

Marjaana Helminen

# EU

## TAX LAW

*Direct Taxation*

2021 EDITION

IBFD



# EU Tax Law – Direct Taxation 2021

## Why this book?

EU tax law substantially impacts the domestic tax laws of the EU Member States and the way in which those laws should be interpreted and applied. The effect of EU tax law on national legislation is becoming increasingly complex. Today, anyone working with or interested in tax law or tax planning is confronted with EU tax law issues.

The 2021 edition of EU Tax Law – Direct Taxation provides a clear picture of the EU law norms that are relevant from the perspective of direct taxes. It explains how these norms are, and should be, interpreted and how they affect national tax laws and the tax treatment in EU Member States. The book describes the legal remedies available against tax treatment that is in conflict with EU law.

The study begins with a comprehensive overview of the basic principles and concepts of EU tax law and relevant articles of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, analysing them in the light of direct tax case law. A discussion follows covering relevant EU directives and recommendations and other soft law material on direct taxes. Reference is made to all relevant judgments of the EU Court on direct taxes. The book includes a chapter on the tax treatment of the different EU entity forms and the future of corporate taxation. A separate chapter is dedicated to the EU law issues related to transfer pricing and to the EU law norms on administrative cooperation in tax matters. An extensive bibliography is included that directs the reader to further material on the topic.

The book is a handy reference tool for tax practitioners, judiciaries, tax administrations and university students alike. Its structure allows quick and easy access to essential information and facilitates a better understanding of the direct tax issues of EU tax law.

<b>Title:</b>	EU Tax Law – Direct Taxation 2021
<b>Author(s):</b>	Marjaana Helminen
<b>Date of publication:</b>	August 2021
<b>ISBN:</b>	978-90-8722-724-1 (print/online), 978-90-8722-725-8 (ePub), 978-90-8722-726-5 (PDF)
<b>Type of publication:</b>	Book
<b>Number of pages:</b>	608
<b>Terms:</b>	Shipping fees apply. Shipping information is available on our website
<b>Price (print/online):</b>	EUR 115 / USD 140 (VAT excl.)
<b>Price (eBook: ePub or PDF):</b>	EUR 90 / USD 105 (VAT excl.)

## Order information

To order the book, please visit [www.ibfd.org/IBFD-Products/shop](http://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

IBFD

*Visitors' address:*  
Rietlandpark 301  
1019 DW Amsterdam  
The Netherlands

*Postal address:*  
P.O. Box 20237  
1000 HE Amsterdam  
The Netherlands

Telephone: 31-20-554 0100  
Email: [info@ibfd.org](mailto:info@ibfd.org)  
[www.ibfd.org](http://www.ibfd.org)

© 2021 IBFD

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written prior permission of the publisher. Applications for permission to reproduce all or part of this publication should be directed to: [permissions@ibfd.org](mailto:permissions@ibfd.org).

### **Disclaimer**

This publication has been carefully compiled by IBFD and/or its author, but no representation is made or warranty given (either express or implied) as to the completeness or accuracy of the information it contains. IBFD and/or the author are not liable for the information in this publication or any decision or consequence based on the use of it. IBFD and/or the author will not be liable for any direct or consequential damages arising from the use of the information contained in this publication. However, IBFD will be liable for damages that are the result of an intentional act (*opzet*) or gross negligence (*grove schuld*) on IBFD's part. In no event shall IBFD's total liability exceed the price of the ordered product. The information contained in this publication is not intended to be an advice on any particular matter. No subscriber or other reader should act on the basis of any matter contained in this publication without considering appropriate professional advice.

Where photocopying of parts of this publication is permitted under article 16B of the 1912 Copyright Act jo. the Decree of 20 June 1974, Stb. 351, as amended by the Decree of 23 August 1985, Stb. 471, and article 17 of the 1912 Copyright Act, legally due fees must be paid to Stichting Reprorecht (P.O. Box 882, 1180 AW Amstelveen). Where the use of parts of this publication for the purpose of anthologies, readers and other compilations (article 16 of the 1912 Copyright Act) is concerned, one should address the publisher.

ISBN 978-90-8722-724-1 (print)  
ISBN 978-90-8722-725-8 (eBook, ePub); 978-90-8722-726-5 (eBook, PDF)  
ISSN 2589-9465 (print); 2589-9759 (electronic)  
NUR 826

---

# Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>	xvii
<b>Abbreviations and Terms</b>	xix
<b>Chapter 1 EU Tax Law as Part of the Legal System</b>	1
1.1. Concepts	1
1.2. Relation to other legislation	3
1.2.1. Competences	3
1.2.2. Separateness and interaction	6
1.2.3. The primacy of EU law	7
1.2.4. Tax consequences	9
1.2.5. Direct effect and application	11
1.3. Primary law	12
1.3.1. The founding treaties and the accession treaties	12
1.3.2. Fundamental rights	15
1.3.3. Legal principles of EU law	15
1.4. Secondary law	21
1.4.1. Concept	21
1.4.2. Directives	22
1.4.2.1. Authorization to issue directives	22
1.4.2.2. Impact of the directives	23
1.4.2.3. Directives on direct taxes	25
1.4.3. Recommendations and other measures	26
1.5. International conventions	28
1.5.1. Connection to EU law	28
1.5.2. Tax treaties between EU Member States	28
1.5.2.1. Right to conclude tax treaties	28
1.5.2.2. Primacy of EU law	29
1.5.2.3. Most favoured nation	30
1.5.3. Tax treaties with third countries	32
1.5.3.1. Right to conclude tax treaties	32
1.5.3.2. Primacy of EU law	33
1.5.4. Other treaties with non-Member States	35
1.5.4.1. EEA Agreement	35
1.5.4.2. Other conventions	36

1.6.	Harmful tax competition and forbidden state aid	37
1.6.1.	Harmful tax competition	37
1.6.1.1.	Concept	37
1.6.1.2.	Measures against harmful tax competition	37
1.6.1.3.	Prevention of tax evasion	38
1.6.2.	Prohibition of state aid	41
1.7.	Elimination of international double taxation	47
1.7.1.	Legal basis	47
1.7.2.	Tax treaties and directives	48
1.7.3.	Obligation to take into account taxes levied in another Member State	50
1.8.	Interpretation of EU law	58
1.8.1.	EU law method of interpretation	58
1.8.2.	EU law-consistent interpretation of domestic law	59
<b>Chapter 2 Non-Discrimination and Basic Freedoms</b>		<b>63</b>
2.1.	Discrimination based on nationality	63
2.1.1.	General conditions for application	63
2.1.2.	Concept of discrimination	65
2.1.3.	Comparable situation or different situation	68
2.1.3.1.	Comparability analysis	68
2.1.3.2.	Different situation	68
2.1.3.3.	Comparable situation	70
2.1.3.4.	Resident companies of different states	71
2.2.	Basic freedoms	72
2.2.1.	General conditions for application	72
2.2.2.	Free movement of goods	80
2.2.2.1.	Applicable norms	80
2.2.2.2.	Relevance to direct taxation	81
2.2.3.	Free movement of EU citizens	81
2.2.4.	Free movement of workers	84
2.2.4.1.	General conditions for application	84
2.2.4.2.	Different tax treatment on the basis of residence	87
2.2.4.2.1.	Employment in several states	87
2.2.4.2.2.	Most income from employment state	88
2.2.4.2.3.	Small part of income from employment state	92
2.2.4.3.	Social security contributions	94

2.2.5.	Freedom of establishment	96
2.2.5.1.	Relevance and scope of application	96
2.2.5.2.	Undertakings in a comparable situation	102
	2.2.5.2.1. Permanent establishments	102
	2.2.5.2.2. No permanent establishment	106
2.2.5.3.	Dividend taxation systems	107
	2.2.5.3.1. Permanent establishment	107
	2.2.5.3.2. Foreign-source dividends	108
	2.2.5.3.3. Non-resident dividend recipient	112
2.2.5.4.	Thin capitalization and interest deduction limitations	116
2.2.5.5.	Group taxation systems	118
	2.2.5.5.1. Need for cross-border balancing of profits and losses	118
	2.2.5.5.2. Permanent establishments	121
	2.2.5.5.3. No permanent establishment	122
2.2.6.	Free movement of capital and payments	130
2.2.6.1.	Primary rule	130
2.2.6.2.	Exceptions	134
2.2.6.3.	Relations to non-Member States	135
2.2.6.4.	Right to capital in companies	140
2.2.7.	Freedom to provide services	140
2.2.7.1.	Scope of application	140
2.2.7.2.	Cases on direct taxes	143
2.2.8.	Overlapping scope of application	145
2.2.8.1.	Freedom of establishment or free movement of capital?	145
2.2.8.2.	Free movement of capital or services?	150
2.2.8.3.	Freedom of establishment/free movement of capital or free movement of workers?	151
2.2.8.4.	Free movement of capital or goods?	152
2.2.8.5.	Simultaneous application	152
2.3.	Justifications for discrimination or restrictions	153
2.3.1.	Rule of reason	153
2.3.2.	Effectiveness of fiscal supervision and the recovery of tax debt	156
2.3.3.	Anti-avoidance purpose	157
	2.3.3.1. Tax planning versus tax avoidance	157
	2.3.3.2. CFC regimes as an example	163
2.3.4.	Balanced allocation of taxing rights	166
2.3.5.	Coherence of the national tax system	168

2.3.6.	Territoriality	172
2.3.7.	Need to prevent double use of losses	173
2.3.8.	Treatment in the other state	174
2.3.9.	Non-EU and non-EEA States	174
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Corporate Tax Directives</b>	<b>177</b>
3.1.	EU Parent-Subsidiary Directive	177
3.1.1.	Background	177
3.1.2.	Scope of application	178
3.1.2.1.	Profit distributions between subsidiary and parent companies residing in different Member States	178
3.1.2.2.	Profit distributions connected with a permanent establishment	180
3.1.2.3.	Company of a Member State	184
3.1.2.4.	Permanent establishment	187
3.1.2.5.	Parent and subsidiary company	188
3.1.2.6.	Profit distribution	190
3.1.2.7.	Other requirements	191
3.1.2.8.	EEA and other non-Member States	192
3.1.3.	Tax treatment	192
3.1.3.1.	Tax treatment in the dividend recipient's state	192
3.1.3.1.1.	Elimination of double taxation in the parent company state	192
3.1.3.1.2.	Exemption or credit in the parent company state or in the permanent establishment state	193
3.1.3.1.3.	Treatment of hybrid subsidiaries in the parent company state	196
3.1.3.1.4.	Treatment of subsidiary-related costs in the parent company state	198
3.1.3.2.	Tax treatment in the subsidiary state	199
3.1.3.2.1.	No withholding tax	199
3.1.3.2.2.	Withholding tax	200
3.1.4.	Tax-avoidance situations	201



3.2.	EU Interest-Royalty Directive	205
3.2.1.	Background and force	205
3.2.2.	Tax treatment	206
3.2.2.1.	Tax consequences	206
3.2.2.2.	Administrative prerequisites	208
3.2.2.3.	Repayment of a tax levied in conflict with the directive	210
3.2.3.	Intra-EU cross-border payment	210
3.2.4.	Qualifying companies	217
3.2.4.1.	Company of a Member State	217
3.2.4.2.	Permanent establishment	221
3.2.4.3.	Associated companies	222
3.2.4.4.	Beneficial owner	225
3.2.5.	Source state	227
3.2.6.	The concepts of interest and royalty	229
3.2.6.1.	Interest	229
3.2.6.2.	Royalty	229
3.2.6.3.	Payments outside the scope of the directive	230
3.2.7.	Tax-avoidance situations	231
3.3.	EU Merger Directive	233
3.3.1.	Background and force	233
3.3.1.1.	Force	233
3.3.1.2.	Relevance of the directive	234
3.3.2.	Scope of application	235
3.3.2.1.	Reorganizations covered	235
3.3.2.2.	Company from a Member State	236
3.3.2.3.	Merger	239
3.3.2.4.	Division	244
3.3.2.5.	Transfer of assets	248
3.3.2.6.	Exchange of shares	250
3.3.3.	Tax treatment of mergers, divisions and transfers of assets	253
3.3.3.1.	Applicable provisions	253
3.3.3.2.	Deferral of capital gains taxation	254
3.3.3.3.	Carry-over of provisions and reserves	257
3.3.3.4.	Takeover of losses	257
3.3.3.5.	Holdings of the receiving company in the transferring company	259

3.3.3.6.	Tax exemption of the shareholders	259
	3.3.3.6.1. Situations covered	259
	3.3.3.6.2. Situations not covered by the tax exemption	261
3.3.3.7.	Transfer of a permanent establishment	263
3.3.4.	Transfer of registered office of a European Company or European Cooperative Society	264
	3.3.4.1. Background and relevance	264
	3.3.4.2. Transfer of registered office	265
	3.3.4.3. Tax consequences	266
3.3.5.	Tax avoidance	268
	3.3.5.1. Artificial tax-avoidance arrangements	268
	3.3.5.2. Other situations	272
3.3.6.	Employee representation	273
3.4.	Anti-Tax Avoidance Directive	273
3.4.1.	Background, relevance and implementation	273
3.4.2.	Personal scope of the directive	275
3.4.3.	Interest deduction limitation rule	275
	3.4.3.1. Different limitations on interest deductions	275
	3.4.3.2. EBITDA-based fixed ratio rule	276
	3.4.3.3. Voluntary <i>de minimis</i> rule	277
	3.4.3.4. Voluntary exclusions	278
	3.4.3.5. Voluntary group ratio rule	280
	3.4.3.6. Voluntary carry-forward and carry-back	281
3.4.4.	Exit taxation provision	282
	3.4.4.1. Exit taxation	282
	3.4.4.2. Transfers covered	282
	3.4.4.3. Exclusion of temporal transfers	284
	3.4.4.4. Deferral of payment	284
	3.4.4.5. Tax value in the receiving country	286
	3.4.4.6. Estonia	286
3.4.5.	General anti-abuse rule	287
3.4.6.	Controlled foreign company rule	288
	3.4.6.1. Functioning and structure of the rule	288
	3.4.6.2. Entities treated as CFCs	289
	3.4.6.3. The CFC tax base	290
	3.4.6.4. Computation of the CFC income	292
3.4.7.	Hybrid mismatch rule	294

<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>EU Company Forms and the Future of Corporate Taxation</b>	303
4.1.	Introduction	303
4.2.	European Company and European Cooperative Society	304
4.2.1.	Formation	304
4.2.1.1.	Company law	304
4.2.1.2.	Tax treatment	306
4.2.2.	Tax treatment of a European Company or a European Cooperative Society	311
4.2.2.1.	Relevance of the SE Regulation and the SCE Regulation	311
4.2.2.2.	National tax laws	312
4.2.2.3.	Tax treaties	313
4.2.2.4.	Founding treaties and directives	315
4.2.2.5.	Tax-related problems	316
4.3.	European Economic Interest Grouping	316
4.3.1.	Company law	316
4.3.2.	Tax treatment	317
4.4.	Future of corporate taxation in the European Union	318
4.4.1.	Need for development	318
4.4.2.	From CCCTB to BEFIT	319
4.4.3.	Alternatives	320
4.4.4.	Significant digital presence and digital services tax	322
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Transfer Pricing</b>	325
5.1.	Relevance	325
5.2.	Code of Conduct on transfer pricing documentation	327
5.2.1.	Background and purpose	327
5.2.2.	General principles	329
5.2.2.1.	Rights and obligations of enterprises	329
5.2.2.2.	Rights and obligations of Member States	331
5.2.3.	Content of documentation	332
5.2.3.1.	General principles	332
5.2.3.2.	Master file	334
5.2.3.3.	Country-specific documentation	335
5.3.	Advance pricing agreements	336
5.3.1.	Background and purpose	336
5.3.2.	Binding effect	337
5.3.3.	Prerequisites for an advance pricing agreement	339
5.3.4.	Conduct of the advance pricing agreement process	340
5.3.4.1.	Preliminary negotiations and informal application	340

	5.3.4.2.	Formal application	341
	5.3.4.3.	Evaluation and negotiations	344
	5.3.4.4.	Formal advance pricing agreement	345
5.4.		Arbitration Convention	347
	5.4.1.	Relevance, force and interpretation	347
		5.4.1.1. Relevance	347
		5.4.1.2. Force	349
		5.4.1.3. Interpretation	350
	5.4.2.	Scope of application	351
		5.4.2.1. Elimination of double taxation	351
		5.4.2.2. Double taxation caused by a transfer pricing adjustment	351
		5.4.2.3. Enterprise of a contracting state	353
		5.4.2.4. Serious penalty	355
		5.4.2.5. Taxes covered by the Arbitration Convention	355
		5.4.2.6. Competent authority	355
		5.4.2.7. Territorial scope of application	356
	5.4.3.	Arm's length principle and transfer pricing adjustment	356
	5.4.4.	Notification of a transfer pricing adjustment	358
	5.4.5.	Mutual agreement procedure	359
		5.4.5.1. Institution of proceedings	359
		5.4.5.2. Notifications and information request	360
		5.4.5.3. Starting the negotiations	360
		5.4.5.4. Negotiations	362
		5.4.5.5. Agreement and implementation	364
	5.4.6.	Arbitration procedure	365
		5.4.6.1. Starting the procedure	365
		5.4.6.2. Advisory commission	367
		5.4.6.3. Rights and obligations within the arbitration procedure	370
		5.4.6.4. Opinion of the advisory commission	371
		5.4.6.5. Costs	372
	5.4.7.	Correction of tax assessment	373
		5.4.7.1. Abolition of international double taxation	373
		5.4.7.2. Suspension of tax collection	374

<b>Chapter 6 Mutual Assistance and Recovery of Tax Claims</b>	<b>377</b>
6.1. Directive on Administrative Cooperation	377
6.1.1. Background and relevance	377
6.1.2. Scope of application	381
6.1.3. Types of information exchange	383
6.1.3.1. Automatic exchange of information	383
6.1.3.2. Automatic exchange of information on reportable cross-border arrangements	389
6.1.3.2.1. Introduction	389
6.1.3.2.2. Reportable cross-border arrangements	390
6.1.3.2.3. Reporting obligation	395
6.1.3.2.4. Automatic exchange of information	400
6.1.3.2.5. Penalties	402
6.1.3.3. Exchange on request	402
6.1.3.4. Spontaneous exchange of information	405
6.1.3.5. The exchanging authority	407
6.1.4. Limits for exchange of information	408
6.1.5. Disclosure of information	411
6.1.6. Presence in the requested state	413
6.1.7. Notification of tax decisions	413
6.1.8. Simultaneous controls	415
6.1.9. Joint audits	416
6.1.10. Consultations	417
6.2. Recovery Directive	418
6.2.1. The norms and scope of application	418
6.2.1.1. Norms	418
6.2.1.2. Taxes on income and capital	419
6.2.2. Competent authorities	420
6.2.3. Types of assistance	420
6.2.3.1. Exchange of information	420
6.2.3.2. Notification of documents	422
6.2.3.3. Recovery	423
6.2.3.4. Precautionary measures	427
6.2.4. Limits to the obligation to assist	428
6.2.5. Periods of limitation	429
6.2.6. Use of languages	430
6.2.7. Disclosure of information and documents	430
6.2.8. Costs linked to recovery	431

<b>Chapter 7 Legal Remedies</b>	433
7.1. National legal remedies	433
7.2. Tax treaties	438
7.2.1. Mutual agreement procedure	438
7.2.2. Arbitration Convention	439
7.3. Dispute Resolution Mechanisms Directive	439
7.3.1. Objective and scope	439
7.3.2. Interpretation	441
7.3.3. Complaint	442
7.3.4. Mutual agreement procedure	446
7.3.5. Dispute resolution by the advisory commission	447
7.3.6. The alternative dispute resolution commission	453
7.3.7. Procedural rules	454
7.3.8. The opinion and the final decision on the dispute	457
7.3.9. Interaction with national proceedings	460
7.3.10. Special provisions for individuals and smaller undertakings	462
7.4. EU Court	463
7.4.1. Tasks of the EU Court	463
7.4.2. Preliminary rulings	465
7.4.3. Actions	468
7.4.3.1. Actions against a Member State	468
7.4.3.2. Infringement procedure	469
7.4.3.3. Actions of Member States	471
7.4.4. Costs	471
7.5. Effects of EU Court judgments	472
7.5.1. Repayment of taxes paid in conflict with EU law	472
7.5.2. Liability for damages	474
7.5.3. Consequences of the failure to comply with an EU Court judgment	476
<b>References</b>	479
Bibliography	479
EU Court cases (listed chronologically)	548
European Court of Human Rights	562
EFTA Court	563
EU Court cases (listed alphabetically)	563
<b>Index</b>	577

---

## Preface

I got hooked by EU tax law in the early 1990s when I was writing my doctoral thesis. I have had a great passion for teaching and researching EU tax law ever since. Today, no one who is interested in, or working with, tax law or tax planning can avoid dealing with EU tax law issues. EU tax law has a huge impact on the domestic tax laws of the EU Member States and on the way in which the domestic tax laws and tax treaties of the Member States must be interpreted and applied.

There is a substantial body of literature on the different EU tax law issues. However, in my professional endeavours, I missed having a clear and comprehensive work on EU tax law available. There was a need for a reader-friendly, complete presentation of the direct tax law issues of EU tax law. As a professor of international tax law, I felt that it was my duty to remedy this defect. As a consequence, the first edition of this book was published in 2009. The book has been written keeping in mind the needs of practitioners, judiciary, tax administrations, scholars and university students. It provides a complete, in-depth yet easily manageable presentation of the direct tax law issues of EU law. The layout, headlining, figures, tables, bibliography and index are designed to allow fast and easy access to the information needed and to facilitate understanding and learning.

EU tax law develops rapidly, especially because of the growing number of judgments from the EU Court on direct tax matters. Therefore, regular updates of the book are necessary. The most recent judgments have clarified the many remaining, unclear issues concerning the impact of EU law on direct taxation. This 2021 edition takes into account all judgments of the EU Court on direct tax matters issued by 31 May 2021. These include, for example, *Impressa Pizzarotti* (C-558/19) concerning transfer pricing, *Lexel AB* (C-484/19) concerning interest deduction limitation and tax avoidance, *E* (C-480/19) concerning comparability of a Luxembourg SICAV to a Finnish investment fund and *Société Générale* (C-403/19) concerning the amount of foreign dividend tax credit.

Proposals for substantial new legislation are expected in the near future in the area of EU corporate tax law. In May 2021, the Commission released a revised business tax agenda that includes withdrawing the 2016 Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base (CCCTB) proposal. According to the communication, the Commission will present a single corporate tax rulebook for the European Union (Business in Europe: Framework for Income Taxation, BEFIT) by 2023. BEFIT will be based on a formulary

apportionment and a common tax base. The Commission would tackle the abusive use of shell companies through the proposal for new anti-tax avoidance measures (ATAD 3) by the fourth quarter of 2021. The aim is to ensure that EU legal entities without a substantial business presence will not benefit from tax advantages. Further, the Commission plans to promote innovation by addressing the debt-equity bias in corporate taxation through an allowance system (DEBRA) by the first quarter of 2022 and to issue a new proposal requiring certain large companies operating in the European Union to publish their effective tax rates based on the methodology under discussion in the OECD Pillar II negotiations by 2022.

Turku, 31 May 2021

Marjaana Helminen



---

## Chapter 1

### EU Tax Law as Part of the Legal System

#### 1.1. Concepts

##### *European Union*

The European Union (EU) is the consequence of the European integration development that started in the 1950s after the Second World War.<sup>1</sup> The European Union in its present form was created by the Treaty on European Union (TEU), i.e. the Treaty of Maastricht, signed in 1992 and entered into force in 1993.<sup>2</sup>

The European Union originally consisted of three pillars or sectors of cooperation. These were (1) the European Communities, (2) common foreign and security policy, and, (3) police cooperation and judicial cooperation in criminal matters.

The most relevant cooperation from the perspective of tax law has been the cooperation based on the European Communities. The European Communities were formed by the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), established by the Treaty of Paris signed in 1951, the European (Economic) Community (EEC), and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) established by the Treaty of Rome signed in 1957. By the Lisbon Treaty, which entered into force on 1 December 2009, the European Communities were replaced and succeeded by the European Union.<sup>3</sup>

##### *TFEU*

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU; originally the EC Treaty) has the most relevance with respect to taxation. The TFEU is based on the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community signed in 1957 in Rome, as replaced by the Treaty of Maastricht signed in

---

1. See e.g. Craig & de Búrca 2011, pp. 1-30.

2. The Treaty on European Union has been amended by the Treaty of Amsterdam, signed in 1997 and entered into force in 1999, the Treaty of Nice, signed in 2001 and entered into force in 2003 and the Treaty of Lisbon, signed on 13 December 2007 and entered into force on 1 December 2009. The abbreviation “TEU” is used in this book to refer to the Treaty on European Union in the form as amended by the Treaty of Lisbon.

3. See art. 1(3) TEU.

1992 and amended by the Treaty of Amsterdam signed in 1997, the Treaty of Nice signed in 2001 and the Treaty of Lisbon signed in 2007. The TFEU entered into force on 1 December 2009.

### *EU tax law*

EU law consists of the founding treaties (the TEU and the TFEU) and the legal provisions based on the legislative powers delegated to the European Union by the founding treaties. The part of the EU law provisions that may have an effect on taxes is referred to as EU tax law. After the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the European Convention on Human Rights also became a part of EU law.<sup>4</sup>

### *Territorial scope*

EU tax law provisions limit the sovereign taxing rights of the EU Member States in the area of direct taxation chiefly in situations in which the tax object or the tax subject has a connection to two or more Member States. However, for example, the free movement of capital principle of article 63 of the TFEU is relevant also in situations in which the other state is a non-Member State.

Besides certain exceptions, EU law provisions are relevant in relation to the whole territory of the European Union.<sup>5</sup> The territorial scope of application of the EU law provisions in relation to each Member State depends on each state's own accession agreement. Article 355 defines how the founding treaties apply to certain associated and dependent territories of the EU Member States.<sup>6</sup>

---

4. Art. 6(2) TEU and the Protocol to the Treaty of Lisbon on Article 6(2) of the Treaty on the European Union, on the accession to the European Convention on Human Rights and basic freedoms. *See e.g.* the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in cases *Jussila v. Finland* (73053/01), *Hentrich v. France* (13616/88), *Burden and Burden v. United Kingdom* (13378/05), *Jokela v. Finland* (28856/95) and e.g. Kofler, Maduro & Pistone 2011, Greggi 2007, pp. 610-615, Baker 2007, pp. 587-588, Baker 2008, pp. 315-316, Baker 2008a, pp. 643-646, Baker 2010, pp. 259-261, Baker 2012, pp. 584-586 and Craig & de Búrca 2011, pp. 362-406 about questions concerning human rights and taxes in the European Union.

5. *See* art. 52 TEU and arts. 349 and 355 TFEU.

6. About the EU law provisions that apply to different territories, *see also e.g.* Pancham, Fibbe & Ruiter 2007, pp. 164-175 and Smit 2011, pp. 40-61 and about the territorial scope of EU law, *see* Kavelaars 2007, pp. 268-273.

## Literature

There is substantial literature on EU tax law published in different languages of the Member States. The most comprehensive work in English is Terra and Wattel's *European Tax Law* (2019). Certain international tax periodicals, such as *EC Tax Review* published by Kluwer, *European Taxation* published by IBFD and *EC Tax Journal* published by Key Haven Publications, specialize in issues concerning EU tax law.

## 1.2. Relation to other legislation

### 1.2.1. Competences

#### *Sovereignty*

Despite the European Union and the Commission (the executive branch of the European Union), the Member States have broad sovereignty in the area of direct taxation.<sup>7</sup> The organs of the European Union do not have their own taxing powers with regard to direct taxes.<sup>8</sup> However, both the European Union and the Member States can make decisions concerning tax legislation.

Each Member State executes its own taxing powers by domestic tax laws. Each Member State decides which are the criteria that determine the scope of direct taxation in the state concerned. The Member States may, for example, choose to apply the territoriality principle for the purposes of income taxation and to tax non-residents only on the income from sources in the country concerned.<sup>9</sup> The Member States, however, must exercise their tax-

---

7. See arts. 3-6 TFEU and art. 5 TEU for the competence of the European Union. See also e.g. Bizioli 2008, pp. 133-140 and Isenbaert 2009, pp. 264-278.

8. See, however, art. 12 Protocol on the privileges and immunities of the European Union, [2016] OJ C 202/266, according to which officials and servants of the European Union are liable to a tax for the benefit of the European Union on salaries, wages and emoluments paid to them by the European Union. The income that falls under the Protocol must not even indirectly have an impact on the amount of national taxes. For interpretation of the Protocol, see *Humblet* (6/60), *Bourges-Maunoury and Heintz* (C-558/10), *Gistö* (C-270/10) and *Pazdziej* (C-349/14). See also Helminen 2010a, pp. 541-544, KHO 2010/1295 and KHO 2011/3121 (88). See Kofler (2019), ch. 23 for the EU taxation system of its staff.

9. See e.g. *Schumacker* (C-279/93), *Royal Bank of Scotland* (C-311/97), *Futura* (C-250/95) and *Marks & Spencer* (C-446/03), para. 39.

ing powers consistently with their obligations under the founding treaties and the legislative provisions given on the basis of such treaties.<sup>10</sup>

### *Principle of conferral*

In accordance with articles 4 and 5 of the TEU, the European Union shall act only within the limits of the competences conferred upon it by the Member States in the founding treaties to attain the objectives set out therein. All other competences belong to the Member States. This scope of competence is in accordance with the legality principle and the principle of legal certainty.

The founding treaties do not expressly confer competence to the European Union regarding direct taxes. The general competence of the European Union based on the founding treaties, however, is broad. In accordance with article 352 of the TFEU, the Council can take any action that is necessary for the attainment of the EU objectives in the functioning of the common market. This general competence does not exclude taxation.

### *Division of competence*

Strictly interpreted, the lack of express EU competence means that direct taxation falls within the competence of the Member States. However, because of the general competence of the European Union, the Union also has a certain competence. In this regard, direct taxation falls under the scope of divided or shared competence.<sup>11</sup> The competence of the European Union, however, is fairly limited. Positive harmonization of direct taxation in the Member States is possible, provided that it affects the realization of the

---

10. See *Commission v. France (avoir fiscal)* (270/83), para. 24, *Schumacker* (C-279/93), para. 21, *Wielockx* (C-80/94), para. 16, *Asscher* (C-107/94), para. 36, *Futura* (C-250/95), para. 19, *Safir* (C-118/96), para. 21, *ICI* (C-264/96), para. 19, *Royal Bank of Scotland* (C-311/97), para. 19, *Gschwind* (C-391/97), para. 20, *Eurowings* (C-294/97), para. 32, *Vestergaard* (C-55/98), para. 15, *Baars* (C-251/98), para. 17, *Verkooijen* (C-35/98), para. 32, *AMID* (C-141/99), para. 19, joined cases *Metallgesellschaft* (C-397/98 and C-410/98), para. 37, *Danner* (C-136/00), para. 28, *X and Y* (C-436/00), para. 32, *Lankhorst-Hohorst* (C-324/00), para. 26, *De Groot* (C-385/00), para. 75, *Skandia and Ramstedt* (C-422/01), para. 25, *Lindman* (C-42/02), para. 18, *Commission v. France (fixed levy)* (C-334/02), para. 21, *de Lasteyrie du Saillant* (C-9/02), para. 44, *Turpeinen* (C-520/04), para. 11, *Schempp* (C-403/03), *Manninen* (C-319/02), para. 19, *Oy AA* (C-231/05), para. 16, *Meilicke* (C-292/04), *Marks & Spencer* (C-446/03), para. 29, *Cadbury Schweppes* (C-196/04), para. 40 and *Test Claimants in Class IV of the ACT Group Litigation* (C-374/04), para. 36. See also e.g. Weber 2006, pp. 585-616.

11. See also art. 2(2) TFEU and the Protocol of the Treaty of Lisbon on the exercising of shared competence.

internal market that the harmonization actions are made unanimously and that the subsidiarity principle is followed.<sup>12</sup>

### *Subsidiarity*

In accordance with the subsidiarity principle stipulated in article 5 of the TEU, in areas that do not fall within its exclusive competence, the European Union shall act only if and in so far as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States but can rather, by reason of the scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved at EU level.<sup>13</sup>

EU tax law provisions direct the domestic tax laws of the Member States only to the extent that it is necessary for the realization and the functioning of the internal market.<sup>14</sup> The purpose of the founding treaties is not to totally harmonize the tax laws of the Member States.

### *Proportionality*

In accordance with the proportionality principle stipulated in article 5 of the TEU, the actions of the European Union must not go beyond what is necessary for the attainment of the objectives of the founding treaties. The measures used and the objectives pursued must be in the right proportion to each other.<sup>15</sup>

The measures taken must be appropriate for the attainment of the objective, must be necessary because a less restrictive measure is not available and must be sufficient for the attainment of the objective.<sup>16</sup>

### *Flexibility*

Even though EU-wide harmonization of direct taxes requires unanimous decision-making by the Member States, certain Member States may enter

---

12. See also Pistone 2002, p. 68, and an in-depth analysis on the competence of the European Union in the area of direct taxation in Kofler 2020, pp. 11-50.

13. The institutions of the European Union apply the principle of subsidiarity as laid down in the Protocol of the Lisbon Treaty on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality. National parliaments ensure compliance with the principle of subsidiarity in accordance with the procedure set out in that Protocol.

14. Arts. 3-6 TFEU and art. 5 TEU.

15. See e.g. *Fromançais* (66/82) and *Fédéchar* (8/55).

16. The institutions of the European Union must apply the principle of proportionality as laid down in the Protocol of the Lisbon Treaty on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality. See e.g. Freyer 2017, pp. 384-392 about the proportionality principle under EU law.

into tighter cooperation in accordance with the flexibility principle. This alternative includes differentiated or flexible integration; for example, by means of bilateral tax treaties that are in accordance with EU law.

### 1.2.2. Separateness and interaction

#### *Legal systems of tax law*

Each EU Member State has its own national tax system. EU tax law, the tax treaties concluded by each Member State and the national tax laws of each Member State are parts of the national tax laws of the Member States. In accordance with the principle of autonomy, EU tax law, tax treaties and national tax law of each Member State are separate legal systems belonging to the national legal system of the Member State concerned. These different parts of tax law, however, are in a strong interaction with each other. For example, EU law has a substantial impact on the national tax laws of the Member States.

#### *No EU tax*

At present, the EU does not use direct taxes for its own recourse collecting purposes. There is no general EU-level income tax<sup>17</sup> and the income taxes levied in the Member States are based on the national tax provisions of each Member State's own domestic legislation. The tax revenue from the income taxes levied by the Member States goes directly to the Member State concerned or to a local authority thereof. The European Union does not benefit directly from the tax revenue.<sup>18</sup>

#### *Conflicts*

EU tax law, the national tax laws of the Member States and the tax treaties concluded by the Member States each has a language, concepts and provisions of its own. The provisions of EU tax law, the national tax laws and the

---

17. See, however, art. 12 Protocol on the privileges and immunities of the European Union, [2016] OJ C 202/266, according to which officials and servants of the European Union are liable to a tax for the benefit of the European Union on salaries, wages and emoluments paid to them by the European Union. The income that falls under the Protocol must not even indirectly have an impact on the amount of national taxes. For interpretation of the Protocol, see *Humblet* (6/60), *Bourges-Maunoury and Heintz* (C-558/10), *Gistö* (C-270/10) and *Pazdziej* (C-349/14). See also Helminen 2010a, pp. 541-544, KHO 2010/1295 and KHO 2011/3121 (88). See Kofler (2019), ch. 23 for the EU taxation system of its staff.

18. About the need and the possibilities for an EU tax, see e.g. Plasschaert 2004, pp. 470-479.

tax treaties may therefore conflict with each other. The relationship and the primacy order among the different segments of tax law must be determined in order to determine the tax consequences in a cross-border situation.

### 1.2.3. The primacy of EU law

#### *Founding treaties*

Unlike indirect taxes, the TEU and TFEU (the founding treaties) do not mention direct taxes. The only express reference to direct taxes was included in article 293 of the EC Treaty concerning the right of the Member States to conclude tax treaties in order to avoid double taxation. Such an express reference is no longer included in the TEU or the TFEU in the form as amended by the Lisbon Treaty. Both the TEU and the TFEU, however, apply to direct taxes despite the lack of an express reference.<sup>19</sup>

#### *Case law*

No express provision exists concerning the interrelationship between EU law and the national laws of the Member States. Based on the judgments given by the Court of the European Union (the EU Court),<sup>20</sup> however, it is clear that EU law takes precedence over national laws. The primacy of EU law applies both in relation to the founding treaties and the EU directives. Even though direct taxation falls under the purview of the Member States, the states must follow the EU law rules and principles when exercising this power.<sup>21</sup>

19. See also Kemmeren 2008b, pp. 156-158.

20. E.g. *Filipiak* (C-314/08), paras. 81-85, *Simmenthal* (106/77) and *Costa v. ENEL* (6/64).

21. See *Avoir fiscal* (270/83), para. 24, *Schumacker* (C-279/93), para. 21, *Wielockx* (C-80/94), para. 16, *Asscher* (C-107/94), para. 36, *Futura* (C-250/95), para. 19, *Safir* (C-118/96), para. 21, *ICI* (C-264/96), para. 19, *Royal Bank of Scotland* (C-311/97), para. 19, *Gschwind* (C-391/97), para. 20, *Eurowings* (C-294/97), para. 32, *Vestergaard* (C-55/98), para. 15, *Baars* (C-251/98), para. 17, *Verkooijen* (C-35/98), para. 32, *AMID* (C-141/99), para. 19, joined cases *Metallgesellschaft* (C-397/98 and C-410/98), para. 37, *Danner* (C-136/00), para. 28, *X and Y* (C-436/00), para. 32, *Lankhorst-Hohorst* (C-324/00), para. 26, *De Groot* (C-385/00), para. 75, *Skandia and Ramstedt* (C-422/01), para. 25, *Lindman* (C-42/02), para. 18, *Commission v. France* (fixed levy) (C-334/02), para. 21, *de Lasteyrie du Saillant* (C-9/02), para. 44, *Turpeinen* (C-520/04), para. 11, *Schempp* (C-403/03), *Manninen* (C-319/02), para. 19, *Oy AA* (C-231/05), para. 16, *Meilicke* (C-292/04), *Marks & Spencer* (C-446/03), para. 29, *Cadbury Schweppes* (C-196/04), para. 40 and *Test Claimants in Class IV of the ACT Group Litigation* (C-374/04), para. 36.

EU law norms override national law provisions that are in conflict with EU law, regardless of the status or the age of the national law provision. EU law norms take precedence also in the case of a conflict between an EU law provision and a national constitutional provision.<sup>22</sup> Because of the primacy of EU law, the Member States must not enact legislation or conclude tax treaties, nor apply existing legislation or tax treaties in conflict with EU law. Domestic laws and tax treaties of the Member States must be applied and interpreted in accordance with EU law.

### *Conflict must be abolished*

The domestic laws and tax treaties of the Member States may include provisions that are in conflict with EU law. Once the conflict has been discovered, these provisions must be amended or abolished in order to comply with EU law. For reasons of legal certainty, the conflicting provisions must be amended or abolished even though the tax authorities of the state concerned would not apply them in practice.<sup>23</sup>

### *Loyalty*

In accordance with the loyalty principle (or principle of sincere cooperation) stipulated in article 4 of the TEU, the Member States must take all necessary measures in order to comply with their EU law obligations (positive Union loyalty). The Member States must also refrain from any measures that endanger the realization of the objectives of the European Union (negative Union loyalty).<sup>24</sup> The loyalty obligation also binds, in addition to the legislator, the tax authorities and the courts of the Member States.<sup>25</sup>

### *Effectiveness*

Effectiveness or the *effet utile* principle has a close connection to the loyalty principle. The Member States must provide for the effective realization of EU law in their legislation, administration and jurisdiction. The Member States must provide for effective legal remedies for the purposes of the realization of the rights based on EU law before the tax authorities and the

---

22. See e.g. *Filipiak* (C-314/08), paras. 81-85. See also e.g. Szudoczky 2020, pp. 93-118 about the relationship between EU law and national law.

23. See e.g. *Commission v. Italy* (C-358/98), paras. 16 and 17, *Commission v. France* (C-160/99), para. 22 and *Commission v. Belgium* (C-522/04), para. 70.

24. See e.g. *Simmenthal* (106/77), paras. 16 and 21 and *Factortame* (C-213/89), para. 19.

25. See also e.g. van Thiel 2009, pp. 292-299 and Wittock 2014, pp. 171-188 about the loyalty principle in tax matters.



courts. They must give full force and effect to EU law as interpreted in the decisions of the EU Court.<sup>26</sup>

#### *Assimilation or equivalence*

The assimilation, or equivalence, principle obliges the Member States to use as efficient measures for the execution of their EU law obligations as they do for the execution of national provisions.<sup>27</sup> It must not be more complicated to appeal to EU law than it is to appeal to national laws.

#### *Primacy and direct effect*

The primacy and direct application of the EU law provisions by the domestic authorities and courts have a close connection to the efficiency and the loyalty principles.<sup>28</sup> The EU law provisions and principles must be applied ex officio, even if the taxpayer would not refer to them.<sup>29</sup>

### 1.2.4. Tax consequences

#### *More lenient tax treatment*

The main purpose of the EU tax law norms is to abolish tax obstacles within the internal market. Therefore, in relation to direct taxes, the precedence of EU law has traditionally meant that EU law takes precedence over the domestic law or tax treaty provisions when EU law leads to more lenient tax consequences for the taxpayer.

The domestic law or tax treaty norms on direct taxation that mean more lenient tax consequences to the taxpayer than EU law requires have traditionally not been in conflict with EU law. EU tax law, for example, does not require a minimum corporate tax, i.e. that national corporate taxes exceed a certain level.<sup>30</sup> Except for certain exceptions, the Member States have

---

26. *Simmenthal* (106/77), *Heylens* (222/86), *Borelli* (C-97/91), *Kühne and Heitz* (C-453/00), *Kapferer* (C-234/04) and *Pelati d.o.o.* (C-603/10), paras. 23 and 24. See also e.g. van Thiel 2009, pp. 299-301 about the effectiveness principle.

27. See e.g. *Kapferer* (C-234/04), *Meilicke* (C-262/09) and *Pelati d.o.o.* (C-603/10), para. 23. See also e.g. van Thiel 2009, pp. 301-305.

28. *Costa v. ENEL* (6/64) and *Van Gend & Loos* (26/62).

29. *Van Schijndel* (C-431/93).

30. Unlike in the case of direct taxes, the principle of the most lenient provision cannot be followed in the case of indirect taxes that are subject to broader harmonization than direct taxes.

the right to choose not to levy certain direct taxes, provided that the tax treatment does not amount to selective state aid forbidden by the TFEU.<sup>31</sup>

### *Taxing obligation*

Despite the primary purpose of the EU founding treaties to abolish obstacles within the internal market, the principle of the most lenient provision is not without exception. The number of such EU tax law provisions that require taxation irrespective of a possibly more lenient domestic law or tax treaty provision have increased. The legitimacy of such EU tax law provisions may be based, for example, on the assumption that tax avoidance is harmless to the proper functioning of the internal market.

An example is the binding anti-avoidance provision added to the Parent-Subsidiary Directive in 2014.<sup>32</sup> According to the general anti-avoidance provision the Member States shall not grant the Directive benefits to an arrangement or a series of arrangements which, having been put into place for the main purpose or one of the main purposes of obtaining a tax advantage that defeats the object of the Directive, are not genuine having regard to all relevant facts and circumstances.<sup>33</sup>

Also the Anti-Tax Avoidance Directive provisions require taxation or denial of tax benefits in certain situations.<sup>34</sup> The Directive includes a controlled foreign corporation rule, a hybrid mismatch rule, an interest deduction limitation rule, an exit tax provision and a general anti-avoidance provision.<sup>35</sup>

In any event, the taxation must not be in conflict with EU primary law. Even in situations where secondary EU law seems to require taxation or denial of tax benefits, the taxation must not be in conflict with the TFEU basic freedoms.

---

31. About state aid, *see* sec. 1.6.2.; for the limits of non-taxation, *see* e.g. Sullivan 2009, pp. 189-198.

32. Art. 1(2) and (3) of the Parent-Subsidiary Directive after the 2015 amendment. Council Directive (EU) 2015/121 of 27 January 2015 amending Directive 2011/96/EU on the common system of taxation applicable in the case of parent companies and subsidiaries of different Member States.

33. Art. 1(2) Parent-Subsidiary Directive after the 2015 amendment. *See* sec. 3.1.4.

34. Council Directive (EU) 2016/1164 of 12 July 2016 laying down rules against tax avoidance practices that directly affect the functioning of the internal market, as amended by Council Directive (EU) 2017/952 of 29 May 2017 amending Directive (EU) 2016/1164 as regards hybrid mismatches with third countries.

35. Council Directive (EU) 2016/1164 of 12 July 2016 laying down rules against tax avoidance practices that directly affect the functioning of the internal market, as amended by Council Directive (EU) 2017/952 of 29 May 2017 amending Directive (EU) 2016/1164 as regards hybrid mismatches with third countries.

## 1.2.5. Direct effect and application

### *Relevance*

EU law has direct effect and forms a part of the legal systems of the Member States without special national transformation acts. EU law creates directly rights and obligations to the organs of the Communities, to the Member States and to the citizens of the Member States. The EU tax law provisions that are sufficiently precise, clear and unconditional are directly applicable.<sup>36</sup>

Both legal persons and individuals with the nationality of an EU Member State can rely on the directly applicable TEU and TFEU provisions and the directly applicable EU directive provisions before the tax authorities and the tax courts of the Member States, even if the provisions would have been implemented into domestic laws incorrectly or insufficiently.<sup>37</sup> The tax authorities and the tax courts of the Member States must take the EU law provisions into account ex officio in the limits possible under the national procedural rules.<sup>38</sup>

### *Taxation*

The EU law provisions that are directly applicable and that are relevant in relation to direct taxes include, for example, the TFEU general non-discrimination rule (article 18), the TFEU articles on the basic freedoms (articles 21, 45, 49, 56 and 63) and the sufficiently precise provisions of the Parent-Subsidiary Directive, the Interest-Royalty Directive and the Merger Directive. Wherever the provisions of a directive are unconditional and sufficiently precise, those provisions may, in the absence of proper implementing measures adopted within the prescribed period, be relied upon.<sup>39</sup>

### *Vertical and horizontal direct effect*

Unlike horizontal direct effect, vertical direct effect is particularly relevant in relation to direct taxes. Vertical direct effect enables EU citizens to rely on the direct effect of the founding treaties and the EU directives in actions

36. *Van Gend & Loos* (26/62). See also e.g. Weber 2009, pp. 45-53 about direct effect and direct applicability of EU law.

37. See e.g. *Van Duyn* (41/74) and *Becker* (8/81), para. 25.

38. See joined cases *Van der Weerd* (C-222/05–C-225/05), para. 41 on how the principle of effectiveness does not require the national courts to examine of its own motion a plea based on EU law if the parties are given a genuine opportunity to raise a plea based on EU law before the national court. See sec. 7.1. about procedural autonomy.

39. *Becker* (8/81). See also joined cases *Francovich* (C-6/90 and C-9/90), para. 11, *Marks & Spencer I* (C-62/00), para. 25 and *Cobelfret* (C-138/07), para. 58.

against the state. In relation to the founding treaties, however, horizontal direct effect, i.e. an individual's right to rely on such treaties in actions against another individual, is also possible.<sup>40</sup>

In the case of directives, only vertical direct effect is possible. Horizontal direct effect is not possible because directives create obligations and are only enforceable against the state.<sup>41</sup> Before a directive has been implemented into domestic law, the directive does not create obligations but only rights to individuals.<sup>42</sup>

### 1.3. Primary law

#### 1.3.1. The founding treaties and the accession treaties

##### *History*

The founding treaties of the European Communities, i.e. the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the European (Economic) Community (EEC, later EC), and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), form the basis of EU law. These treaties are in force in the form as amended by the Treaty on European Union – i.e. the Treaty of Maastricht (signed in 1992; entered into force in 1993), the Treaty of Amsterdam (signed in 1997; entered into force in 1999), the Treaty of Nice (signed in 2001; entered into force in 2003) and the Treaty of Lisbon (signed in 2007; entered into force in 2009).<sup>43</sup> These treaties (i.e. the TEU and the TFEU) and the accession treaties of the new Member States are primary EU law.

##### *The internal market*

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU; originally the treaty establishing the European Community, i.e. the EC Treaty) has the most relevance as regards direct taxes. The TFEU is based on the founding treaty of the European Economic Community (signed in 1957 in Rome),

---

40. About direct effect and application, *see also* e.g. *Van Gend & Loos* (26/62), *Reyners* (2/74), joined cases *Denkavit* (C-283/94, C-291/94 and C-292/94). *See also* e.g. Tenore 2009, pp. 31-33, Weber 2009, pp. 45-53, Steiner-Woods 2009, pp.105-132, Ojanen 2006, pp. 79-93, Penttilä 1996, pp. 240-241, Kok 2000, pp. 10-14 and Kok 2000a, pp. 15-17.

41. *Marshall* (152/84), *Faccini Dori* (C-91/92), para. 24 and *Wells* (C-201/02), para. 54.

42. *Kolpinghuis Nijmegen* (80/86), *Marleasing* (C-106/89) and *Faccini Dori* (C-91/92). *See also* Weber 2009, pp. 52-53 about inverse direct effect.

43. *See also* Craig & de Búrca 2011, pp.1-30 about the founding treaties.

which has been replaced by the Treaty of Maastricht and amended by the Treaties of Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon.

Economic integration of the Member States and the creation of an internal market are the most important objectives of the founding treaties. These objectives are achieved by establishing an internal market and an economic and monetary union.<sup>44</sup> Obstacles, including the tax obstacles, to the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital must be abolished.<sup>45</sup>

### *Abolition of tax obstacles*

Taxes must not prevent or restrict the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital between the EU Member States. The domestic laws of the Member States must be approximated to the extent required for the functioning of the internal market.<sup>46</sup> The scope of the necessary actions is a political decision.

### *Negative and positive integration*

The necessary approximation of the tax laws of the EU Member States supposes both negative and positive integration measures, i.e. both judicial and legislative integration. Negative integration is primarily a result of the judgments of the EU Court. Negative integration includes the abolition of the domestic law tax provisions and practices that constitute discrimination or a restriction in conflict with the TFEU or which otherwise, on the basis of the EU Court judgments, conflict with EU law.

Positive integration, on the other hand, implies express measures of the EU organs with the purpose of the approximation of the domestic tax laws of the Member States. Also, tax competition among the Member States has resulted in a certain level of integration.

### *Coordination*

Until now, the harmonization of the domestic laws of the Member States in the field of direct taxation has been rather limited. Primarily, the integration of the tax laws of the Member States is based on the EU Court's interpretation of the founding treaties.<sup>47</sup> However, the direct tax systems

---

44. Art. 3 TEU.

45. Arts. 18, 21, 45, 49, 56 and 63 TFEU.

46. Art. 5 TEU.

47. About harmonization and integration of direct taxation, *see e.g.* Englund 1992, de Hosson 1990, Myrsky 1992, Viherkenttä 1995, Arvela 2000, Schön 2000, pp. 90-105, van





## 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)

**Email:** [info@ibfd.org](mailto:info@ibfd.org)

**Web:** [www.ibfd.org](http://www.ibfd.org)



IBFD, Your Portal to Cross-Border Tax Expertise