

*Editors: Eric Kemmeren, Peter Essers, Stan Stevens, Ton Stevens, Cihat Öner,  
Michael Lang, Georg Kofler, Jeffrey Owens, Pasquale Pistone, Alexander Rust,  
Josef Schuch, Claus Staringer, Karoline Spies, Daniel Blum*

# Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2022

IBFD | Linde



# Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2022

## Why this book?

This book is a unique publication that provides a global overview of international tax disputes in respect of double tax conventions and thereby fills a gap in the area of tax treaty case law. It covers the 37 most important tax treaty cases that were decided around the world in 2021. The systematic structure of each chapter allows for the easy and efficient study and comparison of the various methods adopted for applying and interpreting tax treaties in different cases. With the continuously increasing importance of tax treaties, Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2022 is a valuable reference tool for anyone interested in tax treaty case law, including tax practitioners, multinational businesses, policymakers, tax administrators, judges, and academics.

<b>Title:</b>	Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2022
<b>Date of publication:</b>	October 2023
<b>ISBN:</b>	9789087228514 (print), 9789087228538 (PDF), 9789087228521 (e-pub)
<b>Type of publication:</b>	Book
<b>Number of pages:</b>	496
<b>Terms:</b>	Shipping fees apply. Shipping information is available on our website.
<b>Price (print/online):</b>	EUR 95   USD 114 (VAT excl.)
<b>Price (eBook: e-Pub or PDF):</b>	EUR 76   USD 91 (VAT excl.)

## Order information

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



# Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2022

Editors:

Eric Kemmeren

Peter Essers

Stan Stevens

Ton Stevens

Cihat Öner

Michael Lang

Georg Kofler

Jeffrey Owens

Pasquale Pistone

Alexander Rust

Josef Schuch

Claus Staringer

Karoline Spies

Daniel Blum



Linde

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)

© 2023 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.

The IBFD and/or the author cannot be held responsible for external content, broken links or risks within the external websites that are referenced as hyperlinks within this publication.

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 978-90-8722-851-4 (print)  
ISBN 978-90-8722-852-1 (eBook, ePub); 978-90-8722-853-8 (eBook, PDF)  
ISSN 2468-2799 (print); 2590-1206 (electronic)  
ISBN 978-3-7073-4902-3 (Linde, print)  
ISBN 978-3-7094-1329-6 (Linde, eBook, ePub); 978-3-7094-1328-9 (Linde, eBook, PDF)  
NUR 826

---

# Table of Contents

Preface

xxv

## Part 1

### Interpretation and Residence

<b>Chapter 1:</b>	<b>The Netherlands: The Definition of “International Traffic” in Article 3(1)(e) of the OECD Model: Which Vessel Types Qualify? – Dutch High Court 24 December 2021, nr. 20/03226, BNB 2022/37</b>	<b>3</b>
	<i>Ton Stevens</i>	
1.1.	Introduction	3
1.2.	Facts of the case	3
1.3.	The Dutch Supreme Court decision	4
1.3.1.	Question/issue disputed	4
1.3.2.	The Court’s decision	5
1.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	6
1.5.	Conclusion	8
<b>Chapter 2:</b>	<b>Brazil: Tax Treaty Issues under the <i>Montagna Case</i></b>	<b>9</b>
	<i>Luís Eduardo Schoueri and Renan Baleeiro</i>	
2.1.	Introduction	9
2.2.	Facts of the case	9
2.2.1.	Taxpayer’s position	10
2.2.2.	Tax authorities’ position	11
2.3.	The CARF’s decision	11
2.4.	Comments on the CARF’s reasoning	13
2.5.	Conclusion	16

<b>Chapter 3:</b>	<b>Canada: Corporate Residence and the Treaty Tiebreaker Rule – <i>Landbouwbedrijf Backx B.V. v. Her Majesty The Queen</i></b>	19
	<i>David G. Duff</i>	
3.1.	Introduction	19
3.2.	Facts of the case	20
3.3.	The Court decisions	21
3.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	23
3.5.	Conclusion	25
<b>Chapter 4:</b>	<b>Portugal: Interpretation: Taxation of Dividends and Beneficial Ownership – Case No. Ac. TCAS, 42/10.8BELRS</b>	27
	<i>Ana Paula Dourado</i>	
4.1.	Introduction	27
4.2.	Facts of the case	27
4.3.	Arguments by the plaintiff (taxpayer) and the tax authorities	28
4.3.1.	Arguments by the plaintiff	28
4.3.2.	Arguments by the tax authorities	28
4.4.	The Court decision	28
4.5.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	29
4.6.	Conclusion	32



Part 2  
Permanent Establishment

<b>Chapter 5:</b>	<b>India: Ascertaining the Role Played by a PE in a Composite Contract of Setting up a Project in the Hydrocarbon Sector – The Case of <i>Technip France SAS</i></b>	35
	<i>D.P. Sengupta</i>	
5.1.	Introduction	35
5.2.	Facts of the case	35
5.2.1.	Arguments of the taxpayer	37
5.2.2.	Arguments of the revenue	39
5.2.3.	Counter arguments of the taxpayer	40
5.3.	The ruling of the AAR	41
5.3.1.	When did the PE come into existence?	41
5.3.2.	What was the role of the subsidiary?	41
5.3.3.	Taxability of the income from offshore supply	42
5.3.4.	Taxability of the income from design services	43
5.3.5.	Role played by the PE and income attribution	45
5.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	46
5.5.	Conclusion	48
<b>Chapter 6:</b>	<b>Finland: KHO 2021/H4294 (171) – Auxiliary Activities</b>	51
	<i>Marjaana Helminen</i>	
6.1.	Introduction	51
6.2.	Facts	51
6.3.	Position of the tax administration	52
6.4.	Position of the Administrative Court	52
6.5.	Proceedings before the Supreme Administrative Court	53

6.6.	Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court	54
6.7.	Comments	55
<b>Chapter 7:</b>	<b>Italy: Retrospective Application of the OECD Report on the Attribution of Profits to Permanent Establishments (Supreme Court, Case No. 8500 of 25 March 2021)</b> <i>Guglielmo Maisto and Cesare Silvani</i>	59
7.1.	Introduction	59
7.2.	Facts of the case	60
7.3.	The Supreme Court’s decision	62
7.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	63
7.5.	Conclusions	68
<b>Chapter 8:</b>	<b>Türkiye: Report on the Decision of the Fourth Chamber of the Supreme Administrative Court on 18 January 2021 – Understanding of the Concept of PE under the Germany-Türkiye Income Tax Treaty (2011)</b> <i>Cihat Öner</i>	69
8.1.	Introduction	69
8.2.	Facts of the case	70
8.3.	The Court’s Decision	70
8.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	72
8.5.	Conclusion	75

Part 3  
Business Profits, Capital Gains and Associated Enterprises

<b>Chapter 9:</b>	<b>United States: United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, <i>Whirlpool v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue</i> (6 December 2021)</b> <i>Yariv Brauner</i>	79
9.1.	Introduction	79
9.2.	Facts of the case	81
9.3.	The Court decision	83
9.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	85
9.5.	Conclusion	88
<b>Chapter 10:</b>	<b>United States: <i>Adams Challenge (UK) Limited v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue</i></b> <i>Yariv Brauner</i>	89
10.1.	Introduction	89
10.2.	Facts of the case	90
10.3.	The Court decision	90
10.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	94
10.5.	Conclusion	97
<b>Chapter 11:</b>	<b>Austria: Hiring-Out of Labour, Austrian Supreme Administrative Court 23 April 2021, Ra 2020/13/0089-6</b> <i>Daniel W. Blum</i>	99
11.1.	Introduction: The double function of withholding tax levied on hiring-out of labour transactions under Austrian tax law	99
11.2.	Facts of the case	101

11.3.	The Supreme Administrative Court decision	102
11.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	103
11.4.1.	The Court’s reluctance to address tax treaty interpretation questions	103
11.4.2.	Hiring-out of labour fee: Can a division into an employment income component and a business profits component be justified?	104
11.4.3.	Conditional refund mandated by Court in line with Austria’s treaty obligations?	107
11.5.	Conclusion	109
<b>Chapter 12:</b>	<b>Finland: KHO 2021/346 (66) – Cost-Plus Method for Intra-Group Financing</b>	<b>111</b>
	<i>Marjaana Helminen</i>	
12.1.	Introduction	111
12.2.	Facts	111
12.3.	The position of the tax administration	112
12.4.	The position of the Helsinki Administrative Court	112
12.5.	The proceedings before the Supreme Administrative Court	113
12.5.1.	A Oyj’s position	113
12.5.2.	Tax Recipients Legal Services Unit	114
12.6.	The decision of the Supreme Administrative Court	114
12.6.1.	Decision	114
12.6.2.	Relevance of the OECD Guidelines	114
12.6.3.	Functional analysis: Intra-group financing service	114
12.6.4.	The cost-plus method	115
12.7.	Comments	115
12.7.1.	Relevance of the OECD Guidelines	115
12.7.2.	Financing services vs. financing transactions	116
12.7.3.	Separate-entity approach vs. group approach	118

<b>Chapter 13:</b>	<b>South Africa: Is the Power to Adjust Profits Inextricably Linked to the Determination of a Transfer Price Adjustment?</b>	121
	<i>Karen Miller, Johann Hattingh and Craig West</i>	
13.1.	Introduction	121
13.2.	Facts of the case	122
13.2.1.	Arguments for the taxpayer	124
13.2.2.	Arguments for the tax authority	125
13.2.3.	Decision by the Court	126
13.3.	The Tax Court decision	127
13.4.	Comments on the Tax Court’s reasoning	129
13.4.1.	The separation of issue	129
13.4.2.	The most appropriate method	133
13.4.3.	International precedence: Treatment of foreign case law	137
13.4.4.	Interpretive technique	137
13.4.5.	The (ir)relevance of tax policy (and international tax politics)	138
13.5.	Conclusion	139
Part 4		
Dividends and Interest		
<b>Chapter 14:</b>	<b>Denmark: Beneficial Ownership and Abuse of Tax Treaty Rights</b>	143
	<i>Søren Friis Hansen</i>	
14.1.	Case SKM2021.304ØLR and its background	143
14.1.1.	The Danish beneficial ownership cases before the ECJ	143
14.1.2.	Abuse and application of anti-abuse principles in national tax law	145
14.1.2.1.	Establishment of elements of abuse	147
14.1.3.	Does a “conduit company” constitute abuse?	148
14.1.4.	The decision by the Eastern High Court: SKM2021.304:ØLR	150

14.2.	Comments on the Eastern High Court’s ruling in SLM2021.304.ØLR	153
<b>Chapter 15:</b>	<b>“Butoir” Rule and Tax Credits on Inbound Dividends</b>	157
	<i>Marilyne Sadowsky</i>	
15.1.	Introduction	157
15.2.	Facts of the case	158
15.3.	The Court decision	159
15.3.1.	The legal framework	159
15.3.2.	The merits of the case	162
15.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	163
15.4.1.	An extensive conception of expenses	163
15.4.2.	Imperfect elimination of double taxation	164
15.4.3.	A transposition to interest	166
15.5.	Conclusion	167
<b>Chapter 16:</b>	<b>India: Interpretation of the MFN Clause in Some of India’s Tax Treaties with the OECD Member Countries – The <i>Concentrix Services Netherlands BV</i> Case</b>	169
	<i>D.P. Sengupta</i>	
16.1.	Introduction	169
16.2.	Facts of the case	170
16.2.1.	Arguments of the taxpayer	173
16.2.2.	Arguments of the tax department	174
16.3.	The Court decision	175
16.3.1.	Interpretation of the word “is” and common interpretation	176
16.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasonings	177
16.5.	Conclusion	180
16.6.	Annexure	180

<b>Chapter 17:</b>	<b>Luxembourg: Qualification of Partnership Interest Payments</b>	183
	<i>Werner Haslehner</i>	
17.1.	Introduction	183
17.2.	Legal background	184
17.2.1.	Luxembourg law	184
17.2.2	German law	185
17.2.3.	Tax treaty law	185
17.3.	Facts of the case	186
17.3.1.	Agreed facts	186
17.3.2.	Arguments of the taxpayer	186
17.3.3.	Arguments of the tax administration	187
17.4.	The court decision	188
17.5.	Comments	189
17.5.1.	Introductory comment positioning the dispute in relation to earlier case law	189
17.5.2	Comments on the court's findings	190
17.6.	Conclusion	192
<b>Chapter 18:</b>	<b>Portugal: Personal Income Tax, Non-Habitual Resident, Burden of Proof (Process n. 401/ 2020-T)</b>	197
	<i>Ana Paula Dourado</i>	
18.1.	Introduction	197
18.2.	Facts of the case	197
18.3.	Arguments by the plaintiffs	198
18.4.	Arguments by the tax authorities	198
18.5.	The Court decision	198
18.6.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	199
18.7.	Conclusion	200

Part 5  
Royalties

<b>Chapter 19:</b>	<b>Brazil: Tax Treaty Issues under the WEG Case</b>	203
	<i>Luís Eduardo Schoueri and Renan Baleeiro</i>	
19.1.	Introduction	203
19.2.	Facts of the case	204
19.2.1.	Taxpayers' position	205
19.2.2.	Tax authorities' position	206
19.3.	The TRF4's decision	207
19.4.	Comments on the TRF4's reasoning	208
19.4.1.	Royalties, independent professional services and business profits: Qualifying services income under Brazilian tax treaties	208
19.4.2.	The need to tackle hybrid mismatch arrangements as argument for taxation	212
19.5.	Conclusion	213
<b>Chapter 20:</b>	<b>France: Legal Qualification of Remunerations for Software Maintenance and Integration Services</b>	215
	<i>Marilyne Sadowsky</i>	
20.1.	Introduction	215
20.2.	Facts of the case	215
20.3.	The Supreme Court's decision	217
20.3.1.	The legal framework of the dispute	217
20.3.2.	The merits of the case	218
20.4.	Comments on the Supreme Court's reasoning	218
20.4.1.	A first time for the Supreme Court	219
20.4.2.	The remuneration of software	221
20.4.3.	A risk of double taxation	222
20.5.	Conclusion	222



<b>Chapter 21:</b>	<b>Peru: The Interpretation of the Concept of Beneficial Owner in the Tax Treaty between Peru and Chile</b>	223
	<i>Esteban A. Montenegro Guillinta</i>	
21.1.	Introduction	223
21.2.	Facts of the case	225
21.3.	The Court's decision	228
21.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	234
21.5.	Conclusion	244
<b>Chapter 22:</b>	<b>Poland: Foreign Organization for Collective Copyright Management and the Beneficial Owner of Royalties</b>	247
	<i>Karolina Tettak</i>	
22.1.	Introduction	247
22.2.	Facts of the case	248
22.3.	The Court decision	251
22.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	254
22.5.	Conclusion	259
Part 6		
Employment Income – Government Services		
<b>Chapter 23:</b>	<b>Croatia: The Residence of Individuals, the Income from Dependent Personal Services, Directors' Fee</b>	265
	<i>Hrvoje Arbutina</i>	
23.1.	Introduction	265
23.2.	Facts of the case	266

23.3.	The Court decision	267
23.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	271
23.5.	Conclusion	272
<b>Chapter 24:</b>	<b>Poland: Taxation of Non-Resident’s Employment Income from Business Trips</b> <i>Karolina Tetlak</i>	275
24.1.	Introduction	275
24.2.	Facts of the case	276
24.3.	The Court decision	279
24.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	281
24.5.	Conclusion	288
<b>Chapter 25:</b>	<b>Norway: Supreme Court – <i>Poseidon</i></b> <b>(HR-2021-1243-A)</b> <i>Eivind Furuseth</i>	291
25.1.	Facts	291
25.2.	The argument of the taxpayer	292
25.2.1.	Tax liability to Norway for foreigners’ income from work on the Norwegian continental shelf: The shelf provision in Norway’s tax treaties	292
25.2.2.	The location condition: The meaning of “offshore”	293
25.2.3.	The time condition: The 30-day rule	293
25.3.	The arguments of the tax authorities	294
25.3.1.	The location condition: The meaning of “offshore”	294
25.3.2.	The time condition: The 30-day rule	295
25.4.	Findings of the court	296
25.4.1.	The scope of the shelf provision: Tax liability to Norway for foreigners’ income from work on the Norwegian continental shelf	296

25.4.2.	The location condition: The interpretation of the term “offshore”	297
25.4.3.	The time condition: The 30-day rule	299
25.5.	Conclusion	302
<b>Chapter 26:</b>	<b>Austria: Employment Income vs. Directors’ Fees and the Role of Authentic Languages in Treaty Interpretation: Austrian Supreme Administrative Court, 10 May 2021, Ra 2019/15/0095</b>	305
	<i>Daniel W. Blum</i>	
26.1.	Introduction	305
26.2.	Facts of the case	306
26.3.	The Supreme Administrative Court decision	307
26.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	308
26.4.1.	Application and interpretation of article 15 of the Austria-Russia Income and Capital Tax Treaty	308
26.4.2.	Potential application of article 16 of the Austria-Russia Income and Capital Tax Treaty	311
26.4.2.1.	Introductory remarks: The Austrian/German view on the scope of article 16 of the OECD Model	311
26.4.2.2.	The role of authentic languages in interpreting article 16 of the Austria-Russia Income and Capital Tax Treaty	314
26.5.	Conclusion	317
<b>Chapter 27:</b>	<b>Italy: No Residence State’s Taxing Rights under Article 19(1)(a) of the Italy-UAE Income Tax Treaty (1995) Even If This Leads to Double Non-Taxation</b>	319
	<i>Guglielmo Maisto and Cesare Silvani</i>	
27.1.	Introduction	319
27.2.	Facts of the case	319

27.3.	The Court decisions	321
27.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	323
27.5.	Conclusion	327
<p>Part 7 Relief from Double Taxation</p>		
<b>Chapter 28:</b>	<b>Belgium: Subject-to-Tax Clause</b> <i>Anne Van de Vijver and Eva Baekelant</i>	331
28.1.	Introduction	331
28.2.	Facts of the cases	332
28.2.1.	Case 1: Director in the UAE	332
28.2.2.	Case 2: Dutch jubilee payment	333
28.3.	The Court decisions	333
28.3.1.	Case 1: Director in the UAE	333
28.3.2.	Case 2: Dutch jubilee payment	334
28.4.	Comments on the Courts' reasoning	335
28.5.	Conclusion	337
<b>Chapter 29:</b>	<b>Norway: Whether the Norwegian/Domestic Tax Credit Rules Were in Conflict with Article 23 of the Tax Treaty – Case No: 19-083263TVI-THOD/1</b> <i>Eivind Furuseth</i>	339
29.1.	Facts	339
29.2.	The arguments of the taxpayer	340
29.3.	The arguments of the tax authorities	341
29.4.	Findings of the court	342
29.4.1.	Introduction	342

29.4.2.	Inclusion of tax-exempt income under the calculation of the maximum foreign tax credit	343
29.4.3.	Whether a group contribution is relevant for calculating the maximum foreign tax credit	345
29.4.4.	The relevance of tax treaties for the interpretation of domestic foreign tax credit rules	347
29.5.	Conclusion	350
<b>Chapter 30:</b>	<b>Germany: Credit for Foreign Taxes in the Case of an Option</b>	353
	<i>Alexander Rust</i>	
30.1.	Introduction	353
30.2.	Facts of the case	354
30.3.	The Court's decision	355
30.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	355
30.5.	Conclusion	357
Part 8		
Exchange of Information, Non-Discrimination, MAP and Abuse of Tax Treaties		
<b>Chapter 31:</b>	<b>Switzerland: The Exchange of Information and Its Limitations</b>	361
	<i>Moritz Seiler and Michael Beusch</i>	
31.1.	Introduction	361
31.2.	Facts of the cases	362
31.2.1.	Case 2C_542/2018	362
31.2.2.	Case 2C_750/2020	362
31.3.	The Court decisions	363
31.3.1.	Case 2C_542/2018	363
31.3.2.	Case 2C_750/2020	366

31.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	368
31.4.1.	Case 2C_542/2018	368
31.4.2.	Case 2C_750/2020	369
31.4.3.	Principle of speciality	370
31.5.	Conclusion	371
<b>Chapter 32:</b>	<b>Australia: Fears Realized in Respect of the Non-Discrimination Article in <i>Addy v. Commissioner of Taxation Michael Dirkis</i></b>	373
32.1.	Introduction	373
32.2.	Facts of the case	375
32.3.	The Court’s decision	378
32.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	380
32.5.	Conclusion	381
<b>Chapter 33:</b>	<b>Argentina: <i>Molinos</i> Case: GAAR and Treaty Shopping</b>	383
	<i>Mirna Screpante</i>	
33.1.	Introduction	383
33.2.	Facts of the case	384
33.3.	The Court’s decision	386
33.3.1.	The majority’s vote	387
33.3.2.	The dissenting vote	390
33.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	391
33.4.1.	Argentina’s GAAR and its relationship with tax treaties	393
33.4.2.	Misapplication of the GAAR and the OECD Model interpretation	395
33.4.3.	Implicit application of the beneficial ownership?	397
33.5.	Conclusion	399

<b>Chapter 34:</b>	<b>Spain: On the Burden of Proof in Tax Abuse Cases and Beneficial Ownership (<i>Qatar Holding and Acciona</i>)</b>	403
	<i>Ricardo García Antón and Adolfo Martín Jiménez</i>	
34.1.	Introduction	403
34.2.	Facts of the case and the Spanish tax administration's position	404
34.3.	The Court's decisions	405
34.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	407
34.4.1.	The burden of proof in abuse cases related to holding companies	407
34.4.2.	Is the BO provision implicit in article 10 of the Netherlands-Spain Income and Capital Tax Treaty (1971)?	410
34.4.3.	The attendance fees for participating in general shareholding meetings	412
34.5.	Conclusion	414
<b>Chapter 35:</b>	<b>Spain: The Domestic GAAR and the Initiation of the MAP in the Context of the Germany-Spain Income and Capital Tax Treaty (the <i>Carbon Holding</i> case)</b>	415
	<i>Adolfo Martín Jiménez and Ricardo García Antón</i>	
35.1.	Introduction	415
35.2.	Facts of the case	416
35.3.	The AN's decision	418
35.4.	The Supreme Court decision in <i>Carbon Holding</i>	420
35.4.1.	The appeal before the Supreme Court	420
35.4.2.	The arguments of the Supreme Court to refuse the appeal	421
35.4.2.1.	The risk of double taxation	421

35.4.2.2.	The Spanish GAAR and the Germany-Spain Income and Capital Tax Treaty	422
35.4.2.3.	The MAP in the EU AC	424
35.5.	Comments on the Supreme Court’s reasoning	424
35.5.1.	Introductory remarks	424
35.5.2.	Some procedural issues conditioning the Supreme Court’s reasoning	424
35.5.3.	The (wrong?) starting point: The MAP, the GAAR and double taxation	426
35.5.4.	The wording and goals of the Germany-Spain Income and Capital Tax Treaty: A correct decision in view of the wording but probably less so if the goals are considered?	427
35.5.5.	The OECD Commentaries on Article 25 in connection with article 28 of the Germany-Spain Income and Capital Tax Treaty and the Spanish Map Regulation	429
35.5.6.	The international minimum standards of BEPS Action 14, the evolution of the Spanish MAP Regulation and its effects on the Germany-Spain Income and Capital Tax Treaty	431
35.5.7.	The Supreme Court decision and the EU AC	433
35.6.	Conclusion	433
<b>Chapter 36:</b>	<b>Canada: Tax Treaty Abuse – <i>Alta Energy Luxembourg S.A.R.L. v. The Queen</i></b> <i>David G. Duff</i>	435
36.1.	Introduction	435
36.2.	Facts of the case	437
36.3.	The majority and minority decisions	439
36.3.1.	Misuse or abuse requirement	439
36.3.1.1.	Majority decision	441
36.3.1.2.	Minority decision	442
36.3.2.	Application to the treaty	443
36.3.2.1.	Majority decision	443
36.3.2.1.1.	Nature of tax treaties and relevance of subsequent Commentaries	444



36.3.2.1.2.	Articles 1 and 4(1)	445
36.3.2.1.3.	Article 13(4)	447
36.3.2.1.4.	Conclusion	449
36.3.2.2.	Minority decision	449
36.3.2.2.1.	Specific anti-avoidance rules	449
36.3.2.2.2.	Object, spirit and purpose of relevant provisions	450
36.3.2.2.3.	Conclusion	451
36.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	452
36.4.1.	Interpretation and the GAAR	452
36.4.2.	Application to the Treaty	454
36.4.2.1.	Conduit companies and specific anti-avoidance rules	455
36.4.2.2.	Relevance of subsequent OECD Commentaries	456
36.4.2.3.	Object, spirit and purpose of relevant provisions and Treaty as a whole	458
36.4.2.3.1.	Articles 1 and 4(1)	458
36.4.2.3.2.	Article 13(4)	459
36.4.2.3.3.	Treaty as a whole	462
36.5.	Conclusions	464
<b>List of Contributors</b>		465

---

## Preface

Both the OECD Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital (OECD Model) and the United Nations Model Double Taxation Convention (UN Model) are designed as tools for legislative harmonization and, therefore, often serve as a basis for tax treaty negotiations between different jurisdictions worldwide. At the same time, however, the interpretation of a particular tax treaty provision may still differ from country to country due to a number of reasons. The risk of double/multiple (non)-taxation is, therefore, not entirely removed, and this will adversely affect the international exchange of goods and services and the movement of capital, technology and persons. In order to facilitate a uniform interpretation of tax treaties worldwide and, hence, reduce the risk of double/multiple (non)-taxation, basic knowledge is needed on how various tax treaty issues are resolved by different jurisdictions.

It is widely known that a unified approach to the interpretation and application of international tax treaty rules may benefit not only the countries/parties to a certain tax treaty but also their taxpayers, as well as international trade and investments in general. This topic is, therefore, an ongoing concern for many tax practitioners, representatives of international organizations, public officers and tax scholars.

The Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2022 Conference was held by Tilburg University on 12-14 May 2022, in a hybrid format for the first time, in the aftermath of the COVID-19 crisis. This international event took place for the eleventh time and was jointly organized by the European Tax College of Tilburg University and the Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law of WU. The conference was dedicated to the analysis of the most important cases on international tax treaty law decided in 2021 in different tax jurisdictions worldwide. Thirty-two cases were presented by outstanding tax experts from more than 20 different countries. Each presentation was followed by an intensive and fruitful discussion. The participants in the conference compared the interpretative approaches existing in both OECD and non-OECD member countries and came up with comprehensive conclusions and suggestions. The main scientific results of the conference are presented in this book.

Each chapter in this book is dedicated to a court case or a number of cases relating to a particular article of the tax treaty at issue (often based on the OECD or UN Model) that was decided in a certain jurisdiction in 2021. Every chapter is structured in a similar way, presenting the facts of the case,



the decision and reasoning of the court, as well as the observations and conclusions of the authors, including the possible impact of the decision on international tax law development in the respective country and other jurisdictions.

This clear and concise structure enables a solid and accessible overview of the global case law on tax treaty application in 2021. The systematic structure of each chapter allows different tax treaty case law to be studied and compared in a comprehensive and efficient way.

The editors believe that the chapters presented in this book are of high value and will, therefore, be of particular interest to tax consultants, public officers, academics and all those interested in international tax law. The fact that many domestic decisions are otherwise available only in the national language makes the material contained in this book even more valuable.

Eric Kemmeren  
Peter Essers  
Stan Stevens  
Ton Stevens  
Cihat Öner  
Michael Lang  
Georg Kofler  
Jeffrey Owens  
Pasquale Pistone  
Alexander Rust  
Josef Schuch  
Claus Staringer  
Karoline Spies  
Daniel Blum

Tilburg, March 2023

## Part 1

### Interpretation and Residence



---

## Chapter 1

### **The Netherlands: The Definition of “International Traffic” in Article 3(1)(e) of the OECD Model: Which Vessel Types Qualify? – *Dutch High Court* 24 December 2021, nr. 20/03226, BNB 2022/37**

Ton Stevens

#### **1.1. Introduction**

In December 2021, the Dutch Supreme Court rendered an interesting decision on the applicability of article 15(3) of the Netherlands-Switzerland Income Tax Treaty (2010), which is almost identical to article 15(3) of the OECD Model (in the pre-2017 version) on the wages earned by a Dutch resident seaman who worked on board a construction vessel. Although the case handles the applicability of article 15(3), the specific issue dealt with in the court case was the reference in article 15(3) to the definition of “international traffic” in article 3(1)(e) of the OECD Model and whether or not construction vessels could qualify as ships operated in international traffic. The special issue in this particular case was the fact that the construction vessel was not operated yet during the working periods of the Dutch seaman but was still in the construction phase. Therefore, two issues were to be decided by the Dutch tax courts in this case: (i) can construction vessels qualify as ships under article 3(1)(e) of the OECD Model?; and (ii) can a ship that is not in the operational phase but still in its construction phase already qualify as a ship operated in international traffic?

#### **1.2. Facts of the case**

Mr. X worked in 2014 and 2015 as “second mate” (second officer) on board a construction vessel. The vessel was designed for the single-lift installation and removal of large oil and gas platforms, as well as the installation of record-weight pipelines.<sup>1</sup> Mr. X lived (tax resident) in the Netherlands and was employed by a Swiss company (a sister company of the Swiss single

---

1. Tax court cases in the Netherlands are strictly anonymized. However, given the facts of the case (“world largest construction vessel” that was built between 2014 and 2015 in South Korea and Rotterdam), it was rather easy to find out the vessel’s name: Pioneering Spirit. Surprisingly, the same vessel played a role in the Norwegian Supreme

ship company that owned and exploited the construction vessel). The vessel was built in South Korea starting in 2014, and in 2016 it started its first operations.<sup>2</sup> Mr. X was working during 2014 and 2015 for several periods “on board” the vessel, either at the Korean construction yard or in the Rotterdam harbour (where the outfitting and completion of the vessel construction was carried out). His remuneration was not taxed in Switzerland. Mr. X worked also on board the vessel when it sailed from the Korean construction yard to the outfitting location in the Rotterdam harbour. The following working periods can be distinguished:

- from 1 April 2014 to 17 November 2014: construction yard in South Korea;
- from 18 November 2014 to 8 January 2015: sailing from South Korea to Rotterdam; and
- from 8 January 2015 to 31 December 2015: outfitting location in Rotterdam.

### 1.3. The Dutch Supreme Court decision

#### 1.3.1. Question/issue disputed

The court case dealt with the question of whether the income earned by the Dutch seaman (Mr. X) should be qualified as remuneration derived from employment that is exercised aboard a ship operated in international traffic (article 15(3) of the Netherlands-Switzerland Income Tax Treaty (2010)). If the answer to the question was positive (standpoint of the taxpayer), taxation rights would be allocated to Switzerland as the contracting state in which the place of effective management of the shipping enterprise was situated. In that case, the remuneration would be exempted<sup>3</sup> in the Netherlands based on article 22(2) of the tax treaty. In case of a negative answer (standpoint of the Dutch tax authorities), the taxation rights would be allocated to the Netherlands (article 15(1) of the tax treaty), as Mr. X did not work at all between 2014 and 2015 in Switzerland (working state).

More specifically, the question before the Dutch Supreme Court was whether the activities of seamen during the construction phase and the sailing period

---

Court decision (NO: *Høyesterett* [Supreme Court], 8 June 2021, HR-2021-1243-A), *Farid Ati Allah & Others v. Skatteetaten (Poseidon)*, Case Law IBFD discussed by E. Furuseth during this year’s Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe seminar. See ch. 25 of this book.

2. In Norway as can be derived from the Norwegian *Poseidon* court case.

3. Exemption with progression reservation.



to a testing/completion site could be qualified as working aboard a ship that is operated in international traffic?

### 1.3.2. The Court's decision

The decision of the Dutch Supreme Court can be summarized as follows.

The Supreme Court started by stating that articles 3(1)(g), 8 and 15(3) of the Netherlands-Switzerland Income Tax Treaty (2010) are almost identical to those articles<sup>4</sup> of the OECD Model (2008) (art. 3(1)(e) OECD Model). For that reason, the OECD Commentary on those articles is, in the view of the Dutch Supreme Court, of “utmost importance” for the interpretation of those articles.

The Court continued its decision by stating that article 15(3) and article 8 are two sides of the same coin in the sense that they provide for special allocation rules for the operation of ships or aircrafts in international traffic. From the Commentary on Article 8 of the OECD Model, the Court found that profits derived from the exploitation of ships in international traffic meant profits directly related with the commercial transportation of goods and persons by ship in international traffic (including connected or ancillary activities).

The Court then decided that the facts of the case left no other conclusion than that the vessel was destined for the lifting and removal of big platforms and pipelaying. The transport of goods and persons by the ship was only incidental to this main activity. In such a case, it could not be said that profits from the exploitation of the vessel were directly connected with the commercial transport of goods and persons by ship in international traffic (including connected or ancillary activities).

In the view of the Dutch Supreme Court, there was no further need to answer the question of whether article 15(3) of the Netherlands-Switzerland Income Tax Treaty (2010) is also applicable during the construction phase of a ship that is destined for use in international traffic.

---

4. Art. 3(1)(g) of the *Netherlands-Switzerland Income Tax Treaty* (2010), *Treaties & Models IBFD* being identical to art. 3(1)(e) of *OECD Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital* (17 July 2008), *Treaties & Models IBFD*.







The Home of International Taxation

## Contact

**IBFD Head Office**

Tel.: +31-20-554 0100 (GMT+2)

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

**Visitors' Address:**

Rietlandpark 301  
1019 DW, Amsterdam  
The Netherlands

**Postal Address:**

P.O. Box 20237  
1000 HE Amsterdam  
The Netherlands

Order online at [ibfd.org/Shop/Book](https://ibfd.org/Shop/Book)