

# **Taxation of International Performing Artistes**

## **Table of Contents**

### **PART A – INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITIONS**

#### **Introduction, aim of the thesis and research methods**

- 1.1. A variety of stars
- 1.2. Performances are business activities
- 1.3. Special taxing rules for artistes (Article 17 of the OECD Model Tax Convention)
- 1.4. Aim of the study and delimitation
- 1.5. Structure of the study and research methods

#### **History of non-resident artiste taxation**

- 2.1. Income taxation of non-residents
- 2.2. International double taxation
- 2.3. Double (and multilateral) tax treaties
- 2.4. Oldest tax treaties; income from the “practice of art”
- 2.5. The League of Nations: no special rules for artistes
- 2.6. The 1939 United States–Sweden tax treaty
- 2.7. The 1945 United States–United Kingdom tax treaty
- 2.8. US treaties with other countries in 1951
- 2.9. German tax treaties in the 1950s and 1960s
- 2.10. The 1963 OECD Model Tax Convention; introduction of Article 17
- 2.11. The object and purpose of Article 17(2) in 1977
- 2.12. Reversal in the 1987 OECD Report
  - 2.12.1. Mistrust, tax avoidance schemes
  - 2.12.2. Equal treatment as principle, but still expanding the deviating treatment
  - 2.12.3. Gross taxation, no deduction of expenses, appropriate tax rate
  - 2.12.4. Tentative conclusions, suggested improvements
- 2.13. Implementation in the Commentary to the 1992 OECD Model
- 2.14. The limited approach in the 1996 US Model
  - 2.14.1. Article 17 for artistes and sportsmen
  - 2.14.2. The *de minimis* rule in Article 17(1)
  - 2.14.3. The limited approach in Paragraph 2
  - 2.14.4. Extensive use in the various US tax treaties
- 2.15. Discussion after the 1987-1992 changes
  - 2.15.1. Publications in the early years after the 1992 implementation
  - 2.15.2. Book by Daniel Sandler and IFA Congress in 1995
  - 2.15.3. Rijkele Betten and Marco Lombardi on triangular situations in 1997
  - 2.15.4. Harald Grams on the German artistes tax rules in 1999
  - 2.15.5. Decision by the Tax Court of Canada
  - 2.15.6. General criticism of Article 17
  - 2.15.7. Taxation of payments to “star companies” in Spain
  - 2.15.8. Taxation of non-resident artistes’ income in Finland
  - 2.15.9. 2001 IFA Congress in San Francisco
  - 2.15.10. Obstacles for international performing artistes
  - 2.15.11. Jörg Holthaus in Germany
  - 2.15.12. Rent-a-star – the object and purpose of Article 17(2)
  - 2.15.13. The *Arnoud Gerritse* decision by the European Court of Justice

- 2.15.14. Limited approach of Article 17(2) in Sweden
- 2.15.15. Angel Juárez, LLM in Leiden in 2003
- 2.15.16. Further publications
- 2.16. General discussion and conclusions

### **Who is an artiste?**

- 3.1. Various publications, different views, Article 3(2) of the OECD Model
- 3.2. The meaning of the words “artiste” and “entertainer”
- 3.3. First description in the 1939 United States–Sweden tax treaty
- 3.4. Second description in German tax treaties in 1950s and 1960s
- 3.5. Clearer description in the 1963 OECD Draft Model Treaty
- 3.6. Minor adjustments in the 1977 OECD Model Tax Convention
- 3.7. More description of the “artiste” in the 1987 OECD report
- 3.8. Continuation in the 1992 OECD Commentary
- 3.9. Little help in the wording in the 1996 US Model Tax Convention
- 3.10. Klaus Vogel on double taxation conventions
- 3.11. Daniel Sandler and IFA Seminar in 1995
- 3.12. Articles and court cases in various countries
  - 3.12.1. Germany
  - 3.12.2. Austria
  - 3.12.3. Canada
  - 3.12.4. United Kingdom
  - 3.12.5. United States
  - 3.12.6. Netherlands
  - 3.12.7. Belgium
  - 3.12.8. Australia
- 3.13. General definition of “who is an artiste”; list of examples
- 3.14. General discussion and conclusions

### **What is performance income?**

- 4.1. Different types of (performance) income
- 4.2. The Commentary on Article 17 of the OECD Model and the 1987 OECD Report
- 4.3. Practical implications for different types of performance income
  - 4.3.1. List of examples
  - 4.3.2. Performance fee versus rehearsal fee
  - 4.3.3. Production expenses for a performance
  - 4.3.4. Inducement payments, options, retainers and restrictive covenants
  - 4.3.5. Cancellation fees and insurance cover
  - 4.3.6. Advertising and commercials
  - 4.3.7. Sponsorship
  - 4.3.8. Endorsement by suppliers of equipment
  - 4.3.9. Subsidies
  - 4.3.10. Royalties for record or movie sales
  - 4.3.11. Tour support from record companies
  - 4.3.12. Publishing copyright
  - 4.3.13. Neighbouring rights
  - 4.3.14. Sales of merchandising
  - 4.3.15. Pensions and other insurance benefits
- 4.4. The “territoriality” principle
- 4.5. General discussion and conclusions

## **PART B – PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION – BILATERAL TREATIES**

## **Tax treaties: allocation with Article 17**

- 5.1. Allocation according to Article 17(1) and (2)
- 5.2. No special artiste clause in tax treaties
- 5.3. Limitation to only business activities, exceptions for artistes/employees
- 5.4. The use of Article 17(2) and its limitations
- 5.5. The additional Article 17(3)
  - 5.5.1. Exception in the Commentary
  - 5.5.2. More frequent use than expected
  - 5.5.3. Germany: example of a country using Article 17(3) in tax treaty practice
  - 5.5.4. Variations in the content of Article 17(3)
  - 5.5.5. Undefined conditions
  - 5.5.6. Defending the state's budget?
  - 5.5.7. Chances of unequal treatment
- 5.6. Two examples of country's tax treaties: the United States and the Netherlands
  - 5.6.1. Variations in tax treaty policy
  - 5.6.2. Tax treaties: United States
  - 5.6.3. Tax treaties: Netherlands
- 5.7. Triangular situations
  - 5.7.1. Resident in different countries
  - 5.7.2. Decision in the Netherlands in 1983
  - 5.7.3. Article by Rijkele Betten and Marco Lombardi in 1997
  - 5.7.4. Change in the 2000 OECD Commentary
  - 5.7.5. Double taxation problems in triangular situations
  - 5.7.6. Pension benefits
  - 5.7.7. Reference to Article 1 of the OECD Model Tax Convention
- 5.8. General discussion and conclusions

## **Non-resident artiste tax rules in performance countries**

- 6.1. Similarities and differences
- 6.2. Survey of the non-resident artiste tax rules in performance countries
- 6.3. Almost complete coverage
- 6.4. The deduction of expenses
- 6.5. The (withholding) tax rate
- 6.6. Income tax return after the taxable year
- 6.7. Concurrent taxation, other charges or levies
- 6.8. Unilateral exemptions
- 6.9. General discussion and conclusions

## **Elimination of double taxation**

- 7.1. Exemption or credit: history in general
- 7.2. Explanation of tax exemption and tax credit methods
  - 7.2.1. Two different systems, with two variations
  - 7.2.2. Full exemption
  - 7.2.3. Exemption with progression
  - 7.2.4. Full credit
  - 7.2.5. Ordinary credit
  - 7.2.6. Summary of the figures
  - 7.2.7. Conclusions from example; recommendations in Article 23 of the OECD Model
  - 7.2.8. Differences in taxable income
- 7.3. Recommended relief of double taxation under Article 17
  - 7.3.1. No recommendation in 1963, introduction in 1977
  - 7.3.2. Example: the Netherlands
  - 7.3.3. Exceptions in other countries

- 7.3.4. Clearer position in the OECD Model Tax Convention?
- 7.4. Basket/overall method versus per-country method
- 7.5. Tax credit problems
  - 7.5.1. Tax exemption method is easier to apply
  - 7.5.2. Tax certificate
  - 7.5.3. Qualification of foreign tax
  - 7.5.4. Final and compulsory payments
  - 7.5.5. The person of the artiste
  - 7.5.6. Triangular situations
  - 7.5.7. Net deals: transfer of the tax burden to the organizer
  - 7.5.8. Differences in taxable base
  - 7.5.9. Year of tax credit (or exemption)
  - 7.5.10. Creditable domestic tax in the residence country
  - 7.5.11. Complexity of the system of foreign tax credits
- 7.6. Excess tax credits
- 7.7. Deduction of foreign tax as an operating expense
- 7.8. General discussion and conclusions

### **The deduction of (production) expenses**

- 8.1. Expenses seem to be difficult
- 8.2. Non-deductibility of expenses for non-resident artistes in most countries
- 8.3. The amount of expenses
  - 8.3.1. Survey in the Netherlands
  - 8.3.2. More information about the earnings
  - 8.3.3. Expenses in the database
  - 8.3.4. Total earnings and expenses period 2001-2003
  - 8.3.5. Confirmation with survey of the Dutch tax authorities over 2002
  - 8.3.6. Specified earnings and expenses for the year 2003
    - 8.3.6.1. Figures for 2003, explanation of the two graphs
    - 8.3.6.2. First graph: variance of percentage of production expenses
    - 8.3.6.3. Second graph: number of applications, brackets of expenses
    - 8.3.6.4. Conclusions from the figures and the graphs
    - 8.3.6.5. Information about individual performances
    - 8.3.6.6. "Happy few"
    - 8.3.6.7. "Well-established professionals"
    - 8.3.6.8. "Artistes struggling for recognition"
- 8.4. Why do artistes incur such high expenses?
  - 8.4.1. Variation in expenses
  - 8.4.2. Connection between expenses and royalties
- 8.5. Special rules and exclusions for amateurs
- 8.6. General discussion and conclusions

### **Examples of international excessive taxation**

- 9.1. Excessive taxation can occur
- 9.2. Eight examples, divided into three groups
  - 9.2.1. Explanation of the examples
  - 9.2.2. Three individual examples
  - 9.2.3. Four examples, following Paragraph 11 of the OECD Commentary
  - 9.2.4. One extra example: no source tax in the country of performance
- 9.3. Results from these examples
  - 9.3.1. Too heavy taxation in the country of performance
  - 9.3.2. The reversal in the 1992 Commentary hits the wrong target
  - 9.3.3. Small risk of under-taxation or even double non-taxation
  - 9.3.4. Excessive taxation can turn into double taxation

#### 9.4. General discussion and conclusions

### **Tax revenue and administrative burden**

- 10.1. Size of the contribution to a state's budget
- 10.2. Calculation of the tax revenue in the Netherlands
  - 10.2.1. Two reliable sources
  - 10.2.2. Extrapolation of the Dutch study on expenses
  - 10.2.3. Evaluation of the Dutch artiste and sportsman tax system
  - 10.2.4. Conclusions for the Netherlands
- 10.3. Tax revenue in other source countries
  - 10.3.1. Figures from three countries
  - 10.3.2. United Kingdom
  - 10.3.3. Australia
  - 10.3.4. New Zealand
- 10.4. A weighted average of tax revenue for the four countries
- 10.5. Tax credits or tax exemption in the residence country
- 10.6. Administrative burden
- 10.7. General discussion and conclusions

## **PART C – PRESENT SITUATION WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION**

### **Unequal treatment in the European Community**

- 11.1. Market integration in the European Community
- 11.2. Obstacles for international performing artistes within the Community
- 11.3. The role of the European Court of Justice
- 11.4. The *Arnoud Gerritse* decision (C-234/01)
  - 11.4.1. First case about artiste taxation
  - 11.4.2. The facts and the preliminary question
  - 11.4.3. Discussion while the case was pending
  - 11.4.4. Decision by the ECJ, after conclusion of the Advocate-General Léger
  - 11.4.5. Reactions and changes after the decision
  - 11.4.6. Ambiguity following from the second answer
- 11.5. New cases pending before the European Court of Justice
- 11.6. *FKP Scorpio Konzertproduktion GmbH* (C-290/04)
  - 11.6.1. The facts of the case and the preliminary questions
  - 11.6.2. Discussion and action while the case is pending
  - 11.6.3. Official reaction from the German authorities
  - 11.6.4. Reactions by the European Commission and some Member States
  - 11.6.5. Oral hearing
- 11.7. *Centro Equestre da Lezíria Grande Lda* (C-345/04)
  - 11.7.1. The facts of the case and the preliminary question
  - 11.7.2. Administrative obstacles
  - 11.7.3. Changes by the German tax authorities in November 2003
  - 11.7.4. Comparison with transfer pricing and allocation of head office expenses
  - 11.7.5. Comparison with other ECJ decisions
- 11.8. Solutions through permanent establishment(s)?
- 11.9. Can gross taxation of non-resident artistes be a (forbidden) VAT?
- 11.10. Actions in the cultural field
- 11.11. General discussion and conclusions

### **Conflicts between OECD Model and EC Treaty**

- 12.1. Community law supersedes treaty law, unless it provides otherwise
- 12.2. The (non-)deductibility of expenses and the position of the Commentary

- 12.3. Interpretation of Article 17(2): limited or unlimited approach
- 12.4. Exemptions from corporation tax (*Stauffer* – C-386/04)
- 12.5. Unequal treatment following from Article 17(3)
- 12.6. Deviating treaty provisions and most-favoured-nation treatment
- 12.7. Is Article 17 of the OECD Model permissible under Community law?
- 12.8. European law and the tax credit problems in the country of residence
  - 12.8.1. The limitation of the ordinary tax credit
  - 12.8.2. Tax credit problems
  - 12.8.3. Mutual assistance, exchange of information
  - 12.8.4. Developments towards a full tax credit in the European Union
- 12.9. General discussion and conclusions

## **PART D – DISCUSSION OF THE PRESENT SITUATION**

### **Discussion and conclusions after the study**

- 13.1. End of the study
- 13.2. Conclusions based on the nine criteria defined in 1.4.
- 13.3. Considerations of tax avoidance and non-compliance
- 13.4. Awareness at the OECD in 1987, but lack of action since then
- 13.5. Conclusions

## **PART E – FUTURE**

### **How to improve Article 17 of the OECD Model**

- 14.1. Problems with international artiste taxation need solutions
- 14.2. Reintroduction of the limited approach for Article 17(2)
- 14.3. Change in Paragraph 10 of the Commentary
- 14.4. Normal income (or corporation) tax returns
- 14.5. Special provisions for small artistes (the *de minimis* rule)
- 14.6. Restrict Article 17 to business activities, exempt employees
- 14.7. Exemption for equivalent part of fixed salaries
- 14.8. Addition of Article 17(3) to the official text of Article 17
- 14.9. Change to tax exemption or full credit would give a better balance
- 14.10. Conclusions

### **Can Article 17 of the OECD Model radically be changed?**

- 15.1. Is more possible than just modifications?
- 15.2. A radical change may be considered
  - 15.2.1. Turnaround of Article 17 of the OECD Model
  - 15.2.2. Still counteracting tax avoidance behaviour
  - 15.2.3. Exchange of information and compliance
- 15.3. Comparison with the nine criteria from the aim of the thesis
- 15.4. Conclusions

## **PART F – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **Summary and conclusions**

- 16.1. Introduction and definitions
- 16.2. Present situation – bilateral treaties
- 16.3. Present situation within the European Union
- 16.4. Conclusions for the present situation
- 16.5. Future

## **Summary and conclusions in Dutch**

- 17.1. Introductie en definities
- 17.2. Huidige situatie – bilaterale belastingverdragen
- 17.3. Huidige situatie binnen de Europese Unie
- 17.4. Conclusies voor de huidige situatie
- 17.5. Toekomst

## **Bibliography**

Legislation and case law