Example 6	55
3.5.7.	Example 7	56
3.5.8.	Example 8	57
3.5.9.	Example 9	58
3.5.10.	Example 10	59
3.5.11.	Example 11	60
3.5.12.	Example 12	61
3.5.13.	Example 13	63
3.5.14.	Example 14	64
3.5.15.	Example 15	65
3.5.16.	Example 16	65
3.5.17.	Example 17	67
3.5.18.	Example 18	67
3.6.	Conclusions	68
	References	69
Chapter 4:	Austria	75
	<i>Gerald Toift</i>	
4.1.	General	75
4.2.	Domestic law	75
4.2.1.	Civil law aspects	75
4.2.2.	Tax aspects of Austrian partnerships	77
4.2.3.	Tax aspects of foreign partnerships	78
4.3.	Tax treaty law	82

4.3.1.	General	82
4.3.2.	Tax treaty entitlement	82
4.3.3.	Austria as the State of Residence	84
4.3.4.	Austria as the State of Source	84
4.3.5.	Triangular cases	85
4.4.	EU law	85
4.4.1.	Parent-Subsidiary Directive	85
4.4.2.	Merger Directive	87
4.4.3.	Interest and Royalties Directive	88
4.5.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	89
4.5.1.	Example 1	90
4.5.2.	Example 2	91
4.5.3.	Example 3	92
4.5.4.	Example 4	94
4.5.5.	Example 5	95
4.5.6.	Example 6	96
4.5.7.	Example 7	96
4.5.8.	Example 8	98
4.5.9.	Example 9	99
4.5.10.	Example 10	100
4.5.11.	Example 11	101
4.5.12.	Example 12	103
4.5.13.	Example 13	105
4.5.14.	Example 14	105
4.5.15.	Example 15	106
4.5.16.	Example 16	107
4.5.17.	Example 17	108
4.5.18.	Example 18	109
	Bibliography	110
Chapter 5:	Brazil	113
	<i>Marcos Andre Vinhas Catão</i>	
5.1.	General	113
5.2.	Concept and nature	114
5.2.1.	Importance: Tax and civil effects of the constitution of a partnership	115
5.3.	Partnerships under Brazilian tax law	117
5.3.1.	Consortiums	118
5.3.2.	<i>Sociedades em Conta de Participação</i>	122
5.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	125
5.4.1.	Example 1	125

5.4.2.	Example 2	127
5.4.3.	Example 3	128
5.4.4.	Example 4	130
5.4.5.	Example 5	131
5.4.6.	Example 6	132
5.4.7.	Example 7	133
5.4.8.	Example 8	133
5.4.9.	Example 9	134
5.4.10.	Example 10	135
5.4.11.	Example 11	135
5.4.12.	Example 12	136
5.4.13.	Example 13	137
5.4.14.	Example 14	138
5.4.15.	Example 15	138
5.4.16.	Example 16	139
5.4.17.	Example 17	139
5.4.18.	Example 18	140
Chapter 6:	Canada	141
	<i>Geoffrey Loomer</i>	
6.1.	General	141
6.2.	Domestic law	142
6.2.1.	Legal aspects	142
6.2.2.	Tax aspects	144
6.2.2.1.	Taxation of partnership income	144
6.2.2.2.	Tax treatment of partnership interest	145
6.2.2.3.	Taxation of domestic partnerships with foreign partners	146
6.2.2.3.1.	Effect of fiscal transparency	146
6.2.2.4.	Income types and tax rates	147
6.2.2.5.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	149
6.2.2.5.1.	Classification of foreign partnerships	149
6.2.2.6.	Taxation of partners	151
6.3.	Tax treaty issues	153
6.3.1.	Entitlement to treaty benefits	153
6.3.2.	Canada as the State of Residence	153
6.3.3.	Canada as the State of Source	155
6.3.4.	Triangular cases	157
6.4.	Examples from the OECD Partnership Report	157
6.4.1.	Example 1	157
6.4.2.	Example 2	159

6.4.3.	Example 3	160
6.4.4.	Example 4	163
6.4.5.	Example 5	167
6.4.6.	Example 6	169
6.4.7.	Example 7	170
6.4.8.	Example 8	171
6.4.9.	Example 9	173
6.4.10.	Example 10	173
6.4.11.	Example 11	174
6.4.12.	Example 12	175
6.4.13.	Example 13	176
6.4.14.	Example 14	177
6.4.15.	Example 15	178
6.4.16.	Example 16	179
6.4.17.	Example 17	180
6.4.18.	Example 18	181
Chapter 7:	China	183
	<i>Jianhong Liu</i>	
7.1.	General	183
7.2.	Domestic law	184
7.2.1.	Legal aspects	184
7.2.2.	Tax aspects	186
7.2.3.	Taxation of domestic partnerships	186
7.2.4.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	188
7.3.	Tax treaty issues	190
7.3.1.	Treaty entitlement	190
7.3.2.	China as the State of Residence	191
7.3.3.	China as the State of Source	191
7.3.4.	Triangular cases	192
7.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	192
7.4.1.	Example 1	193
7.4.2.	Example 2	194
7.4.3.	Example 3	195
7.4.4.	Example 4	197
7.4.5.	Example 5	198
7.4.6.	Example 6	198
7.4.7.	Example 7	199
7.4.8.	Example 8	200
7.4.9.	Example 9	201
7.4.10.	Example 10	202

Table of Contents

7.4.11.	Example 11	203
7.4.12.	Example 12	207
7.4.13.	Example 13	208
7.4.14.	Example 14	210
7.4.15.	Example 15	211
7.4.16.	Example 16	212
7.4.17.	Example 17	212
7.4.18.	Example 18	213
	Bibliography	215
Chapter 8:	France	217
	<i>Philippe Derouin</i>	
8.1.	General	217
8.1.1.	Partnerships are half-transparent	217
8.1.2.	Case law and controversy	218
8.1.3.	Recent evolution	218
8.2.	Domestic law	219
8.2.1.	Legal aspects	221
8.2.2.	Tax subject: A combination of the pass-through approach and the entity approach	223
8.2.2.1.	Determination of partnership income	224
8.2.2.2.	Partners' taxation	225
8.2.2.3.	Accounting and tax obligations – Audit procedures	225
8.2.2.4.	Gains or losses made upon the disposal of a partnership interest	226
8.2.2.5.	Tax exemptions in a partnership context	227
8.2.2.6.	Partnerships as paying agents on passive income	227
8.2.3.	Taxation of foreign partners in French partnerships	228
8.2.3.1.	French-source income	228
8.2.3.2.	Foreign-source income (triangular situations)	229
8.2.4.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	229
8.3.	Tax treaty issues	231
8.3.1.	Treaty entitlement	232
8.3.1.1.	French partnerships and foreign partners	232
8.3.1.2.	Foreign partnerships	233
8.3.3.	France as the State of Source	234
8.3.3.1.	French partnerships	234
8.3.3.2.	Foreign partnerships	235
8.3.4.	Triangular cases	235
8.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	236
8.4.1.	Example 1	236

8.4.2.	Example 2	236
8.4.3.	Example 3	237
8.4.4.	Example 4	237
8.4.5.	Example 5	238
8.4.6.	Example 6	238
8.4.7.	Example 7	239
8.4.8.	Example 8	239
8.4.9.	Example 9	240
8.4.10.	Example 10	241
8.4.11.	Example 11	242
8.4.12.	Example 12	242
8.4.13.	Example 13	244
8.4.14.	Example 14	245
8.4.15.	Example 15	246
8.4.16.	Example 16	246
8.4.17.	Example 17	247
8.4.18.	Example 18	247
Chapter 9:	Germany	249
	<i>Florian Haase and Daniela Steierberg</i>	
9.1.	General rules of partnership taxation	249
9.2.	Available classes of partnerships	249
9.3.	Tax law classification	251
9.3.1.	Commercial partnerships	252
9.3.2.	Deemed-commercial partnerships	257
9.3.3.	Non-commercial partnerships	258
9.4.	Relationship between partners and “their” partnership	259
9.5.	Tax rates/earnings retention	262
9.6.	Procedural aspects of income determination	264
9.7.	Application of tax treaties	265
9.7.1.	Commercial partnerships	265
9.7.2.	Deemed-commercial partnerships	268
9.7.3.	Non-commercial partnerships	269
9.8.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	270
9.8.1.	Example 1	271
9.8.2.	Example 2	272
9.8.3.	Example 3	274
9.8.4.	Example 4	276
9.8.5.	Example 5	277
9.8.6.	Example 6	278

9.8.7.	Example 7	279
9.8.8.	Example 8	281
9.8.9.	Example 9	283
9.8.10.	Example 10	285
9.8.11.	Example 11	287
9.8.12.	Example 12	288
9.8.13.	Example 13	290
9.8.14.	Example 14	291
9.8.15.	Example 15	292
9.8.16.	Example 16	294
9.8.17.	Example 17	295
9.8.18.	Example 18	296
	References	297
Chapter 10:	India	299
	<i>Bijal Ajinkya and Daksha Baxi</i>	
10.1.	General	299
10.2.	Taxation under Indian domestic law	300
10.2.1.	“Person”, “firm” and “partnership” – Definition, scope and meaning	300
10.2.2.	“Partnership” under the Partnership Act	301
10.2.3.	“Partnership” under the LLP Act	302
10.2.4.	“Partnership” under the ITA	303
10.3.	Legal status of a partnership firm	304
10.3.1.	Residency rule for a partnership firm	305
10.3.2.	Taxation of partnerships: Relevant principles and provisions	306
10.4.	Indian exchange control regulations	309
10.4.1.	An overview of India’s exchange controls	309
10.4.1.1.	Inbound investment in Indian partnerships	310
10.4.1.2.	Outbound investment by Indian partnerships	311
10.5.	Taxation under double taxation avoidance agreements	312
10.5.1.	Scheme of international taxation in India	312
10.5.2.	Relevance of the OECD Commentary in Indian context	313
10.5.3.	Relevant provisions of the Commentary	314
10.5.4.	India’s positions on the Commentary	317
10.5.5.	India’s judicial approach to tax international partnerships	318
10.5.6.	Taxing international partnerships	324

10.6.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	325
10.6.1.	Example 3	326
10.6.2.	Example 4	328
10.6.3.	Example 5	329
10.6.4.	Example 6	330
10.6.5.	Example 7	332
10.6.6.	Example 8	335
10.6.7.	Example 9	337
10.6.8.	Example 10	338
10.6.9.	Example 14	338
10.6.10.	Example 16	339
10.6.11.	Example 17	340
10.6.12.	Example 18	341
	References	342
Chapter 11:	Italy	345
	<i>Maricla Pennesi and Massimo Giaconia</i>	
11.1.	General	345
11.2.	Domestic law	346
11.2.1.	Legal aspects	346
11.2.2.	Tax aspects	347
11.2.3.	Taxation of domestic partnerships	349
11.2.4.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	352
11.3.	Tax treaty issues	354
11.3.1.	Treaty entitlement	354
11.3.2.	Italy as the State of Residence	358
11.3.3.	Italy as the State of Source	360
11.3.4.	Triangular cases	362
11.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	363
11.4.1.	Example 1	363
11.4.2.	Example 2	364
11.4.3.	Example 3	365
11.4.4.	Example 4	366
11.4.5.	Example 5	367
11.4.6.	Example 6	368
11.4.7.	Example 7	369
11.4.8.	Example 8	370
11.4.9.	Example 9	372
11.4.10.	Example 10	373
11.4.11.	Example 11	374
11.4.12.	Example 12	376

11.4.13.	Example 13	377
11.4.14.	Example 14	378
11.4.15.	Example 15	379
11.4.16.	Example 16	380
11.4.17.	Example 17	381
11.4.18.	Example 18	381
Chapter 12:	Netherlands	383
	<i>Paulus Merks and Sebastian Frankenberg</i>	
12.1.	General	383
12.2.	Domestic law	383
12.2.1.	Legal aspects	383
12.2.2.	Tax subject	385
12.2.3.	Taxation of domestic partnerships	385
12.2.4.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	386
12.3.	Tax treaty issues	389
12.3.1.	Treaty entitlement	389
12.3.2.	The Netherlands as the State of Residence	390
12.3.3.	The Netherlands as the State of Source	391
12.3.4.	Triangular cases	392
12.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	392
12.4.1.	Example 1	394
12.4.2.	Example 2	395
12.4.3.	Example 3	395
12.4.4.	Example 4	396
12.4.5.	Example 5	397
12.4.6.	Example 6	398
12.4.7.	Example 7	398
12.4.8.	Example 8	400
12.4.9.	Example 9	401
12.4.10.	Example 10	402
12.4.11.	Example 11	402
12.4.12.	Example 12	403
12.4.13.	Example 13	405
12.4.14.	Example 14	406
12.4.15.	Example 15	406
12.4.16.	Example 16	407
12.4.17.	Example 17	408
12.4.18.	Example 18	409

Chapter 13: Singapore	411
<i>Nicholas Neo</i>	
13.1. General	411
13.2. Domestic law	412
13.2.1. Legal aspects	412
13.2.1.1. General partnerships	413
13.2.1.2. Limited liability partnerships	413
13.2.1.3. Limited partnerships	414
13.2.2. Tax subject	415
13.2.3. Taxation of domestic partnerships	416
13.2.3.1. General partnerships	416
13.2.3.2. Limited liability partnerships	416
13.2.3.3. Limited partnerships	417
13.2.3.4. Non-resident partners	417
13.2.3.5. Payments to partnerships with non-resident partners	418
13.2.4. Taxation of foreign partnerships	419
13.2.4.1. Foreign LLPs and LPs	419
13.2.4.2. Other foreign partnerships	419
13.2.4.3. Certainty through tax treaties	420
13.3. Tax treaty issues	420
13.3.1. Treaty entitlement	420
13.3.2. Singapore as the State of Residence	421
13.3.3. Singapore as the State of Source	421
13.3.4. Triangular cases	422
13.4. Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	423
13.4.1. Example 1	423
13.4.2. Example 2	424
13.4.3. Example 3	425
13.4.4. Example 4	426
13.4.5. Example 5	426
13.4.6. Example 6	427
13.4.7. Example 7	428
13.4.8. Example 8	428
13.4.9. Example 9	429
13.4.10. Example 10	430
13.4.11. Example 11	431
13.4.12. Example 12	432
13.4.13. Determination of “employer” for purposes of Article 15	435
13.4.14. Example 13	436
13.4.15. Example 14	436
13.4.16. Example 15	437

Table of Contents

13.4.17.	Example 16	438
13.4.18.	Example 17	439
13.4.19.	Example 18	440
	References	441
Chapter 14:	Spain	443
	<i>Ignacio del Val</i>	
14.1.	General	443
14.2.	Domestic law	443
14.2.1.	Legal aspects	443
14.2.2.	Tax aspects	444
14.2.3.	Taxation of domestic partnerships	446
14.2.4.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	449
14.3.	Tax treaty issues	451
14.3.1.	Treaty entitlement	451
14.3.2.	Spain as the State of Residence	452
14.3.3.	Spain as the State of Source	452
14.3.4.	Triangular cases	453
14.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	453
14.4.1.	Example 1	454
14.4.2.	Example 2	455
14.4.3.	Example 3	457
14.4.4.	Example 4	458
14.4.5.	Example 5	459
14.4.6.	Example 6	460
14.4.7.	Example 7	461
14.4.8.	Example 8	462
14.4.9.	Example 9	464
14.4.10.	Example 10	465
14.4.11.	Example 11	466
14.4.12.	Example 12	469
14.4.13.	Example 13	471
14.4.14.	Example 14	472
14.4.15.	Example 15	473
14.4.16.	Example 16	474
14.4.17.	Example 17	475
14.4.18.	Example 18	476
	Bibliography	477

Chapter 15: Switzerland	479
<i>Samuel Dürr</i>	
15.1. General	479
15.2. Domestic law	479
15.2.1. Legal aspects	479
15.2.1.1. General partnership	480
15.2.1.2. Limited partnership	481
15.2.1.3. Civil law partnership	481
15.2.2. Tax subject	482
15.2.2.1. Taxation of domestic partnerships	483
15.2.2.2. Taxation of foreign partnerships	484
15.3. Tax treaty issues	486
15.3.1. Treaty entitlement	486
15.3.2. Switzerland as the State of Residence	487
15.3.3. Switzerland as the State of Source	487
15.3.4. Triangular Cases	488
15.4. Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	488
15.4.1. Example 1	488
15.4.2. Example 2	489
15.4.3. Example 3	490
15.4.4. Example 4	491
15.4.5. Example 5	492
15.4.6. Example 6	493
15.4.7. Example 7	493
15.4.8. Example 8	495
15.4.9. Example 9	496
15.4.10. Example 10	498
15.4.11. Example 11	499
15.4.12. Example 12	500
15.4.13. Example 13	501
15.4.14. Example 14	503
15.4.15. Example 15	503
15.4.16. Example 16	504
15.4.17. Example 17	505
15.4.18. Example 18	506
References	507

Chapter 16:	United Kingdom	509
	<i>Stephen Hoyle</i>	
16.1.	General	509
16.2.	Domestic law	510
16.2.1.	Legal aspects	510
16.2.2.	Tax aspects	511
16.2.3.	Taxation of domestic partnerships	513
16.2.4.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	514
16.3.	Tax treaty issues	517
16.3.1.	Treaty entitlement	517
16.3.2.	United Kingdom as the State of Residence	517
16.3.3.	United Kingdom as the State of Source	518
16.3.4.	Triangular cases	519
16.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	519
16.4.1.	Example 1	519
16.4.2.	Example 2	520
16.4.3.	Example 3	521
16.4.4.	Example 4	522
16.4.5.	Example 5	523
16.4.6.	Example 6	523
16.4.7.	Example 7	524
16.4.8.	Example 8	525
16.4.9.	Example 9	526
16.4.10.	Example 10	527
16.4.11.	Example 11	528
16.4.12.	Example 12	528
16.4.13.	Example 13	529
16.4.14.	Example 14	530
16.4.15.	Example 15	531
16.4.16.	Example 16	531
16.4.17.	Example 17	532
16.4.18.	Example 18	533
Chapter 17:	United States	535
	<i>Linda E.S. Pfattheicher and Chris Kotarba</i>	
17.1.	General	535
17.2.	Domestic law	535
17.2.1.	Legal aspects	535
17.2.1.1.	Partnership forms	535
17.2.1.1.1.	General partnership	536

17.2.1.1.2.	Limited partnership	536
17.2.1.1.3.	Limited liability partnership	537
17.2.1.1.4.	Limited liability company	537
17.2.2.	Tax aspects of partnerships generally	538
17.2.2.1.	Formation	538
17.2.2.2.	Pass-through principle	539
17.2.2.3.	Check-the-box elections	539
17.2.2.4.	Reporting requirements	540
17.2.3.	Taxation of US partnerships	540
17.2.3.1.	Entity v. aggregate theory	540
17.2.3.2.	Formation and contributions	541
17.2.3.3.	Operations, allocations and sale treatment	542
17.2.3.3.1.	Basic operations	542
17.2.3.3.2.	Allocations and distributions	543
17.2.3.3.3.	Sale treatment for US partners	544
17.2.3.4.	Non-US partners of US partnerships	544
17.2.3.4.1.	Withholding	544
17.2.3.4.2.	Branch profits tax	545
17.2.3.4.3.	Sale treatment for non-US partners	546
17.2.4.	Taxation of foreign partnerships	547
17.2.4.1.	Classification of foreign partnerships	547
17.2.4.2.	Foreign tax credits	547
17.3.	Tax treaty issues	548
17.3.1.	Regulatory framework	549
17.3.2.	Hybrid entities	553
17.4.	Examples of the OECD Partnership Report	556
17.4.1.	Example 1	556
17.4.2.	Example 2	557
17.4.3.	Example 3	558
17.4.4.	Example 4	560
17.4.5.	Example 5	561
17.4.6.	Example 6	562
17.4.7.	Example 7	563
17.4.8.	Example 8	564
17.4.9.	Example 9	565
17.4.10.	Example 10	567
17.4.11.	Example 11	568
17.4.12.	Example 12	569
17.4.13.	Example 13	570
17.4.14.	Example 14	570
17.4.15.	Example 15	572
17.4.16.	Example 16	573

Table of Contents

17.4.17.	Example 17	574
17.4.18.	Example 18	574
	References	575

Introduction

Florian Haase

1.1. An overview and brief history

The history of legal forms of partnerships is undoubtedly a success story. In many jurisdictions, partnerships nowadays play a vital economic role. In some major countries, like Germany for instance, there are even more partnerships than any other legal form. Recent surveys have shown that around 80% of all registered German companies still bear the legal form of a partnership. Often, but not necessarily, this has historic reasons, because partnerships are usually much older than, for example, limited liability companies. This is particularly true for countries whose economic success is based on trade and merchants. In Germany, for instance, the first partnerships were known as early as 1300, whereas the other “international best-seller”, the German limited liability company (GmbH) was first established in 1892, when the Law Governing Limited Liability Companies (GmbHG) passed the parliament.

However, in many countries today partnerships as well as corporations are highly technical and very elaborate legal forms. As a rule of thumb, one could not say that in terms of market acceptance, corporations are still less efficient or less successful than partnerships, although there are still some countries in which partnerships are simply not very widely used, particularly in Eastern Europe. There are also countries that are just about to open partnerships for foreign partners, as India has done recently.

By the same token, however, it is also a fact that in many countries partnerships are a lot more flexible than corporations from a legal point of view. The law that governs corporations is usually a lot stricter and more rigid, and the shareholders of a corporation cannot necessarily agree on what they like. Moreover, experience shows that in some industries the legal form of a partnership goes along with a great deal of trust in the owners of the partnership and this results in particular from the unlimited personal liability of the partners that is innate to the traditional unlimited partnerships – the limited partnership that is used today even more often is a comparatively young legal form. Be that as it may, many people think that truly honourable

merchants should use their personal funds and monies in case their company is likely to file for insolvency proceedings, and it is therefore small wonder that in some very traditional industries (e.g. private banks, merchant or maritime sectors) the unlimited liability partnership still seems to be the preferred legal form.

A further reason for the success of partnerships may also be seen in their legal variety. In many countries, there are more legal forms of partnerships to choose from than with respect to their corporate counterparts. There are usually unlimited partnerships, limited partnerships, limited liability partnerships, general partnerships, partnerships at will, silent or dormant partnerships, etc., not to mention on a European level the European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG). The EEIG was introduced in 1985 through the Council Regulation (EEC) No 2137/85 of 25 July 1985 on the European Economic Interest Grouping, the objective of which was to create a new legal entity based on European law to facilitate and encourage cross-border cooperation. The EEIG, however, is treated for tax purposes as a partnership in many countries.

When it comes to corporations, on the contrary, there are usually only two or three different types of corporations on a national level that entrepreneurs can use, although a lot of development on a European level in this area has been seen during the last 15 years: the Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Company 2157/2001 is an EU Regulation containing the rules for a public EU company, called *Societas Europaea*, or SE, which was given a lot of hype but was not in fact very successful in practice. There is also a statute allowing European Cooperative Societies, and most recently it was proposed that the SPE company form (i.e. the European Private Company) should be introduced across the EU and EEA area from July 2010 onwards.

The reason for the great variety of partnerships can surely be explained by the fact that dynamic entrepreneurs need to find the right, flexible and tailor-made legal form for their economic undertakings, so that some kind of economic necessity urged the respective legislative bodies in many countries to react to these requirements and provide for legal forms that meet the needs of entrepreneurs and their customers alike. A silent partner, for example, naturally pursues different goals than a general partner who is subject to an unlimited personal liability and also, as a consequence, the needs for regulation and protection are very much different.

Another reason for the wide use of partnerships is the comparatively low entry level. Unlike for corporations, partnerships in most countries are not

“incorporated” or even registered in a commercial or trade register, and if there is a notification requirement, the submission is merely recorded and not verified. When jurisdictions do not even foresee a formal registration or notification, the real number of partnerships can only be estimated very roughly because there is no way to count reliable numbers. In some countries, all you need to form a partnership is a joint goal of at least two partners, purposely or not purposely. It may therefore well be that the partners do not even know that they are acting in the legal form of a partnership.

Partnerships are traditionally used in specific industries and for specific (legal and sometimes illegal) goals. For instance, many family offices use partnerships to structure the wealth of high net worth individuals and families. Many international holding structures use partnerships and partnerships are also widely used to conceal beneficial ownership of large sums of monies – the latter is of course mainly due to the fact that there is often no registration requirement for partnerships.

Partnerships are furthermore used, for example, for closed-end real estate funds and joint ventures in the oil and gas industry, or as vehicles to pool voting rights or some other interests of stakeholders. Partnerships are used between spouses to clarify rights and duties with respect to each other, or they are sometimes used to avoid or minimize taxes in general (think of the classic Dutch CV/BV structures), particularly when they become part of “orphan structures” (mostly in connection with trusts or foundations). The variety of intended purposes is almost endless, in theory as well as in practice.

Leaving that aside, it is very clear that nowadays in many countries the law of partnerships usually lacks strict rules that cannot be amended by the partners. Instead, contractual freedom and less formal rules govern the law of partnerships, which is interesting not only for commercial entrepreneurs, family-owned businesses, ship owners and start-ups, but sometimes even for private equity or venture capital investors. In particular, the latter investors from the United States like to use European partnerships since they offer them freedom with respect to profit sharing, voting rights, earn-outs and exits.

But partnerships are not only attractive from a legal point of view. In many countries, the taxation of partnerships is also very beneficial for the partners when compared with corporate investment structures. In Germany, for instance, limited partnerships have long been used as the prime example of an investment vehicle for inbound real estate investments, since they offered

benefits with respect to trade tax and debt financing. The classic German (and later also Austrian) GmbH & Co. KG was in fact only born in order to combine legal and tax benefits.

On an international level, the picture of partnerships is very much diversified. One finds in many countries the above-mentioned variety in terms of numerous different types of partnerships and structures, whereas other countries hardly use partnerships as commercial vehicles and only know two to three different legal types. This, however, does not necessarily say anything about the practical influences of partnerships. In some countries like Russia, India, South Africa or China, partnerships, for instance, were not allowed at all a few years ago or, at least particularly, foreign investors were barred from becoming a partner in such a partnership, let alone the fairly poor market acceptance. The latter is still true for countries like Spain (at least in certain industries or business sectors) or certain countries of Eastern Europe.

Other countries do not know limited liability partnerships, which is obviously disadvantageous in a fair competition for investments from abroad. Again, other countries, such as, for example, Germany, the Netherlands or Norway, use partnerships in certain industries for historic reasons, if we think of the shipping industry.

Moreover, from the legal perspective, things get easily complicated if jurisdictions follow different concepts as regards the attribution of legal ownership. Some countries treat a partnership as an “ownership in common”, i.e. each co-owner actually has a share in the property. Consequently, the value of the property is, as it were, divided between the co-owners, although the mere physical substance of the assets is undivided and the right to possession can only be exercised jointly. Upon the death of a co-owner, his share in the property passes to his personal representatives.

“Joint ownership”, as some countries call the right to possession of the partners in a partnership, on the contrary is something very different. The value of the property is then not divided, but all joint owners together own the property; they hold it, as it were, “with one hand”. In many common law jurisdictions, for instance, a co-ownership in common has historically only been possible in equity, whereas a joint ownership has long been the only possible legal co-ownership of land. As such, the division of the value substance into “shares” exists only as a matter concerning the internal relationships between co-owners, but not as a matter of binding outside force. Since there is no share, which upon a co-owner’s death can devolve upon

his personal representatives, his right accrues to the other co-owners and, upon the death of the last surviving co-owner, passes on to his personal representatives.

1.2. A myriad of legal rules ... and questions

Courts, academic literature and law practice in many jurisdictions have developed a myriad of legal rules around the two main above-mentioned legal concepts pertaining to partnerships and have solved the most important questions accordingly: Can a partnership bear legal rights and duties? Are corporations treated as partnerships in the period of time between the submission for registration and the actual registration in the commercial register? Is there a difference between management capacity and representation of a partnership? Can partnership rights and duties be transferred to non-partners? Is there a fiduciary duty of the partners towards each other and towards the partnership? How many partners are needed to form a partnership and what happens to the partnership and its property if one of the two remaining partners leaves the partnership? Do partnerships need a formal registration? What about profit sharing that is not proportionally reflected by the partnership share? Are partnerships without a personal liability of its partners allowed? Many other questions could easily be added to this list, but it is clear nowadays that at least most of the fundamental legal questions around partnerships have been answered sufficiently.

The history of partnerships from a legal perspective has in many states every now and then demonstrated interdependencies between the legal questions and corresponding tax questions. Are partnerships taxed differently from corporations and why? How is it decided whether a foreign entity is treated as a partnership or as a partnership – is the legal fact pattern decisive or does tax law require a different treatment? Can partners make use of losses that are derived by the partnership? Are there different tax rules for partners who do not bear an unlimited personal liability? How is a situation taxed in which one of the two remaining partners leaves the partnership?

As mentioned at the outset and based on the above, countries have developed different concepts of partnership taxation. Some countries treat partnerships as “flow-through” entities. Flow-through taxation means that the entity does not pay taxes on its income; instead, the owners of the entity pay tax on their “distributive share” of the entity’s taxable income, even if no funds are distributed by the partnership to the owners. In that context, many jurisdictions permit the owners of the entity to agree how the income

of the entity will be allocated among them, but require that this allocation reflects the economic reality of their business arrangement, as tested under complicated rules with much detail in practice.

Some countries, on the other hand, treat partnerships for tax purposes as corporations or quasi-corporations, or “opaque”, which is a lot more than the corporate doctrine of “piercing the corporate veil” for liability purposes, and, again, some countries allow partnerships to choose which regime shall be applicable. In summary, the dual nature of a partnership for tax purposes – at times an aggregation of its partners and at times an entity – complicates partnership taxation throughout many countries, particularly because only few people have been able to articulate a comprehensive statement of when the aggregate aspect and when the entity aspect should predominate.

Bearing all this in mind, the taxation of partnerships in an international context is particularly one of the most complex areas of (international) tax law. Apart from the problems under the national tax law of many jurisdictions, this is particularly due to two conflicting principles: some countries treat partnerships as taxable entities, while others treat them as transparent and only see the partners as taxpayers for tax purposes. This situation can lead to double taxation or double non-taxation. Particular problems can furthermore arise in triangular situations.

The aforementioned problems boil down to some extent to the question of whether the partnership or its partners are protected under existing double tax treaties. In that context, the question of whether or not a taxpayer qualifies as a “resident of a Contracting State” within the meaning of article 4(1) of the OECD Model Convention goes to the very heart of the application of a double tax treaty. During the past decades, tax courts, scholars and practitioners alike have approached this topic from many different perspectives and angles. Although there seems to be some common understanding of the requirements and consequences of the treaty entitlement status, international tax practice reveals that it is far from being sufficiently investigated. This is not only due to problems that arise in the national tax law of contracting states for the first time, but also because traditional legal institutes and problems are reassessed and treated differently over time, which is particularly true for the treatment of partnerships.

Treaty entitlement or treaty eligibility of taxpayers is a core subject of international tax law from a methodological perspective and is highly topical, theoretically challenging and at the same time of immense practical relevance. It is highly topical, as Seminar G of the IFA Congress 2011 in

Paris has demonstrated, albeit especially with respect to the peculiarities of collective investment vehicles. The IFA Mumbai Congress in 2014, however, will again bring this topic to the agenda. It is theoretically challenging, since particularly treaty entitlement of (international) partnerships, triangular cases in general or the treatment of elective regulations in national tax law (like, for example, the US check-the-box regulations) still leave many questions unanswered. And, last but not least, the subject is of immense practical relevance, for the determination of the treaty entitlement is *condicio sine qua non* for the application of any double tax treaty. The question of treaty entitlement has to be answered not only for the application of a tax treaty as such in principle, but is in particular decisive for the allocation of the power to impose taxes between two contracting states.

The tax treatment of partnerships is so difficult and so important from a practical as well as an academic/theoretical point of view that the OECD, back in 1999, published an extensive report on this subject, the so-called “OECD Partnership Report”. This report expressed in great detail the view of the OECD with respect to the taxation of international partnerships from the perspective of the State of Source as well as the State of Residence. The Report contained general remarks on the taxation of partnerships, but was mainly built on examples of specific cases and their tax treatment.

In 2014, the OECD Partnership Report celebrates its 15th anniversary. Consequently, it is high time to investigate if and how the ideas of the OECD have been adopted by the different jurisdictions in the meantime, albeit the results of the Report are somewhat inconsistent to a significant extent and are not always easy to realize from a practical point of view. Moreover, the tax authorities of many countries seem to be increasingly reluctant to accept the OECD as an authority, particularly at the bottom level of the local tax offices. Indeed, the OECD Model and the OECD Commentary are technically mere recommendations that might be used when it comes to interpreting a tax treaty, but without any binding effect, and in recent times the tax authorities seem to make use of this to their advantage.

1.3. Chapter specifics and guidelines

The underlying idea of this book was to have a short introduction on the taxation of international partnerships from each jurisdiction and then answer the most important examples used in the Partnership Report from each

jurisdiction's perspective. To get the full picture, many EU Member States have participated, plus Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, India, Singapore, Switzerland and the United States.

As regards the taxation of partnerships, theoretical concepts cannot be distinguished from the practical perspective/approach. As mentioned above, there is the basic question of treaty entitlement for partnerships and the answer to this question influences all accompanying questions (e.g. how and on which level double taxation is avoided and who (i.e. the partnership or the individual partners) is entitled, for instance, to a withholding tax reduction). But since the examples of the OECD Partnership Report will be used as a basis here, the book undertakes a very practical approach indeed.

This book will be of interest for a wide audience of practitioners and academics alike. The taxation of partnerships is a core subject of tax law in each jurisdiction, so that anyone who deals with partnerships in the European Union and the additional above-mentioned jurisdictions should be interested in reading it. It may also be a useful tax planning tool if a reader wants to understand which country may be beneficial for his needs with respect to the foundation of a partnership.

1.3.1. Country survey guidelines

The country surveys for Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Italy, the Netherlands, Singapore, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States, which follow below in Part Two, are structured the same way, which makes it easier for the reader to compare the presented solutions on his own.

These start off in the first part of each chapter by demonstrating the general rules of partnership taxation in the respective country. This includes, *inter alia*, mentioning the available classes of partnerships, the tax subject and taxpayer, the underlying taxation principle (flow-through or separate entity), the tax rate and the determination of the tax base. Procedural rules are explained to the extent there are any peculiarities.

After that, the perspective becomes more international. The authors explain how foreign partnerships are qualified and if there are any differences from domestic partnerships. Emphasis is of course placed on the methods of avoiding international double taxation and on practical problems: one country regards the sale of a partnership interest as an alienation of shares, while

another considers it the alienation of the partner's interest in the underlying assets. Or, when a partnership sold assets, one country attributes the capital gain directly to the partnership whereas the other country – applying a “transparency” approach – attributes it directly to its partners.

Each chapter will then basically look at three different situations:

- (i) taxation of a partnership with foreign partners that is registered under the laws of the respective country (for a list of countries, *see* above);
- (ii) taxation of a foreign partnership that is registered under the laws of a foreign country with partners who are tax residents of the respective country; and
- (iii) taxation of a foreign partnership (registered in State A) with partners who are tax residents of State B and the partnership generates income from the respective country,

so that every country is dealt with from all conceivable angles and perspectives (State of Residence versus State of Source versus third-country perspective).

All above-mentioned scenarios are analysed in general under the respective domestic law rules as well as under treaty law aspects. In the second part of each chapter – and this is the core issue – the authors go through all the examples (18 examples in total) of the OECD Partnership Report and comment on where – and why – their home country deviates from the solution presented by the OECD. In these examples, not all of the three above-mentioned perspectives are taken at each example, but the examples of the Partnership Report certainly reflect the scenarios that are most relevant or most complicated in practice.

However, not all examples in the Partnership Report are based on triangular cases (scenario (iii) above). A good half of the examples deals with bilateral situations only (State of Residence versus State of Source perspective), but place emphasis as well on the treaty eligibility issue as well as the avoidance of international double taxation.

Contact

IBFD Head Office
Rietlandpark 301
1019 DW Amsterdam
P.O. Box 20237
1000 HE Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Tel.: +31-20-554 0100 (GMT+1)
Fax: +31-20-620 8626
Email: info@ibfd.org
Web: www.ibfd.org



IBFD, Your Portal to Cross-Border Tax Expertise