

Harm Mark Pit

Dispute Resolution in the EU

The EU Arbitration
Convention and the Dispute
Resolution Directive

IBFD DOCTORAL SERIES

42

Dispute Resolution in the EU

Why this book?

The resolution of international tax disputes is an important element of the OECD/G20 BEPS Project, and the outflow of this Project is likely to further accelerate the steady rising of these types of disputes. Within the European Union, there has, since 1990, already been a mechanism available to resolve transfer pricing disputes among Member States (disputes on the allocation of income between associated enterprises and on the attribution of profits to permanent establishments), namely the EU Arbitration Convention. Since its adoption, the Convention has been an important instrument in resolving these disputes. Furthermore, as from 2002, attempts have been made to improve the Convention's function via a Code of Conduct, which has been developed by the EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum.

The first part of this book discusses, analyses and evaluates the governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention. The primary focus is on whether the current provisions in that Convention, supplemented by the Code of Conduct, are sufficient to enable transfer pricing disputes to be resolved within a timeframe of 3.5 years. Attention is also paid to the legal and governmental structure of the Convention, its embedment in the European legal order and the number of cases dealt with under its procedures. Based on this description and analysis, detailed recommendations are presented to improve the Convention's governmental structure and its functioning.

The second part of the book focuses on recent developments regarding tax dispute resolution within the European Union: the adoption of the Directive on tax dispute resolution mechanisms in 2017. Next to discussing and analysing the background of its adoption, its objectives and its provisions, the book also includes an evaluation as to whether the Directive – for each of its proceedings and on an overall level – will constitute an improvement to tax dispute resolution within the European Union.

Title:	Dispute Resolution in the EU
Subtitle:	The EU Arbitration Convention and the Dispute Resolution Directive
Author(s):	Harm Mark Pit
Date of publication:	December 2018
ISBN:	978-90-8722-466-0 (print/online), 978-90-8722-467-7 (ePub), 978-90-8722-468-4 (PDF)
Type of publication:	Book
Number of pages:	1,816
Terms:	Shipping fees apply. Shipping information is available on our website
Price (print/online):	EUR 165 / USD 195 (VAT excl.)
Price (eBook: ePub or PDF):	EUR 132 / USD 156 (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

© 2018 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 978-90-8722-466-0 (print)

ISBN 978-90-8722-467-7 (eBook, ePub)

ISBN 978-90-8722-468-4 (eBook, PDF)

ISSN 1570-7164

NUR 826

Table of Contents

Preface

Abstract

List of Abbreviations

Table of Contents

lxv

lxvii

lxxv

Introduction

1. Introductory Remarks	1
2. Clarification of the Research Subject	2
2.1. Basic features of the EU Arbitration Convention	2
2.2. New developments: The Dispute Resolution Directive	4
2.3. Previous studies concerning dispute resolution within the European Union	5
2.4. Necessity of an in-depth study of the EU Arbitration Convention	7
3. Aim and Purpose of this Book	9
4. Research Questions	11
4.1. Research questions in relation to the EU Arbitration Convention	11
4.2. Research question in relation to the Dispute Resolution Directive	13
5. Theoretical Framework	13
5.1. EU Arbitration Convention	13
5.1.1. Testing the Convention's governance	13
5.1.2. Testing the Convention's functioning	15
5.1.3. Improving the EU Arbitration Convention's governance and functioning	22
5.2. The Dispute Resolution Directive	23
6. Undertaking the Evaluating Analysis	23
7. Taxonomy of the Book	24
7.1. General considerations	24
7.2. Part I: The EU Arbitration Convention	24
7.3. Part II: The Dispute Resolution Directive	27

Part I

The EU Arbitration Convention

Chapter 1: History and Recent Developments

1.1. Chapter overview	31
1.2. Period 1975-1984: Proposal for an Arbitration Directive and reception by Member States	32
1.2.1. Issuing of a proposal for an Arbitration Directive	32
1.2.2. Reception of the Arbitration Directive proposal	36
1.3. Period 1984-1990: Negotiations on a multilateral convention	43
1.3.1. Breaking the deadlock: A single tax package	43
1.3.2. Breaking the deadlock: Signing of the EU Arbitration Convention	46
1.4. Period 1990-1999: Entry into force and discussions on practical implementation	46
1.5. Period 2000-2011: Commission's Study on company taxation in the internal market, installation of the EU JTPF and adoption of a Code of Conduct	47
1.5.1. General considerations	47
1.5.2. 2001: The Commission's Study on company taxation in the common market and its tax strategy	48
1.5.3. Installation of a Joint Forum on Transfer Pricing	50
1.6. Period 2012-2017: Recent developments	53
1.7. Concluding remarks	54

Chapter 2: General Overview

2.1. Chapter overview	55
2.2. Principal objective	55
2.3. Content	56
2.3.1. General overview	58
2.3.2. Procedural phases	58
2.4. Signatory states and accession of new states	59
2.4.1. General considerations	60
2.4.2. 1995: Accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden	60
2.4.3. 2005: Accession of the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia	63
2.4.4. 2008: Accession of Bulgaria and Romania	63

2.4.5. 2014: Accession of Croatia	66
2.5. Additions: Code of Conduct	68
2.5.1. Process of adoption and implementation	68
2.5.2. Content	69
2.5.3. Revisions	70
2.6. Language	72
2.6.1. Languages of the original signatory Member States	72
2.6.2. Language of the acceding Member States	74
2.7. Revision	76
2.8. Withdrawal	77
2.9. Termination	78
2.10. Evaluation	80
Chapter 3: Ratification, Entry into Force, Running Period and Application of Cases	83
3.1. Chapter overview	83
3.2. Ratification and entry into force	84
3.2.1. EU Arbitration Convention	84
3.2.2. Accession conventions	87
3.3. Running period	93
3.3.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	93
3.3.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	95
3.3.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	95
3.3.4. Analysis	95
3.4. Application of cases	99
3.4.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	99
3.4.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	100
3.4.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	106
3.4.4. Analysis	107
3.5. Evaluation	114
Chapter 4: Usage	117
4.1. Chapter overview	117
4.2. Collection of data	118
4.3. Cases under the EU Arbitration Convention	120
4.3.1. General considerations	120
4.3.2. 1995-1999	121
4.3.3. Period 2000-2011	122
4.3.4. Period from 2012 onwards	127
4.4. Analysis	132
4.4.1. General considerations	132
4.4.2. Quality of published data	132
4.4.3. Analysis of the published data	136
4.5. Evaluation and concluding remarks	145
Chapter 5: Legal Status	149
5.1. Chapter overview	149
5.2. The constitutional framework for eliminating double taxation within the internal market	150
5.2.1. General considerations	150
5.2.2. Adoption of directives: Article 100 of the EEC Treaty and its successor provisions	150
5.2.3. Other possible measures in the field of direct taxation: Former article 220 of the EEC Treaty	155
5.2.4. Principles defining competence of the EU institutions	167
5.3. Lawful conclusion of the EU Arbitration Convention: Relationship between article 100 of the EEC Treaty and article 220 of the EEC Treaty	169
5.3.1. General considerations	169
5.3.2. Competence of the Commission to propose and of the Council to adopt the proposed Arbitration Directive	170
5.3.3. Competence of Member States to adopt measures on the basis of article 220 of the EEC Treaty despite the fact that the EU already proposed similar harmonization measures	174
5.3.4. Lawful conclusion of the EU Arbitration Convention?	182
5.3.5. Challenging the validity of the EU Arbitration Convention	187

5.4. Legal status of the EU Arbitration Convention and related measures	188
5.4.1. Legal status of the EU Arbitration Convention	188
5.4.2. Legal status of the Prolongation Protocol	195
5.4.3. Legal status of the Accession Conventions and Accession Decisions	195
5.4.4. Legal status of the Code of Conduct	205
5.5. Evaluation	212
Chapter 6: Relationship with EU Law, International Law, the OECD Model Convention, Double Tax Conventions between Member States and Member States' Domestic Legislation	215
6.1. Chapter overview	215
6.2. Relationship with EU law	216
6.2.1. General considerations	216
6.2.2. Competence of the ECJ	217
6.2.3. Competence of the Commission	220
6.3. Relationship with international law	221
6.4. Relationship with the OECD Model Convention	222
6.5. Relationship with double tax conventions between Member States	223
6.5.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	223
6.5.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	224
6.5.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	224
6.5.4. Analysis	225
6.6. Relationship with Member States' domestic legislation	238
6.6.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	238
6.6.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	238
6.6.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	238
6.6.4. Analysis	238
6.7. Evaluation	242
Chapter 7: Governance	245
7.1. Chapter overview	245
7.2. Parties involved in governing the EU Arbitration Convention	246
7.2.1. General considerations	246
7.2.2. Role of the Member States	246
7.2.3. Role of the Commission	247
7.2.4. Role of the Council	248
7.2.5. Role of the EU JTPF	250
7.2.6. Role of the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee	260
7.3. International relations theory	261
7.3.1. Basic outline of the theory	261
7.3.2. Main pillars of the international relations theory	262
7.3.3. Previous research concerning the international relations theory and international tax law	268
7.3.4. Using the international relations theory for the EU Arbitration Convention: Which theory?	272
7.4. Clarifying the EU Arbitration Convention's governance through the lens of the international relations theory	276
7.4.1. General considerations	276
7.4.2. Emergence of developments: A broader EU level	276
7.4.3. Emergence of developments: The EU Arbitration Convention	283
7.4.4. International relations theory and the EU Arbitration Convention	288
7.5. Evaluation	292
Chapter 8: Answering the First Research Sub-Question	295
8.1. Chapter overview	295
8.2. Question (1): How is the EU Arbitration Convention governed?	296
8.2.1. Day-to-day application	296
8.2.2. Governance from a procedural perspective	297
8.3. Question (2): Is this governance consistent with the EU Arbitration Convention's legal status and associated competences?	299
8.4. Question (3): Does this governance adhere to the principles of effectiveness and efficiency?	300
8.4.1. Day-to-day application	301
8.4.2. Governance from a legal perspective	302

8.4.3. Governance from a procedural perspective	303
8.5. Answer to the first research sub-question	303

Chapter 9: Formal Scope of Application	305
9.1. Chapter overview	305
9.2. Definitions of terms	306
9.2.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	306
9.2.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	307
9.2.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	308
9.2.4. Analysis	308
9.3. Taxes covered	314
9.3.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	314
9.3.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	315
9.3.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	315
9.3.4. Analysis	315
9.4. Taxpayers covered	320
9.4.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	320
9.4.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	320
9.4.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	321
9.4.4. Analysis	321
9.5. Associated enterprises	326
9.5.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	326
9.5.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	327
9.5.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	327
9.5.4. Analysis	327
9.6. Permanent establishments	333
9.6.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	333
9.6.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	334
9.6.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	335
9.6.4. Analysis	335
9.7. Territorial scope	347
9.7.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	347
9.7.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	348
9.7.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	348
9.7.4. Analysis	348
9.8. Evaluation	357

Chapter 10: Material Scope of Application	361
10.1. Chapter overview	361
10.2. Cases covered	362
10.2.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	362
10.2.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	362
10.2.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	364
10.2.4. Analysis	364
10.3. Primary, corresponding and secondary adjustments	369
10.3.1. General considerations	369
10.3.2. Primary adjustments	372
10.3.3. Corresponding adjustments	379
10.3.4. Secondary adjustments	381
10.4. Application to situations of losses	394
10.4.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	394
10.4.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	394
10.4.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	394
10.4.4. Analysis	394
10.5. Tax principles	398
10.5.1. General considerations	398
10.5.2. Arm's length principle	399
10.5.3. Profit attribution to permanent establishments	403
10.5.3.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	403
10.5.3.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	404

10.6. Application to thin capitalization	421
10.6.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	421
10.6.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	422
10.6.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	427
10.6.4. Analysis	427
10.7. Evaluation	443
Chapter 11: Phase I: Application	447
11.1. Chapter overview	447
11.2. Three-year deadline for submission of a request	448
11.2.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	448
11.2.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	448
11.2.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	453
11.2.4. Analysis	454
11.3. Submission of a request	461
11.3.1. General considerations	461
11.3.2. Persons eligible to submit a request	461
11.3.3. Grounds for submission of a request	466
11.3.4. Content, format and language of the request	472
11.3.5. Addressee of the request	481
11.4. Receipt of the request and initial follow-up	485
11.4.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	485
11.4.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	485
11.4.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	485
11.4.4. Analysis	486
11.5. Evaluation	490
Chapter 12: Phase II: Unilateral Relief Procedure	495
12.1. Chapter overview	495
12.2. Timeline for unilateral relief procedure	496
12.2.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	496
12.2.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	496
12.2.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	496
12.2.4. Analysis	496
12.3. Review of the request	498
12.3.1. Request well-founded	498
12.4. Proceedings during the unilateral relief procedure	513
12.4.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	513
12.4.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	513
12.4.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	514
12.4.4. Analysis	515
12.5. Restrictions in the application of the EU Arbitration Convention: Serious penalty clause	522
12.5.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	522
12.5.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	523
12.5.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	530
12.5.4. Analysis	531
12.6. Suspension of tax collection during the period the EU Arbitration Convention is applied	548
12.6.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	548
12.6.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	548
12.6.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	551
12.6.4. Analysis	552
12.7. Evaluation	557
Chapter 13: Phase III: Mutual Agreement Procedure (<i>Procédure Amiable</i>)	561
13.1. Chapter overview	561
13.2. The 2-year deadline for the mutual agreement procedure	562
13.2.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	562
13.2.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	563
13.2.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	569
13.2.4. Analysis	570

13.3. Amendments to the 2-year deadline	580
13.3.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	580
13.3.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	580
13.3.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	581
13.3.4. Analysis	581
13.4. Proceedings during the mutual agreement procedure	585
13.4.1. General considerations	585
13.4.2. Timeline for the mutual agreement procedure	586
13.4.3. Independent functioning of the competent authority	595
13.4.4. Common working language	600
13.4.5. Position paper and responding position paper	604
13.5. Confidentiality of information	612
13.5.1. Provisions of the EU Arbitration Convention	612
13.5.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	612
13.5.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	613
13.5.4. Analysis	613
13.6. Costs of the mutual agreement procedure	614
13.6.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	614
13.6.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	614
13.6.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	615
13.6.4. Analysis	615
13.7. Outcome of the procedure	616
13.7.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	616
13.7.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	617
13.7.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	618
13.7.4. Analysis	618
13.8. Evaluation	621
Chapter 14: Phase IV: Arbitration Procedure	627
14.1. Chapter overview	627
14.2. Six-month deadline for the arbitration procedure	628
14.2.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	628
14.2.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	628
14.2.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	630
14.2.4. Analysis	631
14.3. Establishment of the advisory commission	638
14.3.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	638
14.3.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	638
14.3.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	639
14.3.4. Analysis	640
14.4. Composition of the advisory commission	644
14.4.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	644
14.4.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	645
14.4.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	648
14.4.4. Analysis	648
14.5. Secretarial assistance	654
14.5.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	654
14.5.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	654
14.5.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	655
14.5.4. Analysis	655
14.6. Selection and appointment of members	656
14.6.1. Member States' representatives	656
14.6.2. Independent persons	660
14.6.3. Chairman	684
14.6.4. Alternates	687
14.7. Proceedings during the arbitration procedure	689
14.7.1. Place of the advisory commission's meetings	689
14.7.2. Planning of the advisory commission's meetings	692
14.7.3. Attendance of the meetings	693
14.7.4. Common working language	694

14.7.5. Providing information to the advisory commission	699
14.7.6. Requesting additional information by the advisory commission	703
14.7.7. Appearance before the advisory commission	708
14.8. Confidentiality of information	714
14.8.1. Provisions of the EU Arbitration Convention	714
14.8.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	714
14.8.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	715
14.8.4. Analysis	715
14.9. Costs	720
14.9.1. Provisions of the EU Arbitration Convention	720
14.9.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	720
14.9.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	724
14.9.4. Analysis	725
14.10. Outcome of the procedure	732
14.10.1. Adoption of the opinion	732
14.10.2. Content of the opinion	737
14.10.3. Communication of the opinion	741
14.11. Evaluation	742
Chapter 15: Phase V: Final Decision and Implementation	753
15.1. Chapter overview	753
15.2. Six-month deadline for taking a final decision	754
15.2.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	754
15.2.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	754
15.2.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	754
15.2.4. Analysis	755
15.3. Content of the final decision	755
15.3.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	755
15.3.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	756
15.3.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	756
15.3.4. Analysis	756
15.4. Communication of the final decision	761
15.4.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	761
15.4.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	761
15.4.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	762
15.4.4. Analysis	762
15.5. Implementation of a mutual agreement reached / The final decision	764
15.5.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	764
15.5.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	764
15.5.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	764
15.5.4. Analysis	764
15.6. Publication of the final decision	767
15.6.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	767
15.6.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	767
15.6.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	767
15.6.4. Analysis	768
15.7. Alteration of decisions and remaining double taxation	773
15.7.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	773
15.7.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	774
15.7.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	774
15.7.4. Analysis	774
15.8. Effect on future years and precedential effects	778
15.8.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	778
15.8.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	778
15.8.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	779
15.8.4. Analysis	780
15.9. Interest charges and refunds	783
15.9.1. Provision of the EU Arbitration Convention	783
15.9.2. Work conducted by the EU JTPF	783
15.9.3. Provision of the Code of Conduct	787

15.9.4. Analysis	788
15.10. Evaluation	794
Chapter 16: Miscellaneous	799
16.1. Chapter overview	799
16.2. Taxpayers' rights and involvement	800
16.2.1. General considerations	800
16.2.2. Taxpayers' rights and involvement during the mutual agreement procedure	800
16.2.3. Taxpayers' rights and involvement during the arbitration procedure	807
16.2.4. Taxpayers' rights and involvement during the implementation phase	813
16.3. Interaction with other dispute settlement procedures	824
16.3.1. Interaction during the application phase and unilateral relief procedure	824
16.3.2. Interaction during the mutual agreement procedure	833
16.3.3. Interaction during the arbitration procedure	841
16.3.4. Interaction during the implementation phase	851
16.4. Triangular cases	853
16.4.1. General considerations	853
16.4.2. Inclusion of triangular cases in the scope of application of the EU Arbitration Convention	854
16.4.3. Procedural application	865
16.5. Evaluations	889
16.5.1. Taxpayers' rights and involvement	889
16.5.2. Interaction with other dispute settlement mechanism	893
16.5.3. Triangular cases	898
16.5.4. Final considerations	902
Chapter 17: Answering the Second Research Sub-Question	903
17.1. Chapter overview	903
17.2. Basic outcome of the evaluation	903
17.2.1. Formal scope of application	903
17.2.2. Material scope of application	904
17.2.3. Procedural functioning	905
17.3. Answer to the second research sub-question	908
Chapter 18: Answering the Third Research Sub-Question	917
18.1. Chapter overview	917
18.2. Bottlenecks in the current design of the EU Arbitration Convention	919
18.3. Improvements through the Code of Conduct	924
18.3.1. General considerations	924
18.3.2. Effect of the Code of Conduct through the lens of the arbitration procedure	925
18.3.3. Contribution of the Code of Conduct to a more efficient and effective functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention	928
18.4. Main contours of improved governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention	931
18.4.1. General considerations	931
18.4.2. Overview of recommendations to improve the Convention's governance	931
18.4.3. Overview of recommendations to improve the Convention's functioning	932
18.5. Concluding remarks	956
Chapter 19: Improving the Governance of the EU Arbitration Convention	957
19.1. Chapter overview	957
19.2. Improving the day-to-day application of the Convention	958
19.2.1. General considerations	958
19.2.2. Performing registration tasks	959
19.2.3. Introducing a central supervising organ	960
19.3. Improving the governance from a legal perspective	972
19.4. Improving the governance from a procedural perspective	973
19.5. Concluding remarks	974
Chapter 20: Improving the Functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention	975
20.1. Chapter overview	975
20.2. Improving the Convention's formal scope of application	976

20.2.1. General considerations	976
20.2.2. Applicable language	976
20.2.3. Period of application and admissibility of cases	977
20.2.4. Ratification procedures	978
20.2.5. Definition of terms	979
20.2.5.1. General considerations	979
20.2.6. Taxes covered	987
20.2.7. Personal application	988
20.2.8. Territorial scope	990
20.3. Improving the Convention's material scope of application	992
20.3.1. General considerations	992
20.3.2. Cases covered	992
20.3.3. Application to primary, corresponding and secondary adjustments	994
20.3.4. Application to situation of losses	996
20.3.5. Tax principles underlying the Convention's material scope of application	997
20.3.6. Application to thin capitalization cases	1001
20.4. Improving the Convention's procedural functioning	1003
20.4.1. General considerations	1003
20.4.2. Phase I: Application	1003
20.4.3. Phase II: Unilateral relief procedure	1014
20.4.3.1. General considerations	1014
20.4.3.2. Introducing a timeline for the unilateral relief procedure	1014
20.4.3.3. Defining the terms "well-founded" and "satisfactory solution"	1015
20.4.4. Phase III: Mutual agreement procedure	1029
20.4.5. Phase IV: Arbitration procedure	1044
20.4.6. Phase V: Implementation	1096
20.4.7. Miscellaneous	1115
20.5. Concluding remarks	1136
Chapter 21: Answering the Central Research Question	1137
21.1. Chapter overview	1137
21.2. Short recap of the outcome of the dissertation	1138
21.2.1. Hypotheses posed	1138
21.2.2. Answer to the first sub-question	1139
21.2.3. Answer to the second sub-question	1140
21.2.4. Answer to the third sub-question	1142
21.3. Answer to the central research question	1144

Part II

The Dispute Resolution Directive

Chapter 22: History of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1149
22.1. Chapter overview	1149
22.2. Developments on an EU level on improving dispute resolution	1149
22.2.1. Origins of a proposal for a directive on dispute resolution	1149
22.2.2. Studies on feasible measures for an EU-wide dispute resolution mechanism	1158
22.3. The proposal for a directive on dispute resolution	1170
22.3.1. Section overview	1170
22.3.2. Legal basis of the proposal	1170
22.3.3. Process of adoption	1179
22.4. Concluding remarks	1182
Chapter 23: Objectives, General Overview and Implementation	1183
23.1. Chapter overview	1183
23.2. Objectives of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1183
23.2.1. General objectives	1183
23.2.2. Specific objectives	1186
23.3. Structure and overview	1188
23.3.1. Basic outline	1188
23.3.2. Structure	1189

23.4. Implementation and application	1190
23.4.1. Transposition into Member States' domestic legislations	1190
23.4.2. Entry into force of the Dispute Resolution Directive and application to cases	1191
23.5. Concluding remarks and evaluation	1192
Chapter 24: Legal Status and Governance	1195
24.1. Chapter overview	1195
24.2. Legal status of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1196
24.3. Governance	1198
24.3.1. Implementing, administering and applying the dispute resolution procedures	1198
24.3.2. Role of the Commission in implementing the dispute resolution procedures	1199
24.3.3. Role of the Commission in providing administrative support	1201
24.3.4. Monitoring implementation	1202
24.3.5. Evaluation of implementation and functioning	1203
24.4. Evaluation	1204
Chapter 25: Formal Scope of Application	1211
25.1. Chapter overview	1211
25.2. Applicable language	1211
25.2.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1211
25.2.2. Analysis	1211
25.3. Definition of terms	1213
25.3.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1213
25.3.2. Analysis	1214
25.4. Taxes covered	1216
25.4.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1216
25.4.2. Analysis	1217
25.5. Persons covered	1218
25.5.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1218
25.5.2. Analysis	1219
25.6. Territorial scope	1230
25.6.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1230
25.6.2. Analysis	1231
25.7. Evaluation	1231
Chapter 26: Material Scope of Application	1235
26.1. Chapter overview	1235
26.2. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1235
26.2.1. Text of the initial directive proposal	1235
26.2.2. Adopted text	1236
26.3. Analysis	1237
26.3.1. General considerations	1237
26.3.2. Changing the material scope of application	1237
26.3.3. Definition of the term "double taxation"	1244
26.3.4. Conditions to be fulfilled for cases falling within the scope of application	1247
26.4. Evaluation	1250
Chapter 27: Phase I: Application	1255
27.1. Chapter overview	1255
27.2. Three-year deadline for submission of a complaint	1256
27.2.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1256
27.2.2. Analysis	1257
27.3. Submission of a complaint	1259
27.3.1. Persons eligible to submit a complaint	1259
27.3.2. Grounds for submission of a complaint	1261
27.3.3. Content, format and language of the complaint	1265
27.3.4. Addressee of the complaint	1274
27.4. Receipt of the complaint and initial follow-up	1277
27.4.1. Notification of receipt of a complaint	1277
27.4.2. Requesting additional information	1278

27.5. Special procedures for individuals and small and medium-sized enterprises	1282
27.5.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1282
27.5.2. Analysis	1282
27.6. Withdrawal of a complaint	1284
27.6.1. Provisions of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1284
27.6.2. Analysis	1285
27.7. Evaluation	1285
Chapter 28: Phase II: Unilateral Review	1289
28.1. Chapter overview	1289
28.2. Timeline for unilateral review phase	1289
28.3. Review of the complaint	1292
28.3.1. Possible outcomes in the review of the complaint	1292
28.3.2. Acceptance or rejection of a complaint	1292
28.3.3. Possibility of a satisfactory solution	1294
28.4. Proceedings during the unilateral review phase	1296
28.4.1. General considerations	1296
28.4.2. Decision on the acceptance or rejection of the complaint	1297
28.4.3. Deciding on a unilateral resolution of the dispute	1319
28.4.4. Informing affected persons of the outcome	1320
28.5. Restrictions on the application of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1326
28.5.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1326
28.5.2. Analysis	1327
28.6. Suspension of tax collection during the period in which the Dispute Resolution Directive is applied	1341
28.6.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1341
28.6.2. Analysis	1341
28.7. Ending of proceedings under the Dispute Resolution Directive	1343
28.7.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1343
28.7.2. Analysis	1343
28.8. Evaluation	1344
Chapter 29: Phase III: Mutual Agreement Procedure	1349
29.1. Chapter overview	1349
29.2. The 2-year deadline of the mutual agreement procedure	1350
29.2.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1350
29.2.2. Analysis	1351
29.3. Extension of the 2-year deadline	1357
29.3.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1357
29.3.2. Analysis	1358
29.4. Proceedings during the mutual agreement procedure	1361
29.4.1. General considerations	1361
29.4.2. Common working language	1362
29.4.3. Final considerations	1364
29.5. Confidentiality of information	1365
29.5.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1365
29.5.2. Analysis	1366
29.6. Costs of the mutual agreement procedure	1367
29.6.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1367
29.6.2. Analysis	1367
29.7. Outcome of the procedure	1368
29.7.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1368
29.7.2. Analysis	1370
29.8. Implementation of mutual agreements	1373
29.8.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1373
29.8.2. Analysis	1374
29.9. Evaluation	1377
Chapter 30: Phase IV: Arbitration Procedure	1381
30.1. Chapter overview	1381

30.2. Possible forms of the arbitration procedure	1382
30.2.1. General considerations	1382
30.2.2. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1383
30.2.3. Analysis	1385
30.3. Deadline for the arbitration procedure	1399
30.3.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1399
30.3.2. Analysis	1400
30.4. Establishment of the advisory commission	1402
30.4.1. Rules for establishing the advisory commission	1402
30.5. Composition of the advisory commission	1415
30.5.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1415
30.5.2. Analysis	1416
30.6. Secretarial assistance	1420
30.6.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1420
30.6.2. Analysis	1421
30.7. Selection and appointment of members	1422
30.7.1. Member States' representatives	1422
30.7.2. Independent persons	1423
30.7.3. Chairman	1445
30.7.4. Substitutes	1448
30.8. Proceedings during the arbitration procedure	1450
30.8.1. General considerations	1450
30.8.2. Rules of functioning for the advisory commission	1450
30.8.3. Place of the advisory commission's meetings	1461
30.8.4. Planning of the advisory commission's meetings	1462
30.8.5. Attendance of the meetings	1463
30.8.5.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1463
30.8.5.2. Analysis	1463
30.8.6. Common working language	1464
30.8.6.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1464
30.8.6.2. Analysis	1464
30.8.7. Providing information to the advisory commission	1466
30.8.8. Requesting additional information by the advisory commission	1468
30.8.9. Appearance before the advisory commission	1472
30.9. Confidentiality of information	1475
30.9.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1475
30.9.2. Analysis	1476
30.10. Costs	1480
30.10.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1480
30.10.2. Analysis	1481
30.11. Outcome of the procedure	1488
30.11.1. Adoption of the opinion by the advisory commission	1488
30.11.2. Content of the opinion	1489
30.11.3. Communication of the opinion	1492
30.12. Evaluation	1493
Chapter 31: Phase V: Final Decision and Implementation	1501
31.1. Chapter overview	1501
31.2. Necessity of the final decision phase	1502
31.3. Six-month deadline for taking a final decision	1503
31.3.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1503
31.3.2. Analysis	1504
31.4. Content of the final decision	1505
31.4.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1505
31.4.2. Analysis	1505
31.5. Communication of the final decision	1508
31.5.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1508
31.5.2. Analysis	1508
31.6. Implementation of the final decision	1511
31.6.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1511

31.6.2. Analysis	1512
31.7. Publication of the final decision	1520
31.7.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1520
31.7.2. Analysis	1521
31.8. Alteration of decisions and a remaining question in dispute	1526
31.8.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1526
31.8.2. Analysis	1526
31.9. Effect on future years and precedential effects	1528
31.9.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1528
31.9.2. Analysis	1529
31.10. Interest charges and refunds	1531
31.10.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1531
31.10.2. Analysis	1532
31.11. Evaluation	1533
Chapter 32: Miscellaneous	1537
32.1. Chapter overview	1537
32.2. Affected persons' rights and involvement	1537
32.2.1. General considerations	1537
32.2.2. Affected persons' rights and involvement during the application and unilateral review phase	1538
32.2.3. Affected persons' rights and involvement during the mutual agreement procedure	1541
32.2.4. Affected persons' rights and involvement during the arbitration procedure	1543
32.2.5. Affected persons' rights and involvement during the final decision and implementation phase	1546
32.2.6. Final considerations	1548
32.3. Interaction with other dispute settlement procedures	1550
32.3.1. Interaction with dispute resolution procedures under double tax conventions between Member States	1550
32.3.2. Interaction with domestic available remedies	1555
32.4. Triangular cases/multilateral disputes	1566
32.4.1. Provision of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1566
32.4.2. Analysis	1566
32.4.2.1. Inclusion of triangular cases/multilateral disputes in the scope of application of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1566
32.5. Evaluation	1570
Chapter 33: Conclusions and Evaluation	1573
33.1. Chapter overview	1573
33.2. Attaining of the objectives of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1574
33.2.1. Basic objective of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1574
33.2.2. Specific objectives of the Dispute Resolution Directive	1576
33.2.3. Final considerations	1587
33.3. The Dispute Resolution Directive versus the EU Arbitration Convention: Improvements realized?	1589
33.3.1. General considerations	1589
33.3.2. Scope of application	1590
33.3.3. Procedural functioning	1591
33.3.4. Answer to the question posed	1599
Annex I – Implementation of the Code of Conduct by Member States as per 2008	1603
Annex II – Ratification procedures	1604
Annex III – Arbitration clauses in double tax conventions between Member States	1607
Annex IV – Taxes to which the EU Arbitration Convention applies	1617
Annex V – Member States' reservations to paragraph 4 of the Code of Conduct	1620
Annex VI – Unilateral definitions by each Member State on the term “serious penalty” in article 8 of the EU Arbitration Convention	1623
References	1631

Sample Content

Preface

Before you is the result of my study on the governance and functioning on the EU Arbitration Convention and the Directive on Tax Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in the European Union, the result of 7 years of research that started on 1 September 2010. The past years of research were intense, but nonetheless interesting: I learned to manage a substantial project, met interesting people and got in-depth knowledge about the working of international tax law for a specific subject. The interesting feature of tax dispute resolution within the European Union is that the existence of double taxation within the EU internal market causes distortions that may hamper cross-border economic activities and, in the end, economic growth. A strict and binding dispute settlement mechanism would benefit taxpayers within the European Union and also could contribute to more cross-border economic expansion. However, tensions persisting in the national electorate, the threat of losing grip on revenue and the desire to retain sovereignty as much as possible make Member States hesitant to make real progress in the area of direct taxation. To speak with Led Zeppelin, “The song remains the same”; whether it concerns the forming of a banking union or an integrated fiscal system, Member States are not likely to put Europe first. But exactly this struggle between the benefit of resolving cases of double taxation through a well-functioning dispute resolution mechanism versus the desire to retain sovereignty made it interesting to study how the EU Arbitration Convention was developed, how – and more importantly, if – it functions in practice and how it is governed. Member States have committed to a binding dispute settlement mechanism, but statistics clearly show that they fail to meet their treaty obligations. What would be the reason? Is it the Convention itself or the Member States’ attitudes towards this Convention? After the finalization of the book, an important development took place within the European Union, namely the adoption of a directive on tax dispute resolution mechanisms in October 2017. The book has been supplemented with an analysis that answers the question of whether this directive has improved the difficulties encountered with the EU Arbitration Convention.

Apart from the study itself, performing the study subtracted substantial time from my social life. As always, Mia stood by me fiercely and patiently, not only in taking care of business, but also in her never-ending willingness to listen to my new findings as well as reading my output. I honestly can say that without her support, the project would have taken much longer or might even not have been finished at all. It is time to fulfil my promise made to her 7 years ago. Further, I would like to thank my promoter, Professor Burgers, who gave me the opportunity to perform this research, greatly supported me

along the way and provided me with many valuable suggestions to further improve my output. Also, I would like to thank Professor Gormley for his thorough and sharp review of the concepts. Especially, I want to thank my parents, who made it possible to fully focus on this dissertation for some time and for their enduring support. I end with a quote of a Dutch writer, Frederik van Eeden, which, for this study, is a perfectly suited remark:

Ieder wetenschappelijk man, zelfs de geheel in details verdiepte specialiteit, moet nu en dan eens opkijken van zijn werk en zorgen dat hij het overzicht van 't groote geheel niet kwijt raakt. Anders wordt hij een geesteloos werker, een bekrompen vakman, die den voortgang van 't geheel belemmeren zou, ter wille van zijn eigen speciaal uitbouwseltje.¹

1. F. Van Eeden, *De Spiritistische Verschijnselen*, in *Studies: Eerste reeks* (W. Versluys 1897), p. 203. English translation: “Every scientific man, even the specialist wholly engrossed in details, must now and then look up from his work and should take care that he does not lose the big picture. Otherwise he will end up as a mindless worker, a narrow-minded professional, who will hinder the progress of the whole, only for the sake of his own special piece of work.”

Abstract

General overview of the content of this book

This book discusses, analyses and evaluates the governance and functioning of the available tax dispute resolution mechanisms in the European Union: the EU Arbitration Convention and the Dispute Resolution Directive. The EU Arbitration Convention was adopted as a multilateral convention by the then-12 Member States on 23 July 1990. The origin of this Convention is to be found in 1976, when the European Commission issued its proposal for a directive for the elimination of double taxation in connection with a profit adjustment between associated enterprises. Because Member States preferred a multilateral convention rather than a directive, the Council could not reach the unanimous agreement required for the adoption of the proposed directive. A proposal for the Convention was submitted by the Netherlands in 1978, which formed the basis for discussions among Member States and led eventually to its adoption in 1990. At that time, the Convention was considered a landmark in international taxation, as then, only a very limited number of double tax conventions included an arbitration procedure to settle international tax disputes, whereas the EU Arbitration Convention is directly applicable in all 28 EU Member States and provides for a compulsory and binding dispute settlement procedure for transfer pricing disputes. The Convention first provides for the traditional mutual agreement procedure, in which the Member States concerned mutually have to strive to agree on how to settle the dispute. If they do not reach such agreement within a 2-year term, they are obliged to establish an advisory commission that has to give a non-binding opinion on the dispute within 6 months. Thereafter, the Member States concerned have another 6 months to agree on a final solution for the case. If they fail to reach an agreement, the opinion becomes binding on them. In 2002, the Commission set up the EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum (EU JTPF), which, inter alia, examined improvements to the European Arbitration Convention. This resulted in a Code of Conduct on the effective implementation of the Convention in 2006, which was revised in 2009 and for which a further revision was proposed in 2015. This Code of Conduct includes guidance on how the Convention should be applied in practice.

The governance and functioning of this Convention formed part of an academic study, finalized by the end of 2016 and with the outcome that numerous modifications were necessary to improve both its governance and functioning. Within the European Union, a similar conclusion was reached, resulting in the European Commission issuing a directive proposal in October 2016. This Dispute Resolution Directive was adopted by the

Council on 17 October 2017 and requires implementation by all Member States as per 1 July 2019. After 40 years, a process thus has been finalized that started in 1976. The academic study performed primarily focused on the EU Arbitration Convention and concerned a critical evaluation of the functioning and governance that Convention and seeks whether – and if so, what – changes should be made so as to improve this governance and functioning. The outcome of this study forms the primary focus of this book. Because important developments with respect to the resolution of tax disputes within the European Union have taken place since then, this book also includes a critical evaluation of the Dispute Resolution Directive and tries to answer the question of whether it has constituted an improvement to the governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention.

Part I: The EU Arbitration Convention

Two hypotheses underlie the study on the governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention, the outcome of which is laid down in Part I of this book:

- the Convention’s governance (i) is not properly regulated in light of state sovereignty and EU law; (ii) is not efficient in that the process involves a range of actors whose competences and practical involvement are ambiguous; and (iii) is not effective in that it does not lead to a timely and successful settlement of all disputes brought under the Convention; and
- after 28 years of existence, the Convention is not able to fulfil its principal objective, despite the adoption of a Code of Conduct in 2006, its revision in 2009 and its proposed revision in 2015.

To test whether these hypotheses are correct, the research question of this study is:

Should changes be made to improve the governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention, and if so, what changes and on what grounds?

Three sub-questions were formulated in order to answer the research question.

Sub-question 1: How is the EU Arbitration Convention governed, is this governance consistent with the EU Arbitration Convention’s legal status and the associated competences and does this governance adhere to the principles of effectiveness and efficiency?

In order to properly evaluate how the EU Arbitration Convention is and should be governed, it is important first to understand the Convention's legal status under EU and international law in order to answer the question of which institutions, from a legal perspective, are competent to be involved in the Convention's governance. Chapter 5 sets out this analysis, which leads to the conclusion that the EU Arbitration Convention is a multilateral convention under international public law and does not constitute secondary EU law. However, despite this legal status, EU institutions were involved in the decision-making process on the accession of new Member States to the Convention and the adoption of the Code of Conduct, even though they had no proper legal competence to be involved. This leads to the conclusion that the decision-making process on both of these occasions was not properly performed. Chapter 6 discusses the relationship of the Convention with double tax conventions between Member States and Member States' domestic legislations, concluding that, under the *lex specialis derogat generali* rule, the Convention has precedence over double tax conventions between Member States and Member States' domestic legislations, unless they provide for wider obligations (e.g. a more efficient and effective dispute settlement mechanism).

Based on the outcome of the analyses in chapters 5 and 6, chapter 7 proceeds with the examination of which parties are, in practice, involved in the Convention's governance. The chapter aims to clarify (i) how the governance of the EU Arbitration Convention has emerged; (ii) whether this governance is consistent with the Convention's legal status; (iii) the associated competences; and (iv) whether it adheres to the principles of efficiency and effectiveness. The following specific issues are discussed: (i) how developments with regard to the Convention were construed; (ii) why certain steps in this governance were chosen; (iii) which parties were involved; and (v) the role that these parties played. These issues were clarified by using a sub-theory of the international relations theory: constructivism. In developing and improving the Convention's rules and procedures, the Member States did not act on a stand-alone basis, but made use of experts in the field of international taxation. The European Commission established the EU JTPF by bringing together a group of actors in a network that share the same beliefs, norms and/or values and that have similar ideas or ideologies as to how these beliefs, norms and/or values are to be realized. The Forum's output is a Code of Conduct, developed through consensus and taking into account states' interests, as well as the interests of other stakeholders. This mixture fits with the trend within the European Union to involve non-state actors in the policy-making process (combining formal and informal governance) and to combine hard-law and soft-law instruments.

The answer to the first sub-question is contained in chapter 8, which is as follows: the Convention's administration and the process of developing and improving its functioning is properly performed in light of state sovereignty and EU law. However, the governance of the Convention itself is not properly performed in light of state sovereignty and EU law in so far as it concerns the adoption of the Code of Conduct and the accession of Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania to the Convention. With regard to these issues, the Commission/Council acted beyond their legal powers and should have refrained from taking legislative action in this field.

Sub-question 2: Is the EU Arbitration Convention's content able to fulfil – in line with the fundamental principles of tax law and taking into account the provisions included in the Code of Conduct – its principal objective, i.e. to eliminate cases of double taxation arising from transfer pricing profit adjustments by providing for a compulsory and binding dispute settlement mechanism that is limited in time?

The second sub-question of this study focuses on the Convention's functioning, which comprises:

- formal scope of application: this concerns multiple subjects relating to the formal and legal foundations of the Convention;
- material scope of application: cases covered by the Convention (terms for application) and its tax principles (the arm's length principle and the rules for attributing profits to permanent establishments); and
- procedural functioning: the five phases of the EU Arbitration Convention, namely (i) application; (ii) unilateral review; (iii) mutual agreement procedure; (iv) arbitration procedure; and (v) implementation.

In order to be able to answer the question of whether the content of the Convention is able to fulfil its principal objective, the provisions included in the EU Arbitration Convention as well as in the Code of Conduct are evaluated in chapters 9-16 against the principles of clarity and simplicity, transparency, efficiency, effectiveness, legal justice, legal equality and legal certainty. This leads to the conclusion that these provisions are not sufficiently descriptive in all aspects and that they do not ensure that cases that fall within the Convention's scope of application can be settled within the given time limits. In other words, these provisions do not adhere to the principles of clarity and simplicity, transparency, effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, application of the Convention's provisions and its procedures do not provide an outcome that adheres in all cases to the principles of legal justice, legal equality and legal certainty. The main conclusion is that there is an error in the institutional design of the EU Arbitration Convention,

which causes cases to not be referred to the arbitration procedure if, after expiry of the 2-year deadline of the mutual agreement procedure, the competent authorities concerned have not reached an agreement that eliminates double taxation for the specific case under review. In other words, due to the absence of a proper default mechanism, Member States' failure to act – even though they legally committed themselves to act – cannot be sanctioned. There is thus no fallback to guarantee that the Convention can fulfil its primary objective. This is reinforced by available statistics, which show that approximately 18% of all pending cases are pending for longer than 2 years under the mutual agreement procedure and are not referred to the arbitration procedure, although they are eligible for such reference. Hence, in a substantial number of cases, it takes far longer for them to be resolved than the time limits set in the EU Arbitration Convention. It is, in particular, the insufficient legal protection of taxpayers against non-compliance by Member States that causes problems.

Sub-question 3: Which changes should be made to improve the governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention, and how could/should these improvements be implemented in practice?

Chapter 18 identifies the bottlenecks in the current design of the EU Arbitration Convention and further answers the question of whether the adoption and revisions of the Code of Conduct have contributed to more efficient and effective functioning of the Convention. As this question is also answered negatively, the answer to the central research question on whether changes should be made to improve the governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention is “yes”. For that reason, chapters 18-20 include strategic and detailed recommendations on which changes are necessary to improve the Convention's effective and efficient governance, as well as to provide a functioning that conforms to the testing principles of this study. On an overall level, the main recommendations concern:

- Improving the Convention's governance: Strengthening the institutional design of the Convention by introducing a proper default mechanism to ensure that the Convention's provisions are properly complied with by assigning competence to the European Commission to function as a third supervising authority that can take the lead if the Member States fail to comply with their obligations under the Convention. The Commission is particularly chosen because it holds no biased view towards an individual Member State. The main focus of the proposed default mechanism is the reference of cases to the arbitration procedure after expiry of the 2-year deadline of the mutual agreement procedure

without an agreement that eliminates double taxation. In the case of Member States' failure to refer a case to the arbitration procedure, the Commission should be assigned competence to establish the advisory commission and appoint its members accordingly. It is also recommended to establish a central and permanent secretariat; the secretariat that assists the EU JTPF can perform in this role. The secretariat's tasks should be, *inter alia*, (i) monitoring cases dealt with under the Convention; (ii) performing registration tasks; (iii) assisting advisory commissions in conducting the arbitration procedure; and (iv) maintaining and publishing the list of eligible persons to act as members of an advisory commission. To improve the Convention's governmental structure, it is further recommended that new Member States can only accede to the EU Arbitration Convention through a specific accession convention and that the Commission/Council cannot play a role in this matter, just as they should not play a role in adopting the Code of Conduct.

- Improving the Convention's functioning:
 - establishing a directly binding arbitration procedure and abolishing the final decision phase;
 - introducing proper and common rules for attributing profits to permanent establishments and defining to what extent thin capitalization cases are included in the Convention's scope of application;
 - introducing more sophisticated timelines for the Convention's procedures, especially the unilateral review phase and the mutual agreement procedure;
 - allowing competent authorities to deny the application of the Convention's procedures only in cases of fraud and not in situations in which a penalty was imposed for non-fraudulent offences;
 - providing a better level of protection for taxpayers by allowing the parallel running of the Convention's procedures and domestic appeals procedures, with the latter being suspended until the Convention's procedures have been finalized;
 - clarifying that taxpayers have a right of acceptance of the outcome of the mutual agreement procedure and of the arbitration procedure; and
 - extending the scope of application of the Convention by including disputes on the existence of a permanent establishment and the residence status of enterprises.

Part II: The Dispute Resolution Directive

The outcome of the study conducted is that the EU Arbitration Convention is not functioning properly in light of its principal objectives and that certain institutional changes need to be made to improve its governance and functioning with a view to provide for an effective and efficiently functioning dispute resolution mechanism. The criticism voiced in the book is shared widely in the literature, but also at the level of the EU institutions. The European Commission has repeatedly pointed to the limited scope of the Convention in particular and the non-functioning of dispute resolution mechanisms in the European Union. This primarily concerns the non-enforceability of taxpayers' access to these mechanisms or to the arbitration procedure. To provide for a more effective, efficient and transparent process, the Commission issued a directive proposal on tax dispute resolution mechanisms in the European Union in October 2016. The Directive was – albeit with substantial modifications – adopted within 1 year by the Council, and will take effect as per 1 July 2019. The Directive has five specific aims, namely (i) broadening the scope of the EU Arbitration Convention to all income tax-related disputes; (ii) increasing legal certainty for taxpayers; (iii) improving effectiveness and efficiency of existing dispute resolution mechanisms; (iv) improving transparency; and (v) improving governance. The Directive follows the structure of the Convention, but builds in enforcement and review mechanisms to ensure that eligible cases have access to the dispute resolution procedures and that cases proceed to arbitration and will ultimately be resolved within a given timeframe. As this Directive has a major impact on tax dispute resolution with the European Union – and thus also on the governance and functioning of the EU Arbitration Convention – a second part was added to the book to analyse whether the Directive has constituted an improvement to the Convention. After discussing the history of the Directive and its objectives in chapters 22 and 23, chapters 24-32 discuss in detail the governance and functioning of the Directive and test each of its provisions on whether they indeed constitute an improvement. Chapter 33 answers this question on an overall basis, thereby also focusing on the specific objectives set by the Directive. The outcome of the analysis is that, in many aspects, the Directive indeed has realized an improvement as compared to the Convention, especially with the introduction of review and enforcement mechanisms and the addition of timelines. However, the Directive also falls short in providing for an efficient dispute resolution mechanism and leaves many aspects of the procedural functioning undefined or to be filled in by the competent authorities concerned, which causes uncertainty and ambiguity and may lead to non-uniform application by the Member States.

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