
Table of Contents

Foreword	v
List of abbreviations	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	3
1.1. The problem	3
1.2. Purpose	6
1.3. Definitions and terminology	10
1.3.1. The principle of territoriality (in international law), the fiscal principle of territoriality and the principle of worldwide taxation	10
1.3.2. Capital import neutrality and capital export neutrality	11
1.3.3. The ability-to-pay principle and the benefit principle	14
1.4. Limitations	15
1.5. Previous research	19
1.6. Method	21
1.6.1. Legal method used in the dissertation	21
1.6.2. Links with other disciplines	23
1.6.3. Language	24
1.6.4. Research method applied to the dissertation	25
1.7. Outline	26
Chapter 2: International Law and Tax Jurisdiction over Foreign Business Income	31
2.1. Introduction	31
2.2. Jurisdiction in international law	33
2.2.1. Introduction	33
2.2.2. Principles of jurisdiction to prescribe	35
2.2.2.1. The principle of territoriality as a jurisdiction principle in international law	36
2.2.2.2. Other jurisdiction principles	39
2.2.2.3. Conclusion	40
2.2.3. Does international law require a genuine or minimum connection to exercise jurisdiction?	40
2.2.4. Is there a hierarchy between the different jurisdiction principles to avoid concurring jurisdictional claims?	42
2.2.5. Conclusion	44

Table of Contents

2.3.	Tax jurisdiction over foreign business income	45
2.3.1.	May a state take into account foreign elements when exercising jurisdiction to prescribe in the field of tax law?	45
2.3.1.1.	Introduction	45
2.3.1.2.	Tax jurisdiction on resident taxpayers: Is it compatible with international law to tax residents on their worldwide income?	47
2.3.1.3.	Tax jurisdiction on non-resident taxpayers: Is it compatible with international law to tax non-residents on worldwide income?	52
2.3.2.	Does international law impose a minimum connection to exercise tax jurisdiction?	54
2.3.3.	Overlaps between tax claims of several states: Does international law prohibit double taxation?	61
2.3.4.	May states refuse to take into account foreign elements when exercising their taxing powers?	62
2.4.	Conclusion	63
2.4.1.	Summary of the findings and illustration of states' tax jurisdiction in relation to different territorial connections	63
2.4.2.	Member States' fiscal sovereignty with regard to EU law	67

Chapter 3: Taxation of Resident Companies on Income of Foreign Group Companies

		71
3.1.	Introduction	71
3.2.	Application of the principle of worldwide taxation to foreign companies' profits: The <i>Cadbury Schweppes</i> case	73
3.2.1.	Introduction and presentation of the <i>Cadbury Schweppes</i> case	73
3.2.2.	Reasoning of the ECJ and choice of a comparator	76
3.2.2.1.	Comparison between the ownership in foreign and domestic subsidiaries	76
3.2.2.2.	Comparison of CFC rules with the taxation of inbound dividends	80
3.2.2.3.	Comparison of CFC rules with the taxation of a permanent establishment	83
3.2.2.4.	Conclusion	86
3.2.3.	Consequences of <i>Cadbury Schweppes</i> with regard to the principle of worldwide taxation	87

3.2.3.1.	CFC rules and the taxation of a non-resident’s foreign income	87
3.2.3.2.	May a Member State favour the principle of worldwide taxation over the fiscal principle of territoriality for the prevention of tax avoidance?	89
3.2.3.2.1.	CFC taxation – A means to prevent the abuse of EU law	90
3.2.3.2.2.	The prevention of tax avoidance through CFC rules: Drawing the line between abusive and non-abusive situations	96
3.2.3.3.	CFC rules imply a different treatment between domestic and foreign subsidiaries for the shareholder: Can Cadbury Schweppes be reconciled with FII Group Litigation?	98
3.2.4.	Conclusion on CFC rules and the application of the principle of worldwide taxation at a group level	100
3.3.	Deduction of negative income incurred by foreign group companies	101
3.3.1.	Introduction	102
3.3.2.	Presentation of the <i>Marks & Spencer, Oy AA</i> and <i>X Holding</i> cases	105
3.3.2.1.	The <i>Marks and Spencer</i> case	105
3.3.2.2.	The <i>Oy AA</i> case	107
3.3.2.3.	The <i>X Holding</i> case	108
3.3.3.	The choice of comparator	109
3.3.3.1.	Comparison between domestic and foreign group companies	110
3.3.3.2.	Comparison between foreign subsidiaries and permanent establishments	112
3.3.3.2.1.	Comparison between foreign subsidiaries and permanent establishments in <i>Marks & Spencer</i>	113
3.3.3.2.2.	Comparison between foreign subsidiaries and permanent establishments in <i>X Holding</i>	115
3.3.4.	Relief for non-final losses incurred by foreign group companies	117
3.3.4.1.	The <i>Marks & Spencer</i> case	117
3.3.4.1.1.	The justification level	118
3.3.4.1.2.	The proportionality level	125
3.3.4.2.	The <i>X Holding</i> case	128
3.3.4.3.	The <i>Oy AA</i> case	130
3.3.4.4.	Conclusion on the relief for non-final losses incurred by foreign group companies	131

Table of Contents

3.3.5.	Relief for final losses incurred by foreign group companies	133
3.3.5.1.	The relevance of cross-border loss relief within the internal market	134
3.3.5.2.	Defining “final” losses	135
3.3.5.3.	The discrepancy between international double taxation and the double non-deduction of final losses	138
3.3.5.4.	The perspective from which final losses should be computed: Capital export neutrality vs capital import neutrality	141
3.3.5.5.	Which group company should be granted relief for final losses?	144
3.3.5.5.1.	Should loss relief be granted only to a parent company or could it also be granted to other group companies?	145
3.3.5.5.2.	Granting loss relief to the parent company: The dilemma between direct and ultimate parent companies	147
3.3.5.6.	Conclusion on the relief for final losses incurred by foreign group companies	148
3.3.6.	Conclusion on losses incurred by foreign group companies	150
3.4.	Conclusion of Chap. 3	150

Chapter 4: Taxation of Resident Companies on Foreign Business Income Earned through Permanent Establishments

4.1.	Introduction	153
4.2.	Application of the principle of worldwide taxation in the Member State of residence	155
4.2.1.	Introduction	155
4.2.2.	The <i>Columbus Container</i> case	158
4.2.2.1.	Presentation of <i>Columbus Container</i>	158
4.2.2.2.	Discussion of <i>Columbus Container</i>	159
4.2.2.2.1.	<i>Columbus Container</i> and compatibility of the principle of worldwide taxation with EU law	160
4.2.2.2.2.	<i>Columbus Container</i> and the prevention of tax avoidance: Can <i>Columbus Container</i> and <i>Cadbury Schweppes</i> be reconciled?	162
4.2.2.2.2.1.	Comparing <i>Columbus Container</i> and <i>Cadbury Schweppes</i>	162

4.2.2.2.2.2.	The apparent incompatibility between <i>Columbus Container</i> and <i>Cadbury Schweppes</i>	165
4.2.2.2.3.	Compatibility with EU law of the non-discriminatory taxation of foreign income: Discrimination-based analysis vs restriction-based analysis	168
4.2.3.	The <i>Krankenheim</i> case	176
4.2.3.1.	Presentation of <i>Krankenheim</i>	176
4.2.3.2.	Discussion of <i>Krankenheim</i> with regard to the taxation of foreign profits	177
4.2.4.	EU law and the grant of a full tax credit	181
4.2.4.1.	Introduction	181
4.2.4.2.	Illustration of the potential advantages of a full tax credit and presentation of the <i>Gilly</i> case	183
4.2.4.3.	May the objective of achievement of the internal market require granting a full tax credit?	186
4.2.5.	Conclusion on the taxation of the positive income of permanent establishments	188
4.3.	Application of the fiscal principle of territoriality in the Member State of residence	190
4.3.1.	Introduction	190
4.3.2.	Presentation of the <i>Deutsche Shell</i> , <i>Lidl Belgium</i> and <i>Krankenheim</i> cases	192
4.3.2.1.	The <i>Deutsche Shell</i> case	192
4.3.2.2.	The <i>Lidl Belgium</i> case	193
4.3.2.3.	The <i>Krankenheim</i> case	194
4.3.3.	Discussion of the solutions reached in <i>Deutsche Shell</i> , <i>Lidl Belgium</i> and <i>Krankenheim</i> with regard to foreign losses	195
4.3.3.1.	Relief for non-final losses incurred by a permanent establishment	196
4.3.3.1.1.	Consequences of the exemption method chosen in a tax treaty	196
4.3.3.1.2.	The justification level	198
4.3.3.1.3.	The proportionality level	200
4.3.3.1.4.	Conclusion on the relief for non-final losses incurred by a permanent establishment	202
4.3.3.2.	Relief for final losses incurred by a permanent establishment	205
4.3.3.2.1.	Analysis of <i>Lidl Belgium</i> with regard to final losses incurred by a permanent establishment subject to the exemption method	205

Table of Contents

4.3.3.2.2.	The tax treatment of final losses in <i>Krankenheim</i>	206
4.3.3.2.3.	Arguments pleading for granting relief for final losses incurred by a permanent establishment subject to the exemption method	208
4.3.4.	Conclusion on the application of the fiscal principle of territoriality to permanent establishments	213
4.4.	The possible requirement of most favoured nation treatment in the Member State of residence with regard to foreign business income	214
4.4.1.	Introduction	214
4.4.2.	The absence of requirement of a most favoured nation treatment in ECJ case law	216
4.4.3.	Arguments supporting the view that EU law should not require most favoured nation treatment as far as the taxation of business income is concerned	217
4.4.4.	Conclusion	220
4.5.	Conclusion on the extent of the tax jurisdiction of the Member State of residence	220

Chapter 5: Taxation of the Foreign Business Income Attributable to a Permanent Establishment by the Member State of establishment	223	
5.1.	Introduction	223
5.2.	Taxation of foreign positive income attributable to a permanent establishment	224
5.2.1.	Introduction	224
5.2.2.	ECJ case law transposed to the taxation of foreign positive income attributable to a permanent establishment	225
5.2.3.	Taxation of foreign positive income attributable to a permanent establishment: Tax policy considerations	227
5.2.4.	Conclusion	230
5.3.	The tax treatment of foreign negative income attributable to a permanent establishment	230
5.3.1.	Introduction	230
5.3.2.	ECJ case law on the tax treatment of foreign negative income in the Member State of source	231
5.3.2.1.	The <i>Futura</i> case	231
5.3.2.2.	The <i>Centro Equestre</i> case	233

5.3.2.3.	The tax treatment of foreign negative income in the Member State of source according to case law applying the <i>Schumacker</i> doctrine: The <i>Renneberg</i> case	236
5.3.3.	Discussion of <i>Futura</i> and <i>Centro Equestre</i> with regard to foreign negative income attributable to a permanent establishment	239
5.3.3.1.	Introduction	239
5.3.3.2.	Attribution to a permanent establishment of costs originally borne by a foreign entity	242
5.3.3.3.	Foreign negative income incurred when a permanent establishment carries on business activities in a third state	245
5.3.3.4.	Application of the profit split method when the enterprise is globally loss-making	248
5.3.3.5.	Final losses incurred outside the territory of the Member State of establishment	251
5.4.	Conclusion on the tax jurisdiction of the Member State of establishment	252
Chapter 6: International Double Taxation and the Objective of Achievement of the Internal Market		255
6.1.	Introduction	255
6.2.	The relation between the EU Treaties and international double taxation	258
6.2.1.	Double taxation and the concept of an internal market	258
6.2.2.	Consequences of former Art. 293 TEC and its repeal by the Treaty of Lisbon	267
6.2.3.	International double taxation and Art. 6 TEU	269
6.2.3.1.	The possible legal value in the EU legal system of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and the Charter of Fundamental Rights with regard to double taxation	271
6.2.3.1.1.	The possible legal value in the EU legal system of the Charter of Fundamental Rights with regard to international double taxation	271
6.2.3.1.2.	The possible legal value in the EU legal system of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights with regard to double taxation	274

Table of Contents

6.2.3.2.	Possible consequences of the protection of possessions and the principle of <i>ne bis in idem</i> with regard to international double taxation	276
6.2.3.2.1.	Possible consequences of the protection of possessions under Art. 6 TEU with regard to international double taxation within the internal market	276
6.2.3.2.2.	Possible consequences of the principle of <i>ne bis in idem</i> under Art. 6 TEU with regard to international double taxation	280
6.2.4.	Conclusion on the relation between the EU Treaties and international double taxation	282
6.3.	The relation between ECJ case law and international double taxation	282
6.3.1.	International double taxation may be incompatible with EU law	283
6.3.1.1.	Double taxation may be incompatible with EU law as a consequence of the taxing rights exercised by the Member State of source	283
6.3.1.2.	Double taxation may be incompatible with EU law as a consequence of the taxing rights exercised by the Member State of residence	287
6.3.1.3.	Conclusion on situations of double taxation that may be incompatible with EU law	290
6.3.2.	Double taxation as a result of the non-discriminatory tax jurisdiction exercised by a Member State	290
6.3.2.1.	Double burdens in direct tax cases	291
6.3.2.2.	Double burdens in the field of social contributions	295
6.3.2.2.1.	The perspective of the host Member State	295
6.3.2.2.2.	The perspective of the home Member State	296
6.3.2.2.3.	Analysis of the different outcomes for social contributions and direct taxes with regard to double burdens	297
6.3.3.	The acceptance of double taxation is difficult to reconcile with case law on double non-deduction of negative income	299
6.4.	Conclusions on the relation between international double taxation and the objective of achievement of the internal market	302

Chapter 7: Reconsidering Cross-Border Loss Relief: Should Final Foreign Losses Necessarily Be Deducted in the Home State?	305
7.1. Introduction	305
7.2. Requiring from the home state an automatic and unconditional relief for all the final losses incurred in the host state: A satisfactory solution?	308
7.2.1. An automatic and unconditional relief for all the final losses in the home state creates tax planning opportunities	308
7.2.2. An automatic and unconditional relief for all the final losses in the home state may contradict the arm's length principle	313
7.3. Requiring from the host state a tax refund corresponding to the value of the final losses for tax purposes: A convincing alternative to the <i>Marks & Spencer</i> doctrine?	319
7.4. The suggested solution: A split of final losses between the home state and the host state	322
7.5. Possible methods for splitting the final foreign losses between the home state and the host state	327
7.5.1. Splitting the final foreign losses on the basis of an allocation key	328
7.5.2. Splitting the final foreign losses on the basis of the arm's length principle	333
7.6. Conclusion	337
Chapter 8: Summary and Conclusions	339
8.1. Introduction	339
8.2. Summary of the main findings of the dissertation	339
8.3. Reconciliation of the findings and discussion from a tax policy perspective	342
8.3.1. CFC taxation	343
8.3.2. Taxation of permanent establishments' profits by the Member State of residence	344
8.3.3. Deduction of foreign losses incurred by foreign subsidiaries and permanent establishments subject to the exemption method	345
8.3.4. Taxation of foreign business income attributable to a permanent establishment by the Member State of establishment	348

Table of Contents

8.4.	Suggestions on possible future research about the conflict between the objective of achievement of the internal market and Member States' taxation of companies' foreign business income	349
8.5.	General conclusion	350
References		355
Other Titles in the IBFD Doctoral Series		395