

*Eric C.C.M. Kemmeren, Daniël S. Smit,
Peter Essers, Michael Lang, Jeffrey Owens,
Pasquale Pistone, Alexander Rust,
Josef Schuch, Claus Staringer, Alfred Storck*

Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2016

IBFD | Linde

Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2016

Why this book?

This book provides a unique and comprehensive global overview of international tax disputes on double tax conventions, thereby filling a gap in the area of tax treaty case law. It covers the 37 most important tax treaty cases that were decided in 2015 around the world. The systematic structure of each case allows easy and efficient comparison of the varying application and interpretation of tax treaties in different regimes.

With the continuously increasing importance of tax treaties, Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2016 is a valuable reference tool for anyone interested in tax treaty case law. This book is of interest to tax practitioners, multinational enterprises, policymakers, tax administrators, judges and academics.

Title:	Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2016
Editor(s):	Eric C.C.M. Kemmeren et al.
Date of publication:	January 2017
ISBN:	978-90-8722-392-2 (print/online), 978-90-8722-393-9 (eBook)
Type of publication:	Print, online and eBook
Number of pages:	448
Terms:	Shipping fees apply. Shipping information is available on our website
Price (print/online):	EUR 85 / USD 100 (VAT excl.)
Price (eBook):	EUR 68 / USD 80 (VAT excl.)

Order information

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

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



IBFD, Your Portal to Cross-Border Tax Expertise

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
Fax: 31-20-622 8658
www.ibfd.org

© 2016 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.

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 978-90-8722-392-2 (print)
ISBN 978-3-7073-3634-4 (Linde)
ISBN 978-90-8722-393-9 (eBook)
NUR 826

Table of Contents

Preface	xix
----------------	-----

Part One
Scope, Tax Treaty Interpretation and Residence

Chapter 1: New Zealand: Treaty Interpretation on an Exchange of Information	3
<i>Craig Elliffe</i>	
1.1. Introduction	3
1.2. Facts of the case	5
1.3. The court decision	9
1.3.1. The evolving law of taxpayer secrecy and no blanket confidentiality obligation	9
1.3.2. The difference between the Australian DTA (1972) and the Korean DTA (1983)	10
1.3.3. Making sense of the Korean DTA using the OECD Commentaries	11
1.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	14
1.4.1. The role of article 26	14
1.4.2. The role of the OECD Commentary and the legal basis for its use	15
1.4.3. Reference to subsequent OECD Model article and Commentaries	16
1.5. Conclusion	19
Chapter 2: Argentina: Can a PE Deduct General Administration Expenses?	21
<i>Axel A. Verstraeten</i>	
2.1. Introduction	21
2.2. Facts of the case	21
2.3. The court decision	23
2.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	25
2.4.1. Status of OECD work for Argentina	25
2.4.2. Is a devil's proof discriminatory?	26
2.4.3. Tax treaty policy	27
2.5. Conclusion	28

Chapter 3:	Spain: Attribution of Free Capital to PEs and Effectiveness of the Authorized OECD Approach	29
	<i>Alejandro García Heredia</i>	
3.1.	Introduction	29
3.2.	Facts of the case	30
3.2.1.	General overview	30
3.2.2.	Applicable legislation	31
3.2.3.	Position of the tax administration	32
3.2.4.	Position of the taxpayer	33
3.2.5.	The decision by the TEAC	35
3.3.	The court decision	37
3.3.1.	Banking regulations	37
3.3.2.	Domestic tax legislation	38
3.3.3.	Interpretation of the Spain-Netherlands tax treaty	38
3.3.4.	Most relevant reasoning	39
3.4.	Comments on the court's reasoning	39
3.4.1.	Connections between banking standards and tax rules: Effects on the allocation of free capital to PEs	40
3.4.2.	Effectiveness of the OECD <i>soft law</i> in tax treaty interpretation: Legitimacy of the authorized approach on PEs' profit attribution	43
3.5.	Conclusion	48
Chapter 4:	South Africa: Is an Exit Levy a Tax?	51
	<i>Jennifer Roeveland and Craig West</i>	
4.1.	Introduction	51
4.2.	Facts of the case	51
4.3.	The courts' decisions	52
4.3.1.	The High Court	52
4.3.2.	Supreme Court of Appeal	53
4.3.3.	Constitutional Court	54
4.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	56
4.5.	Conclusion	59
Chapter 5:	Poland: Residence of Individuals	61
	<i>Karolina Tetlak</i>	
5.1.	Introduction	61
5.2.	Facts of the case	63
5.3.	The Court decision	64

5.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	65
5.4.1.	Flawed reasoning	65
5.4.2.	What is relevant for the centre of vital interests	66
5.4.3.	How to calculate days of presence	70
5.4.4.	Role of the certificate of residence	72
5.5.	Conclusion	75
Chapter 6:	France: Tax-Exempt Entities Are Not Eligible for Tax Treaty Benefits	79
	<i>Daniel Gutmann</i>	
6.1.	Introduction	79
6.2.	Facts of the case	79
6.3.	The Court decision	80
6.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	80
6.5.	Conclusion	82
Chapter 7:	Portugal: Tax Residence Certification and Entitlement to Compensatory Interest within a Relief at Source System	85
	<i>João Félix Pinto Nogueira</i>	
7.1.	Introduction	85
7.2.	Facts of the case	86
7.2.1.	Introduction	86
7.2.2.	Legal framework	88
7.2.2.1.	Domestic law	88
7.2.2.2.	Tax treaty law	91
7.2.3.	Pleadings of the parties and procedures before this court's decision	92
7.3.	The court decision	93
7.4.	Comments on the court's reasoning	94
7.5.	Conclusion	98
Part Two		
Permanent Establishment		
Chapter 8:	Italy: Is there a Permanent Establishment?	105
	<i>Guglielmo Maisto</i>	
8.1.	Introduction	105
8.2.	Legal background and facts of the case	105

8.2.1.	Legal background	105
8.2.2.	Facts of the case	106
8.3.	The Court's decision	107
8.4.	Comments on the decision of the Supreme Court	108
Chapter 9:	The Spanish Saga on PEs: The <i>Dell</i> Judgment on “Commissionaires” and “Dependent Subsidiaries”	111
	<i>Adolfo Martín Jiménez</i>	
9.1.	Introduction	111
9.2.	Facts of the case	112
9.3.	The decision of the Central Administrative Tribunal (TEAC)	114
9.4.	The decision of the court (AN)	117
9.5.	Comments on the court's reasoning	122
9.5.1.	Continuity and heterodoxy in the judgment of the AN in <i>Dell</i>	122
9.5.2.	Actions 7 and 8-10 BEPS and the <i>Dell</i> case	124
9.6.	Conclusion	131
Chapter 10:	India: Sale of Airtime and Agency PE	133
	<i>D.P. Sengupta</i>	
10.1.	Introduction	133
10.2.	Facts of the case	134
10.2.1.	Advertisement revenue – Arguments of the taxpayer	135
10.2.2.	Arguments of the revenue authorities	136
10.2.3.	Revenue from distribution	137
10.3.	The Tribunal decision	137
10.3.1.	Whether advertisement airtime shall fall under the category of goods	137
10.3.2.	Principal and agent relationship	139
10.3.3.	Existence of PE	139
10.3.4.	Existence of PE – Dependent agent PE	140
10.3.5.	Applicability of <i>Morgan Stanley</i> decision	141
10.3.6.	On the issue of royalty	142
10.4.	Comments on the Tribunal's reasoning	142
10.5.	Conclusion	143

Chapter 11: South Africa: Curious Case of the Service PE	145
<i>Craig West and Jennifer Roeleveld</i>	
11.1. Introduction	145
11.2. Facts of the case	145
11.2.1. Appellant's argument	147
11.2.2. Commissioner's argument	147
11.2.3. For decision by the court	148
11.3. The Tax Court decision	148
11.3.1. Interpretation of articles 5(1) and 5(2)(k) of the DTA	148
11.3.2. The application of articles 5(2)(k) and 5(1) to the facts of the case	149
11.3.3. The appeal against the levying of taxation for the 2008 and 2009 years of assessment	150
11.3.4. The levying of additional tax by the respondent	151
11.3.5. The appeal against the interest	152
11.4. Comments on the Tax Court's reasoning	152
11.5. Conclusion	157
Part Three	
Business Profits and Transfer Pricing	
Chapter 12: Czech Republic: Case 2 Afs 8/2014-174	161
<i>Danuše Nerudová</i>	
12.1. Introduction	161
12.2. Facts of the case	161
12.3. The Court decision	164
12.4. Comments on the Court's reasoning	166
12.5. Conclusion	166
Chapter 13: Italy: Interest-Free Loans and Transfer Pricing	169
<i>Guglielmo Maisto</i>	
13.1. Introduction	169
13.2. Facts of the case	169
13.3. The Court's decision	170
13.4. Comments on the decision of the Court	172
13.5. Conclusion	173

Chapter 14: Luxembourg: Profit Adjustments for Interest-Free Loans in Accordance with Article 9	175
<i>Werner Haslehner</i>	
14.1. Introduction	175
14.2. Facts of the case	176
14.3. The court decision	177
14.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	178
14.5. Conclusion	182
Chapter 15: Australia: Pricing Money – The <i>Chevron</i> Case	185
<i>Graeme S. Cooper</i>	
15.1. Introduction	185
15.2. Facts of the case	185
15.3. The court decision	188
15.4. Comments on the court's reasoning and conclusion	196
Chapter 16: United States: The <i>Altera</i> Case	199
<i>Yariv Brauner</i>	
16.1. Introduction	199
16.2. Facts of the case	200
16.3. The court decision	201
16.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	206
16.5. Conclusion	209
Chapter 17: Germany: Timing Issues in case of Termination of a Permanent Establishment	211
<i>Alexander Rust</i>	
17.1. Facts of the case	211
17.2. The Court decision	212
17.3. Comments on the Court's reasoning	212
17.4. Conclusion	216

Part Four
Labour Income

Chapter 18: Germany: Taxing Right for a Golden Handshake and the Effect of a Mutual Agreement between the Competent Tax Authorities	219
<i>Alexander Rust</i>	
18.1. Facts of the case	219
18.2. The Court decision	220
18.3. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	222
18.3.1. The applicable distributive rule	222
18.3.2. The impact of the mutual agreement	224
18.4. Conclusion	226
Chapter 19: Austria: Termination Payments	227
<i>Michael Lang, Selina Siller and Stephanie Zolles</i>	
19.1. Introduction	227
19.2. Facts of the case	228
19.3. The Court’s decision	229
19.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	231
19.5. Conclusion	234
Chapter 20: Luxembourg: Application of Article 16 to a “Collège des Commissaires”	237
<i>Werner Haslehner</i>	
20.1. Introduction	237
20.2. Facts of the case	238
20.3. The Court decision	239
20.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	240
20.5. Conclusion	242
Chapter 21: Austria: Entertainers under Article 17	245
<i>Michael Lang, Selina Siller and Stephanie Zolles</i>	
21.1. Introduction	245
21.2. Facts of the case	246
21.3. The Court’s decision	247
21.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	248
21.4.1. The Court’s interpretation of the term “entertainer”	248

21.4.2.	Relevance of the English and German versions of the Austrian-US Tax Treaty	251
21.4.3.	The OECD Commentary on Article 17	253
21.5.	Conclusion	254
Chapter 22: Belgium: Article 17 OECD Model Still Entertaining Belgian Courts		257
	<i>Luc De Broe</i>	
22.1.	Introduction	257
22.2.	Supreme Court 9 January 2015	257
22.2.1.	Facts of the case	257
22.2.2.	The courts' decisions	259
22.2.2.1.	Appreciation by the court of first instance and the Court of Appeal	259
22.2.2.2.	Decision of the Supreme Court	260
22.2.3.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	260
22.2.3.1.	Taxing rights of Belgium under the Belgium-Ireland DTC	260
22.2.3.2.	Opinion of AG Thijs	261
22.2.3.3.	Article 228(2)(8°) Belgian ITC	262
22.2.3.3.1.	Article 228(2)(8°) ITC does not qualify as a "look-through" rule	263
22.2.3.3.2.	Article 228(2)(8°) ITC qualifies as a "look-through" rule	264
22.2.3.3.3.	Ambulatory interpretation of paragraph 8 of the 1992 Commentary on Article 17 OECD Model?	264
22.3.	Supreme Court 21 May 2015	266
22.3.1.	Facts of the case	266
22.3.2.	The courts' decisions	267
22.3.2.1.	Appreciation by the court of first instance and the Court of Appeal	267
22.3.2.2.	Decision of the Supreme Court	268
22.3.3.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	268
22.3.3.1.	Article 17(3) of the 1975 Belgium-Canada DTC	268
22.3.3.2.	Economic interpretation of article 17(1)	269
22.4.	Conclusion	270

Part Five
Beneficial Ownership, Royalties and Capital Gains

Chapter 23: Poland: Beneficial Ownership of Interest in the Context of Cash Pooling	275
<i>Karolina Tetlak</i>	
23.1. Introduction	275
23.2. Facts of the case	276
23.3. The Court decision	278
23.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	281
23.5. Conclusion	284
Chapter 24: Bolivia: Treaty Shopping and <i>Pacta Sunt Servanda</i>	287
<i>Alvaro Villegas Aldazosa</i>	
24.1. Introduction	287
24.2. Facts of the case	288
24.3. The Court decision	289
24.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	291
24.5. Conclusion	293
Chapter 25: Switzerland: “SWAP Case” and Beneficial Ownership	295
<i>Stefano Bernasconi and Michael Beusch</i>	
25.1. Introduction	295
25.2. Facts of the case	295
25.3. The Court decision	297
25.3.1. Beneficial ownership as an unwritten requirement of article 10(1) DK DTC	298
25.3.2. Components of the concept of beneficial ownership	299
25.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	301
25.5. Conclusion	303
Chapter 26: Argentina: Source-Country Approach: Article 7 versus Article 12	305
<i>Axel A. Verstraeten</i>	
26.1. Introduction	305
26.2. Facts the case	305
26.3. The courts’ decisions	306

Table of Contents

26.3.1.	Tax Court	306
26.3.2.	Federal Court of Appeals	307
26.4.	Comments on the court's reasoning	308
26.4.1.	The mechanics of tax treaties	308
26.4.2.	Know-how vs technical assistance	308
26.4.3.	Argentine-source extension	309
26.5.	Conclusion	310
Chapter 27: Australia: Royalties and Business Profits in the IT Sector		313
	<i>Graeme S. Cooper</i>	
27.1.	Introduction	313
27.2.	Facts of the case	314
27.3.	The court decision	315
27.4.	Comments on the court's reasoning and conclusion	318
Chapter 28: Netherlands: Exit Taxation of a Substantial Shareholder: Tax Treaty Override?		321
	<i>Eric C.C.M. Kemmeren</i>	
28.1.	Introduction	321
28.2.	Facts of the case	322
28.3.	The Court decision	323
28.3.1.	National tax law	323
28.3.2.	Tax treaty law	325
28.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	328
28.4.1.	Assumed aim of exit taxes: Taxation of capital appreciation of a substantial interest over period of domestic tax liability	330
28.4.2.	Test of exit tax to articles 26, 27 and 31 VCLT: Good faith	333
28.5.	Residence-based compartmentalization alternative for taxation of capital gains on shares	340
28.5.1.	Appealable order to fix income on which emigration state wants to preserve tax jurisdiction	341
28.5.2.	Compartmentalization of tax jurisdiction	342
28.5.3.	Decrease of value after departure taken into account in emigration state if not included in taxable base in new residence state	342
28.5.4.	Subsequent emigration may trigger taxable event	343
28.5.5.	Mutual assistance in tax collection	343

28.6.	An origin-based alternative for taxation of capital gains on shares	343
28.6.1.	Origin-based alternative in line with OECD's anti-BEPS starting-point	343
28.6.2.	V.1 International tax neutrality	345
28.6.3.	V.2 Origin-based taxation	347
28.6.4.	V.3 Origin-based allocation of tax jurisdiction on business profits, transferred profits and capital gains on shares	348
28.7.	Conclusion	350
Part Six		
Relief for Double Taxation and LOB		
Chapter 29: Denmark: Classification of Foreign Income; Double Non-Taxation? Article 26(2) of the Nordic Tax Treaty		
	<i>Søren Friis Hansen</i>	355
29.1.	Introduction	355
29.2.	Facts of the case	355
29.3.	The courts' decisions	356
29.4.	Comments on the courts' reasoning	357
29.5.	Conclusion	358
Chapter 30: Hungary: Application of Article 23 on Foreign Tax Credit for Lack of Taxable Net Income		
	<i>Dániel Deák</i>	359
30.1.	Introduction	359
30.2.	Facts of the case	359
30.3.	The Court decision	360
30.4.	Comments on the Court's reasoning	361
30.4.1.	Source-country tax on non-income	361
30.4.2.	Treaty law implications	363
30.4.3.	EU law implications	365
30.5.	Conclusion	365

Chapter 31: United States: The <i>Starr Int'l Case</i>	367
<i>Yariv Brauner</i>	
31.1. Introduction	367
31.2. Facts of the case	367
31.3. The court decision	369
31.3.1. The committed-to-agency-discretion exception	369
31.3.2. Committed to agency discretion	369
31.3.3. Political question doctrine	370
31.3.4. Final holding	371
31.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	371
31.5. Conclusion	372
Chapter 32: Netherlands: Triangular Case and Carve-Out Provision under Dutch-Maltese Tax Treaty	373
<i>Daniël Smit</i>	
32.1. Introduction	373
32.2. The applicable legal framework	373
32.3. The facts of the case	376
32.4. The courts' decisions	377
32.5. Comments on the Court's reasoning	378
32.6. Conclusion	381
Part Seven	
Non-Discrimination, Exchange of Information and Recovery	
Chapter 33: Portugal: Non-Discrimination and Access to Domestic Law Incentives for Individuals in the Residence State	385
<i>João Félix Pinto Nogueira</i>	
33.1. Introduction	385
33.2. Facts of the case	386
33.2.1. Introduction	386
33.2.2. Legal framework	387
33.2.3. Pleadings of the parties and procedures before this court's decision	388
33.3. The court decision	389
33.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	390
33.5. Conclusion	395

Chapter 34: Canada: The Canada-US Enhanced Information Exchange Agreement and the Canada-US Tax Treaty	397
<i>David G. Duff</i>	
34.1. Introduction	397
34.2. Facts of the case	399
34.3. The court decision	401
34.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	403
34.5. Conclusion	407
Chapter 35: Switzerland: Notion of the Persons Involved in the EoI Procedure	409
<i>Michael Beusch</i>	
35.1. Introduction	409
35.2. Facts of the case	410
35.3. The Court decision	411
35.4. Comments on the Court's reasoning	413
35.5. Conclusion	414
Chapter 36: Australia: Enforcing Tax Claims Cross-Border	415
<i>Graeme S. Cooper</i>	
36.1. Introduction	415
36.2. Facts of the case	416
36.3. The court decision	417
36.4. Comments on the Court's reasoning and conclusion	418
List of Cases	419
Contributors	423

Belgium: Article 17 OECD Model Still Entertaining Belgian Courts¹

Luc De Broe

22.1. Introduction

In 1963, article 17 of the OECD Model Convention (OECD Model), governing the tax regime of internationally performing artistes and athletes,² was introduced as an exception to the standard rules of articles 7 and 15 of the OECD Model to “avoid practical difficulties” which often arise in taxing these persons when they perform abroad.³ Since its enactment, however, article 17 of the OECD Model has been the subject of a great amount of case law and has caused considerable controversy in legal doctrine.⁴ Recent decisions of the Supreme Court confirm that this was no different in 2015.

22.2. Supreme Court 9 January 2015⁵

22.2.1. Facts of the case

A Belgian non-profit organization (“NPO”) was involved in the organization of concerts of non-resident entertainers. The fees for the performances were not paid directly to the international entertainers, but to a company resident in Ireland.⁶

1. BE: Supreme Court (*Cour de cassation/Hof van Cassatie*) (SC), 9 Jan. 2015, *VZW Altsien*, no. F.12.0112.N, and BE: SC, 21 May 2015, *S.A.D.S.*, no. F.140143.F.

2. Changed in 2014 to “entertainers and sportspersons”.

3. *OECD Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital: Commentary on Article 17* (1963) para. 2.

4. Inter alia, A. Cordewener, *Article 17. Entertainers and Sportspersons*, in *Klaus Vogel on Double Taxation Conventions*, 4th edn, vol. II, p. 1298 et seq. (E. Reimer & A. Rust eds., Kluwer Law International 2015).

5. On the same date, a similar decision was taken in relation to article 17 of the (1970) DTC concluded between Belgium and the Netherlands.

6. Based on the facts mentioned in the court decisions, it is not clear whether the entertainers were residents of Ireland or if they were shareholders or employees of the Irish company.

In accordance with Belgian domestic law, which provides for a withholding obligation irrespective of whether the income is paid to the entertainer or another person, the NPO withheld source tax at a rate of 18% on the amounts paid. However, as the NPO was of the opinion that Belgium was not granted the right to levy source taxation under the relevant provisions of the double tax treaty with Ireland, it submitted a request for refund of the tax paid. This request was rejected by the Belgian tax authorities.

The NPO appealed to the court of first instance of Leuven, arguing that the double tax treaty of 1970 concluded between Belgium and Ireland, based on the OECD Model (1963), did not allow Belgium to tax the income as it did not include a provision similar to article 17(2) of the OECD Model (1977). Consequently, fees not paid to the performer directly but to a non-resident company were not covered by article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland tax treaty. Instead, the NPO held, article 7 of the treaty was applicable, under which provision the income was not taxable in Belgium since the non-resident company did not have a PE in Belgium.

The Belgian tax authorities took the position that article 17 of the treaty allowed Belgium to tax all income from the entertainers' personal activities exercised in Belgium, regardless whether the income was paid to the entertainers or to another person. They relied on paragraph 8 of the Commentary on Article 17 of the OECD Model (1992).⁷ According to the tax authorities, a look-through provision as mentioned in the Commentary is included in article 228(2)(8°) of the Belgian Income Tax Code ("ITC"), stating that "income received by non-resident entertainers and sportspersons as a consideration for sport and artistic performances in Belgium is subject to Belgian wage tax, even if the income is not directly paid to the entertainer or sportsperson but to another individual or legal entity." As a consequence, the tax authorities argued that income paid to the Irish company was taxable in Belgium to withholding tax at a fixed rate of 18%.

7. Providing that article 17(1) "applies to income derived directly and indirectly from a performance by an individual entertainer or sportsperson ... In addition, where its domestic laws 'look through' such entities and treat the income as accruing directly to the individual, paragraph 1 enables that State to tax income derived from performances in its territory and accruing in the entity for the individual's benefit, even if the income is not actually paid as remuneration to the individual"; see para. 8, fifth sentence, *OECD Model: Commentary on Article 17(1)* (1992).

22.2.2. The courts' decisions

22.2.2.1. Appreciation by the court of first instance and the Court of Appeal

The court of first instance held that article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC is identical to the text of article 17(1) of the OECO Model (1992) and consequently these provisions must be given the same interpretation.

It found that article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC applies to income that is derived either directly or indirectly by the entertainer from his personal activities. Regarding the question whether Belgian domestic law contains a “look-through” provision,⁸ the court of first instance, contrary to the tax authorities' position, found that article 228(2)(8°) of the Belgian ITC did not allow disregarding the legal entity receiving the income. In particular, it held that the “look-through” aspect of article 228(2)(8°) is negated by the fact that this provision also applies in case the income is not paid to a legal entity, but to an individual different from the performer. The court held that “this evidences that this provision does not allow to *disregard* the entity receiving the income” and considered article 228(2)(8°) of the Belgian ITC equivalent to article 17(2) of the OECD Model (1977).

Since in the present case the income was paid to a company and a “look-through” provision was not available, article 7 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC was to be applied. However, the court of first instance concluded that as the Irish company did not have a permanent establishment (PE) in Belgium, the fees it received were not taxable in Belgium.

The Court of Appeal, adhering to the reasoning of the court of first instance, confirmed its decision that the income was not taxable in Belgium.⁹

8. Thereby applying paragraph 8 of the Commentary on Article 17(1).

9. On the grounds that (i) income paid to an Irish company in respect of personal activities exercised by an entertainer in Belgium is not covered by the text of article 17 of the DTC; (ii) article 228(2)(8°) of the Belgian ITC does not qualify as a “look-through” rule since it explicitly recognizes the existence of the non-resident entity (or individual) receiving the income instead of disregarding it, and that therefore this provision corresponds to article 17(2) of the 1977 OECD Model and (iii) the income was governed by article 7 of the Belgium-Ireland treaty, which was not applicable due to lack of a Belgian PE of the Irish company.

22.2.2.2. Decision of the Supreme Court

In a brief judgment, the Supreme Court found that Belgian domestic law (inter alia, the aforementioned “look-through” provision) allows the taxation of income derived from sport and artistic performances carried out by non-residents without the intervention of a PE, even in case the income is not paid to the entertainer or sports person but to a non-resident company.

However, the Supreme Court emphasized that double tax treaties have priority over Belgian domestic law. Consequently, if there is a treaty between Belgium and the state of residence of the company, the domestic provision in itself cannot confer tax jurisdiction on Belgium, but must be applied together with the provisions of the double tax treaty. Article 7 of the treaty prevents Belgium from levying tax on an Irish company with no PE in Belgium. Article 17 of the DTC, on the other hand, does not permit taxation in Belgium of fees paid to an Irish company for the performance of an artiste.

22.2.3. Comments on the Court’s reasoning

22.2.3.1. Taxing rights of Belgium under the Belgium-Ireland DTC

Based on the OECD Model (1977), states in which a non-resident entertainer exercises his (artistic) activities through an interposed company are granted the right to tax the income from those activities provided that they have concluded a DTC with the entertainer’s residence state that includes a provision similar to article 17(2). As from 1992, the Commentary on the OECD Model provides that performance states (alternatively) have tax jurisdiction in such a case if their domestic law includes a so-called “look-through” provision that allows them to disregard the person receiving the income and to tax it as the entertainer’s income.

Article 17 of the 1970 DTC concluded between Belgium and Ireland is identical to article 17 of the OECD Model (1963), which did not include a second paragraph that would entitle Belgium to tax the income paid to “another person”. Consequently, the case at hand concerns two key questions:

- (1) Whether Belgian domestic law provides for a measure that allows the Belgian tax authorities to disregard the interposed company to tax the individual entertainer on his performance-related income (i.e. a so-called “look-through” rule).

- (2) Provided that such a rule is available, whether Belgium is allowed to apply the 1992 Commentary to Article 17 on an ambulatory basis to tax income based on the 1970 DTC with Ireland.

22.2.3.2. Opinion of AG Thijs

As regards the question whether Belgian income tax law provides for a look-through provision, Advocate-General Thijs considers that the Belgian withholding tax is due by the person paying the performance-related income mentioned in article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC to the entertainer, thereby acting as a debtor, depository or intermediary. In the absence of such a person, this obligation lies on the organizer of the event. AG Thijs disagrees with the Court of Appeal. In his view, article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC makes abstraction of the third party to which the income accrues since under this provision, the actual taxpayer is not the non-resident company but the entertainer who received the income as a consideration for his performance.

As regards the second question, AG Thijs examines whether the application of such a domestic “look-through” provision would be prevented by the Belgium-Ireland DTC. The AG finds that article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC is equivalent to article 17(1) of the OECD Model (1992) and therefore the Commentary to the OECD Model (1992) also applies in case the income is derived by the entertainer directly as well as indirectly through another person. The AG refers to paragraph 8 of the Commentary to the OECD Model (1992) and finds that it also applies to the OECD Model (1963), even more so because article 17(1) remained unchanged.

Furthermore, AG Thijs invokes the concept of the ambulatory interpretation of the OECD Model contained in paragraph 35 of its Commentary,¹⁰ to conclude that the Commentary to the OECD Model (1992) is applicable to the DTC agreed between Belgium and Ireland.

Based on this reasoning, article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC allows Belgium to tax the income derived by the entertainer, as provided for under

10. Which the OECD member countries themselves subscribed to in accordance with the principles contained in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969 and providing that “changes or additions to the Commentaries are normally applicable to the interpretation and application of conventions concluded before their adoption, because they reflect the consensus of the OECD Member countries as to the proper interpretation of existing provisions and their application to specific situations.”

article 228(2)(8°) of the Belgian ITC, regardless of whether that income was paid to him directly by the organizer or indirectly via a non-resident company.

22.2.3.3. Article 228(2)(8°) Belgian ITC

The Belgian tax authorities have consistently taken the position that article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC allows them to disregard non-resident companies and tax the individual entertainer on the income/remuneration he receives from such companies for activities performed as an entertainer. In this regard, the Notice of 25 April 1997 issued by the Belgian Ministry of Finance¹¹ on the application of article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC explicitly provides for the obligation, in principle, of the Belgian organizer to withhold 18% Belgian wage tax on the full performance-related income paid to the non-resident company. However, an exemption applies to the amounts that are attributable to the company as its “own income” (i.e. income received by the company for its own benefit).^{12,13}

The Belgian tax authorities are thus of the opinion that article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC qualifies as a “look-through” rule since it allows the taxation of income derived from sport and artistic performances carried out by non-resident sportspersons or entertainers in the absence of a PE, even if this income is not paid to the entertainer or sportsperson but to a non-resident

11. Updated and confirmed by Circular Letter Ci.RH.244/536.588 of 16 October 2001, as well as the responses of the Federal Minister of Finance to the following parliamentary questions: question no. 986 of Representative Daems of 18 July 1997, *Vr. en Antw. Kamer*, no. 100, 1996-1997 and question no. 283 of Senator Hatry of 18 July 1997, *Vr. en Antw. Senaat*, no. 1-57, 1997-1998.

12. Provided that (i) the company did not arrange the performance through a Belgian PE and (ii) article 17 of the applicable DTC does not include a provision similar to article 17(2) of the OECD Model. The company’s “own income” is thereby defined as the difference between the total fee received from the Belgian organizer and the amount which the company will have to pay on to the entertainer from whose personal activities the income was derived.

13. The Notice furthermore states that “it is self-evident that, notwithstanding this exemption for the company’s ‘own income’, the Belgian organizer is still required to withhold the wage tax on the ‘part of the income intended to be paid onto the entertainers or sportspersons.’” Should the company fail to provide the Belgian organizer with the necessary evidence of entitlement to the exemption at source, however, then the latter is “strongly recommended” to withhold the tax on the full amount paid, for which the company could request a refund afterwards. After all, the obligation to withhold the wage tax lies with the Belgian organizer who is liable in case insufficient tax has been withheld.

company. This position, however, has been heavily criticized by legal scholars¹⁴ and was accepted in jurisprudence only once.^{15,16}

In its decision of 9 January 2015, the Supreme Court held that Belgium is not allowed to tax income paid by a Belgian organizer to non-resident companies in consideration for performances of entertainers or sportspersons based solely on its domestic law (i.e. article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC). This decision, however, leaves the question whether Belgian domestic law includes a look-through provision unanswered. It also remains silent on the issue whether article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC is to be interpreted on an ambulatory basis. As the Supreme Court provides no clarity on these key questions whatsoever, it is submitted that this decision can be based on either one of the two premises discussed hereafter.

22.2.3.3.1. *Article 228(2)(8°) ITC does not qualify as a “look-through” rule*

The Supreme Court’s rejection of Belgian tax jurisdiction might hinge on the denial of the qualification as a “look-through” provision of article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC.

Under the assumption that Belgian domestic law does not include a “look-through” rule, Belgium cannot tax an individual entertainer’s performance income on the basis of article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC if the income accrues to an Irish company. As explained above,¹⁷ Belgium’s taxing right would require either (i) the inclusion in the treaty of a provision similar to article 17(2) of the OECD Model (1997) or (ii) a domestic rule which allows the tax authorities to disregard the person receiving the income and to tax it as the entertainer’s income. In the absence of a second paragraph to Article 17 of the DTC, a domestic “look-through” provision becomes a *conditio sine qua non* for the application of article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC. Hence, if article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC is not considered to be such a rule, then article 7 of the DTC is applicable, based on which Belgium is not granted the right to tax the company’s income as the Irish company does not have a PE located in Belgium.

14. Inter alia, P. Hinnekens, Fisk. Int. 162, p. 6 et seq. (1997); A. Nijs, Fisk. Int. 168, p. 1 et seq. (1997); D. Deschrijver, Intertax 26, p. 145 et seq. (1998); W. Coppens & J. Reniers, AFT 50, p. 522 et seq. (2000); W. Claes & P. Hinnekens, Fisc. Int. 263, p. 5 et seq. (2005).

15. BE: Ghent, 13 June 2006, 2002/AR/1211.

16. See Cordewener, *supra* n. 4, at p. 1344, n. 199.

17. See section 22.2.3.1.

22.2.3.3.2. *Article 228(2)(8°) ITC qualifies as a “look-through” rule*

The Supreme Court decision of 9 January 2015 does not explicitly deny the qualification of article 228(2)(8°) of the ITC as a provision allowing the tax authorities to disregard the interposed company in order to tax the individual entertainer’s performance income. It is thus possible that the Supreme Court considers article 228(2)(8°) a “look-through” provision while at the same time rejecting its application. If this is a correct interpretation of the Supreme Court’s decision, it can be said that the Court has implicitly refused the ambulatory interpretation of paragraph 8 of the Commentary on Article 17 of the OECD Model (1992).

This hypothesis equally leads to the non-applicability of article 17 of the Belgium-Ireland DTC and results in the denial of taxing rights of Belgium in the absence of a PE of the Irish company.

22.2.3.3.3. *Ambulatory interpretation of paragraph 8 of the 1992 Commentary on Article 17 OECD Model?*

As stated above, the Supreme Court remains silent on the question whether Belgium is allowed to apply the 1992 Commentary to Article 17 to tax income based on the 1970 DTC with Ireland.

It has been argued in legal doctrine that interpreting the OECD Commentary on an ambulatory basis is appropriate as long as changes thereto serve as mere clarifications or elaborations of existing treaty provisions. Conversely, such an interpretation should not be allowed when revisions of the Commentary are in fact amendments of the treaty.¹⁸

As mentioned above,¹⁹ the first version of article 17 of the OECD Model (1963) contained only one paragraph, which was equivalent in substance to article 17(1) of (subsequent) versions of the OECD Model. The Commentary on Article 17 of the OECD Model (1963) provided that “Article 17 relate[s] to public entertainers and athletes and stipulate[s] that they may be taxed in the State in which the activities are performed, whether these are of an independent or of a dependent nature....”²⁰ Based on an

18. D. Ward, J. Avery Jones & L. De Broe, *The Interpretation of Income Tax Treaties with Particular Reference to the Commentaries on the OECD Model* (IBFD 2005); H.J. Ault, *Intertax* 4, p. 148 (1994); S. Van Crombrugge, *Fisc. Int.* 274, p. 5 (2006).

19. See section 22.2.3.1.

20. See para. 1 *OECD Model: Commentary on Article 17* (1963).

analysis of the drafting history of article 17 of the OECD Model and the Commentary thereon, it can be argued that it is appropriate to consider paragraph 8 of the 1992 version of the Commentary to the Belgian-Ireland DTC concluded in 1970 on an ambulatory basis.²¹ Arguably, however, there are arguments in support of the contrary as well.²²

In its decision of 9 January 2015, the Supreme Court does not reveal its position on the ambulatory interpretation of the 1992 Commentary on Article 17 (1) of the 1977 (and subsequent) versions of the OECD Model. However, should the Supreme Court consider article 228(2)(8^o) of the Belgian ITC a “look-through” rule, then this would imply an implicit rejection of the application of paragraph 8 of the Commentary on Article 17 of treaties concluded prior to 1992 (*see* section 22.2.3.3.2.).

21. The 1963 version of the Commentary indicates that for the application of article 17, it is not required that the income accrues to the entertainer directly. On the contrary, it can be inferred from the expression “stipulate[s] that they may be taxed in the State in which the activities are performed” that the tax should be borne by the entertainer. This is the case when the tax burden weighs on the entertainer’s income, either directly or indirectly. Conversely, article 17 of the OECD Model (1963) cannot be applied to tax income that is not paid for the benefit of the entertainer (such as income derived from the artistic performance by another person for his own benefit). Assuming that article 17(1) of the OECD Model envisaged the taxation of the person who actually exercised the activity, regardless of whether that person received the income directly or indirectly, as long as the income is taxable under the source state’s domestic “look-through” rule, then paragraph 8 of the 1992 Commentary on Article 17 does not widen the scope of article 17(1) but merely explains its application and the limits thereto.

22. Article 17 of the OECD Model (1963) was extended with an extra measure (paragraph 2) in 1977 to combat tax avoidance since many countries could not tax the income of interposed companies based on the text of article 17(1) of the OECD Model, resulting in a loss of taxing rights. It can be argued that this extension was inserted into the OECD Model with the intention to enlarge the scope of the 1963 version of article 17 considerably. Yet, this anti-avoidance measure only resolved the issue in cases where the double tax treaties contained a provision similar to article 17(2). Therefore, the 1992 version of the Commentary was revised to grant taxing rights to source states on income derived from sport and artistic performances paid to companies, provided that their domestic law allowed them to “look through” such entities. Against this background, the 1992 Update of the Commentary does not seem to merely “clarify” or “formulate more precisely” article 17(1) of the OECD Model and one might question the validity of an interpretation of article 17 of the 1970 Belgium-Ireland DTC on an ambulatory basis.

22.3. Supreme Court 21 May 2015

22.3.1. Facts of the case

During the tax years 1996 and 1997, a Canadian-resident individual performed as a singer at a concert in Belgium. The fees for the performance were not paid to the singer directly but to a French company, in which neither the singer nor any person associated with her held a participation. The French company subsequently paid a fee as a consideration for the singer's performance to a Canadian company owned by the singer.²³

As the Belgian concert organizer was not able to determine the “own income” of the French company derived from the artistic performance, it withheld source taxation amounting to 18% on the full amount of the fees paid as a consideration for the artistic performance as if they were entirely derived by the entertainer from her personal activities.²⁴

The Canadian company requested a refund of this wage tax, arguing that the DTC concluded between Belgium and Canada applicable at the time²⁵ did not allow Belgium to tax the income, based on the last paragraph of article 17. In particular, article 17 of the 1975 Belgium-Canada double tax treaty stated the following:

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Articles VII, XIV and XV income derived by entertainers, such as theatre, motion picture, radio or television artistes, and musicians, and by athletes, from their personal activities as such may be taxed in the Contracting State in which these activities are exercised.
2. Where income in respect of personal activities as such of an entertainer or athlete accrues not to that entertainer or athlete himself but to another person that income may, notwithstanding the provisions of Articles VII, XIV and XV, be taxed in the Contracting State in which the activities of the entertainer or athlete are exercised.
3. The provisions of paragraph 2 shall not apply if the entertainer or the athlete establishes that neither he nor any person associated with him participate directly or indirectly in the profits of the person referred to in that paragraph.

23. Although not explicitly mentioned, it is assumed that the entertainer was not employed by the French company.

24. This approach is in line with the recommendation of the Belgian Ministry of Finance's Notice of 25 April 1997, according to which the French company in the case at hand would qualify for a refund of wage tax that was (unduly) withheld by the Belgian organizer; *see* section 22.2.3.3.

25. *Convention between Canada and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the settlement of other matters with respect to taxes on income of 29 May 1975.*

According to the Belgian tax authorities, the income paid to the French company was taxable in Belgium under article 17(1) of the 1975 DTC concluded with Canada in so far as it concerned income earned from the singer's personal activities in Belgium.²⁶

The entertainer took the position that the 1975 Belgium-Canada DTC did not allow taxation of the income by Belgium, arguing that as the income accrued to the French company, it could only be taxed by Belgium on the basis of article 17(2). However, this article did not apply because the conditions of article 17(3) were fulfilled, which provided for an exception to paragraph 2. Thus, as the singer had demonstrated that she nor any person associated with her participated directly or indirectly in the profits of the French company, the fee for the performance could not be taxed by Belgium under article 17 of the 1975 Belgium-Canada DTC.

22.3.2. The courts' decisions

22.3.2.1. Appreciation by the court of first instance and the Court of Appeal

On 18 April 2002, the court of first instance confirmed the Belgian tax authorities' administrative decision. Ten years later (19 December 2012), the Court of Appeal, however, held that the entertainer had never been a shareholder or manager of the French company and the fee for the artistic performance was governed by an agreement between the French production company and the Canadian company owned by the performer. Consequently, article 17(3) of the 1975 Belgium-Canada DTC applied to the income paid to the French company and precluded the application of article 17(2). The Court of Appeal concluded that as the income accrued to the French company and the entertainer had provided evidence that article 17(3) of the 1975 Belgium-Canada DTC was applicable, Belgium was not entitled to tax the fee at source under article 17(2) of the treaty, even though the fee also included the entertainer's own income.

26. In particular, the administrative decision rejecting the entertainer's request for a refund of the tax paid stated that "the exemption of the wage tax could be granted as regards the fees paid by the Belgian concert organizer to the French company to the extent that it concerned the French company's own profits."

22.3.2.2. Decision of the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court considered that Article 17(1) of the Belgium-Canada DTC sets out the rule governing “income derived by entertainers ... from their personal activities as such”, which “may be taxed in the Contracting State in which these activities are exercised”, whereas article 17(2) and (3) provides for (i) an extension (paragraph 2) of the rule included in the first paragraph with regard to income derived from such activities that “accrues to a person different from the entertainer ... himself” and (ii) an exception (paragraph 3) to that extension “if the entertainer ... establishes [that he does not participate] directly or indirectly in the profits of the person referred to in [the second] paragraph.”

According to the Supreme Court, it follows from those provisions that if the entertainer establishes, in accordance with article 17(3), that the income accruing to another person is not taxable under article 17(2), the income that is paid for the entertainer’s own benefit is nonetheless taxable in the contracting state in which the artistic performance was exercised on the basis of article 17(1). Hence, taxation of an entertainer’s performance income that he received for his own benefit on the basis of article 17(1) is not prevented by the application of article 17(3) of the 1975 Belgium-Canada DTC.

22.3.3. Comments on the Court’s reasoning

22.3.3.1. Article 17(3) of the 1975 Belgium-Canada DTC

As mentioned above,²⁷ article 17(2) of the OECD Model was added in 1977 as a measure against tax avoidance through the use of star companies. Under this provision, source countries that did not provide for a “look-through” rule were granted the right to tax income from artistic performances where this income does not accrue to the entertainer himself but to another person. It was explained in the 1977 Commentary that the purpose of paragraph 2 was to counter the use of star company tax avoidance schemes by self-employed top artistes and sportsmen.²⁸

27. See section 22.2.3.1.

28. See para. 4 *OECD Model: Commentary on Article 17* (1977): “The purpose of paragraph 2 is to counteract tax avoidance devices in cases where remuneration for the performance of an entertainer or athlete is not paid to the entertainer or athlete himself but to another person, e.g. a so-called artiste-company,... Paragraph 2 permits the State in which the performance is given to impose a tax on the profits diverted from the

Contributors

Stefano Bernasconi (attorney at law) was employed at the Swiss Federal Administrative Court between 2011 and 2016. He served as a law clerk in the Tax Chamber.

Michael Beusch (PhD, Dr.iur., attorney at law) is a judge at the Swiss Federal Administrative Court, where he served as Vice-President for the term 2011/12. He acts as second vice-president of the International Association of Tax Judges (IATJ). Since 2001, he lectures on tax law at the University of Zurich. The co-editor of *Commentaries on Swiss Tax Law*, he has also published numerous articles in various fields of (international) tax and (general) procedural law.

Yariv Brauner is a University of Florida Research Foundation Professor and Professor of Law with the Levin College of Law at the University of Florida. He joined the Florida faculty in 2006, after teaching at NYU, Northwestern University and ASU. He has been a Visiting Professor or a guest speaker in various universities in the United States and abroad. He is an author of several articles published in professional journals and law reviews, and a co-author of *U.S. International Taxation – Cases and Materials* (with Reuven S. Avi-Yonah and Diane M. Ring), now in its 3rd edition. He has taught multiple courses in the fields of Taxation, Corporate Taxation, International Taxation, International Economic Law, International Trade Law and the Law of Multinational Corporations. He holds an LLB, 1996, Hebrew University School of Law, an LLM in International Taxation, 1998 and a JSD, 2003, New York University School of Law.

Luc De Broe is Professor in International and European Tax Law at KU Leuven, where he is also Director of the Master in Taxation. He is the holder of the Deloitte Chair in International and EU Tax Law and a partner at Laga in Brussels.

Graeme Cooper is Professor of Taxation Law at the University of Sydney and a consultant to Greenwoods & Herbert Smith Freehills in Sydney. He has previously taught at Virginia, Harvard and Tilburg universities, NYU and KU Leuven, has worked on projects for the OECD, IMF, World Bank, United Nations, ASEAN and the governments of several foreign countries.

Dániel Deák is employed as a full professor at the Corvinus University of Budapest, Business Administration Faculty. He teaches and does research

inside and outside Hungary on the subject of comparative and international business law and taxation. From 1998 until 2015 he was the president of the Hungarian national branch of the International Fiscal Association. In addition to being active as a scholar, from time to time he is also invited by Hungarian or European public agencies – including the Hungarian Finance Ministry, the Ministry of Justice, TAXUD and the Internal Market DG of the European Commission – to provide expert opinion, while being expected to promote Hungarian and Community legislation.

David G. Duff is Professor of Law and Director of the Tax LLM programme at the Peter A. Allard School of Law at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada. Prior to joining the law faculty at the University of British Columbia in 2009, Professor Duff was a member of the Faculty of Law at the University of Toronto, which he joined in 1996 after 2 years at the Toronto office of Stikeman Elliott, LLP. In addition to numerous articles on domestic and international tax law and policy, he is the leading author of casebooks on Canadian income tax law and the taxation of business organizations in Canada, has co-authored a book on accident law and co-edited books on Canadian climate change policy and tax avoidance in Canada. He has also served as a consultant to the Canadian Department of Justice, the Alberta Department of Justice, the Ontario Panel on the Role of Government and the Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Bombing of Air India Flight 182.

Craig Elliffe is a professor, specializing in taxation, at the University of Auckland Law School. Before taking a chair at the University, he was a tax partner at KPMG for 14 years and a tax partner at Chapman Tripp (New Zealand's largest law firm) for 9 years. His particular research areas are in international tax, tax avoidance and capital gains tax reform. He is the author of *International and Cross-Border Taxation in New Zealand* (Thomson Reuters 2015). He is the Director of the University of Auckland's Master of Taxation Studies programme and has written extensively on tax issues. He holds both a Bachelor of Commerce and a Bachelor of Law degree (honours) from the University of Otago, New Zealand, and a Master of Law degree from Cambridge University. He is a member of the New Zealand Committee of the International Fiscal Association and a member of the Permanent Scientific Committee of IFA International.

Søren Friis Hansen is Professor of International Company Law at the Copenhagen Business School. He was a member of the committee that prepared the Danish Companies Act of 2009. His research deals with Danish company and tax law as well as European company and tax law.

Alejandro García Heredia is Tax Law Professor at the University of Cádiz (Spain). He has a PhD (University of Oviedo, 2006) and is visiting professor at other Spanish and foreign universities. Professor García Heredia is also author of several contributions on international and EU tax law.

Daniel Gutmann is Professor of Tax Law at the Sorbonne Law School (University Paris-1), where he is Director of a Master in Business and Tax Law and of a research centre in taxation (Sorbonne-Fiscalité). He is a partner at CMS Bureau Francis Lefebvre and a member of the Scientific Committee of the French branch of the International Fiscal Association (IFA). Professor Gutmann is the author of a book on business tax law, *Droit fiscal des affaires* (published by Lextenso, 7th edition, 2016), which was awarded the Legal Book Special Prize by the French Constitutional Court and the Club des Juristes.

Werner Haslechner is Professor of Law with the Faculty of Law, Economics and Finance at the University of Luxembourg, where he holds the ATOZ Chair for European and International Taxation and serves as Director of its LLM Programme in European and International Tax Law. He joined the Faculty as Associate Professor in 2013 after holding full-time academic positions at JKU Linz and the LSE, and was appointed Full Professor in 2015. His research concerns all aspects of international taxation, including the impact of EU law, and tax policy. He is a member of IFA Luxembourg's academic committee, as well as of the ECJ Task Force of the CFE, and a deputy member of the academic committee of the EATLP.

Eric C.C.M. Kemmeren is Professor of International Tax Law and International Taxation and Head of Department of the Tax Economics department at the Fiscal Institute Tilburg of Tilburg University. He is also a member of the board of the European Tax College, a Deputy Justice of the Arnhem Court of Appeals (Tax Division) and Of counsel at Ernst & Young Belastingadviseurs LLP in Rotterdam.

Michael Lang is Head of the Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law of WU (Vienna University of Economics and Business) and Academic Director of both the LLM Program in International Tax Law and the Doctoral Program in International Business Taxation (DIBT) of this university. He is President of the Austrian Branch of the International Fiscal Association and has been visiting professor at Georgetown University, New York University, the Sorbonne, Bocconi University, Peking University (PKU) and the University of New South Wales (Sydney), as well as other universities.

Guglielmo Maisto founded Maisto e Associati in 1991. He is a Professor of International and Comparative Tax Law at the Università Cattolica di Piacenza and president of the Italian Branch of the International Fiscal Association (IFA), as well as being a member of IFA's Permanent Scientific Committee. In addition to being a member of the Board of Trustees of the International Bureau of Fiscal Documentation (IBFD), he is member of the Advisory Board of the Master of Advanced Studies in International Taxation of Lausanne University, member of the Practice Council of New York University (NYU) Law's International Tax Program and member of the Board of the American Chamber of Commerce in Italy. He represents the Italian Association of Industries (Confindustria) at the OECD Business Industry Advisory Committee in Paris and has acted as a consultant to the Ministry for European Community Affairs and was a member of the EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum. Professor Maisto is a member of several law societies and on the editorial board of various Italian and foreign tax legal journals. He participates regularly as a speaker at numerous annual tax conferences.

Adolfo Martín Jiménez is Professor of Tax Law and Director of the Master in Tax Law at the University of Cádiz, Spain.

Danuše Nerudová is Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Accounting and Taxes of the Faculty of Economics and Business, Mendel University in Brno, as well as a researcher at the Research Centre of the same faculty. She lectures on international taxation and is the author of several books and papers on international taxation and tax harmonization within the European Union.

João Félix Pinto Nogueira holds a PhD in Tax Law and acts as Adjunct of IBFD's Academic Chairman. His areas of expertise are international and European tax law, fields in which he has published a dissertation and several articles. He has more than 10 years of experience in teaching at post-graduate level and is currently responsible for several Master's courses on EU Tax Law, taught in different languages. He is a member of EATLP, IFA and the Portuguese Fiscal Association, as well as serving as the current YIN-IFA representative for Portugal and is also a member of the Executive Board of IFA Portugal and of ILADT. A visiting professor at the Universidade Católica Portuguesa (Lisbon and Oporto, Portugal) and the University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Jennifer Roeleveld is Professor and Head of Postgraduate Taxation Studies in the Faculty of Commerce, University of Cape Town. She is a Char-

tered Accountant and holds an LLM in taxation. Jennifer is the president of the South African branch of IFA and member of the permanent scientific committee of IFA. In South Africa, she is a member of the editorial board of the *Integritax Journal of SAICA*. She is co-author of *Jutas Income Tax* and author of a number of other text books and articles, both local and international. She is a registered tax practitioner in South Africa

Alexander Rust is Professor of Tax Law at the Vienna University of Business and Economics. Prior to his appointment in Vienna he held positions at NYU and the University of Luxembourg. Alexander frequently lectures on tax treaties and EU tax law at universities around the world.

D.P. Sengupta joined the Indian Revenue Service in 1975 and retired as Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Delhi. He served as Joint Secretary in the Tax Policy and Legislation Division of the Ministry of Finance. He was also the former Joint Secretary of the Foreign Tax division in the Ministry of Finance and was the Competent Authority for India. He is currently the Principal Consultant to the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, New Delhi.

Selina Siller is a research and teaching assistant and PhD candidate at the Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law of the WU (Vienna University of Economics and Business).

Daniël Smit is a professor in taxation at the Fiscal Institute Tilburg, Tilburg University and the author of more than 100 national and international publications in the field of European and international tax law. In June 2012, his PhD thesis was awarded the prestigious European Academic Tax Thesis Award 2012. Professor Smit has furthermore acted as a speaker at various national and international seminars and conferences and as a guest lecturer at various universities in the Netherlands and abroad. In addition, he is employed at EY since 2002 and is currently part of the EU Tax Services team in Amsterdam.

Karolina Tetlak is Assistant Professor in Tax Law at the University of Warsaw, Poland. She holds an LLM in Taxation from Harvard University Law School and a PhD from the University of Poland. She specializes in international taxation, in particular, the tax treatment of entertainment and sports events.

Axel A. Verstraeten practises as a lawyer and is a partner at Levene Law Firm. He holds an LLM in International Taxation from the University of

Florida and is a Teaching Assistant at the Universidad de Buenos Aires and the Universidad Torcuato Di Tella.

Alvaro Villegas Aldazosa holds an LLM in International Taxation from the University of Florida. In 2010, he founded the Bolivian Branch of the International Fiscal Association and serves as its president since 2014. He is member of the Jury and Director of the Latin American Research Prize of IFA. As the Graduate Professor and Coordinator of the Tax Program at Universidad UPSA and member of the Academic Advisory Board of graduate studies, he is a visiting tax professor at Universidad Católica Boliviana and Universidad Autónoma Gabriel René Moreno in Bolivia, as well as at Universidad Andina Simon Bolivar in Quito, Ecuador. He practises as a partner at the Tufiño & Villegas law firm.

Craig West holds a PhD degree and is an Associate Professor of Taxation at the UCT Tax Institute for Fiscal Research and in the Department of Finance and Tax at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. He is the Secretary-General of the South African branch of IFA and a Chartered Accountant (SA). Craig has various publications both South African and international. He is currently serving as a postdoctoral research fellow at IBFD in Amsterdam.

Stephanie Zolles is a research and teaching assistant and PhD candidate at the Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law of the WU (Vienna University of Economics and Business).

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
Web: www.ibfd.org



IBFD, Your Portal to Cross-Border Tax Expertise