

Double Non-taxation and the Use of Hybrid Entities

An Alternative Approach in the New Era
of BEPS

Leopoldo Parada

Table of Contents

Preface	xix
List of Abbreviations	xxi
List of Figures	xxv
Acknowledgments	xxxii
Introduction	1
1 Object and Purpose	3
2 Scope	4
3 Methodology	5
4 Structure of the Work	8
PART I	
Double Non-taxation: Delimiting the Boundaries of a Stigmatized Concept	11
CHAPTER 1	
Double Non-taxation: A Conceptual Analysis	13
1 Introduction	13
2 The Traditional Attempts to Explain an Ambiguous Concept	15
2.1 Double Non-taxation as the Reverse Side of Double Taxation	15
2.2 Double Non-taxation: Under-Taxation and <i>Stateless Income</i>	17
2.3 Double Non-taxation as an Intended or Unintended Outcome	19
2.4 Double Non-taxation as a per se Undesirable Outcome	22
3 Double Non-taxation and the <i>Single Tax Principle</i>	22
3.1 Historical Background	22
3.2 The Downside of the <i>Single Tax Principle</i>	24

Table of Contents

	3.2.1	The Tax Credit Method to Ensure Single Taxation	25
	3.2.2	The Agnosticism of the Exemption Method	28
	3.2.3	New Voices in Defense of the <i>Single Tax Principle</i>	31
	3.2.3.1	The 1981 LOB Provision: US Model	31
	3.2.3.2	The 2016 LOB Provision: US Model	33
4		Double Non-taxation and Tax Evasion/Tax Avoidance	34
	4.1	Tax Evasion in a Nutshell	35
	4.1.1	Tax Evasion Versus Tax Fraud	36
	4.1.2	The Reactions to Tax Evasion	38
	4.2	Tax Avoidance in a Nutshell	42
	4.2.1	Tax Avoidance and International Tax Planning	44
	4.2.2	The Reactions to Tax Avoidance	45
5		Double Non-taxation and “ <i>Aggressive Tax Planning</i> ”	46
	5.1	The Notion of ATP in Brief	47
	5.2	The EU Notion of ATP: A <i>Consequentialist Approach</i>	47
6		Final Remarks	50
CHAPTER 2			
		Double Non-taxation and Bilateral Tax Treaties	53
1		Introduction	53
2		Interpretation of Tax Treaties	54
	2.1	General Rule of Interpretation	55
	2.2	Supplementary Means of Interpretation	59
	2.3	The Interpretative Role of the OECD Model and Its Commentaries	60
	2.4	The Reference to Domestic Law: Article 3(2) of the OECD Model	66
3		Double Non-taxation and the OECD Model and Its Commentaries	69
	3.1	The Interpretation of the Term “ <i>Liable to Tax</i> ”	69
	3.2	The Concept of <i>Beneficial Owner</i> as a Meaning to Prevent DNT	72
	3.3	<i>Conflicts of Qualification</i> and DNT: The New Interpretation of Article 23A(1) OECD Model	79
	3.4	Conflicts of Interpretation and DNT: Article 23A(4) OECD Model	83
4		Double Non-taxation and Specific Tax Treaty Provisions	84
	4.1	DNT as an Outcome Tolerated by Tax Treaties	84
	4.1.1	<i>Tax Sparing</i>	85
	4.1.2	Matching Tax Credits	87
	4.2	DNT as an Outcome Specifically Avoided by Tax Treaties	88

	4.2.1	Subject-to-tax <i>Clauses</i>	88
	4.2.2	<i>Switch-Over Clauses</i>	93
5		The Impact of the OECD BEPS Action 6 Proposal	95
	5.1	Modification of the Title of the OECD Model	95
	5.2	The Inclusion of a Recommended Preamble in the OECD Model	96
	5.3	The New Concept of “ <i>Special Tax Regime (STR)</i> ”	98
	5.3.1	A Critical View upon the Concept of STR	99
	5.3.2	The STR Rule and EU Law	102
6		Final Remarks	104
PART II			
		Hybrid Entities: A Domestic Decision with International Consequences	107
CHAPTER 3			
		The Hybrid Entities’ Conundrum: A (Simple) Tax Characterization Issue	109
1		Introduction	109
2		Key Concepts	110
	2.1	Legal Entities and Business Entities	110
	2.2	Domestic Entities and Foreign Entities	112
	2.3	Taxable and Nontaxable Legal Entities	113
3		Hybrid Entities and Reverse Hybrids	115
	3.1	Terminology	116
	3.2	The Characterization of Foreign Entities for Tax Purposes	118
	3.2.1	Comparative Approach	118
	3.2.2	Legal Personality Approach	122
	3.2.3	Overall Approach	124
	3.2.4	Fixed Approach	128
	3.2.5	Elective Approach	128
4		The U.S. Elective System: The “Stone Guest” in a Worldwide Waltz	129
	4.1	Introductory Issues: Domestic/Foreign and Taxable/Nontaxable Entities	129
	4.2	The 1954 <i>Kintner</i> Test	131
	4.3	The 1996 CTB Regulations	134
	4.4	The CTB and Tax Planning Opportunities	137
	4.4.1	Avoidance of Subpart F Income	137
	4.4.2	Reaction from U.S. Tax Law	145
	4.4.3	Use of Foreign Tax Credit	148
	4.4.4	Reaction from U.S. Tax Law	151
5		Coordination in an Uncoordinated World	157
	5.1	The Spanish Experience: An Example of Coordination in the Home Country?	158
	5.1.1	Spanish Legal Entities in Brief	158

Table of Contents

	5.1.2	The “ <i>Income Attribution Regime</i> ” of the Spanish NRITL	159
	5.1.3	The Spanish Characterization Test in Practice	159
5.2		The Danish Experience: Re-characterization of Its Own Entities	162
	5.2.1	Danish Reaction to Hybrid Entities	163
	5.2.2	Danish Reaction to Reverse Hybrids	168
5.3		From the EU ATAD I to EU ATAD II: A Frustrated Example of Supranational Coordination	172
	5.3.1	The EU ATAD I (Original Text): A Coordination at Source	173
	5.3.2	The EU ATAD I (Final Text): When Political Pressure Comes First	177
	5.3.3	The EU ATAD II: Confirming (but Not Exclusively) the OECD Standards	179
	5.3.3.1	Article 9(2) EU ATAD II: The OECD Approach	179
	5.3.3.2	Article 9a EU ATAD II: The Characterization of Entities Is Back on the Scene	181
6		Final Remarks	184
CHAPTER 4			
		Hybrid Entities and the Entitlement to Tax Treaty Benefits	187
1		Introduction	187
2		The General Application of Tax Treaties to Entities	189
3		The 1999 OECD Partnership Report	192
	3.1	General Principle	192
	3.2	Exception	195
	3.3	Critics	198
	3.3.1	Formal Critics	198
	3.3.2	Substantial Critics	198
	3.3.2.1	Unresolved Conflicts of Attribution	198
	3.3.2.2	Preference for the State of Residence	200
	3.3.2.3	The (Original Missed) Interplay with the Concept of Beneficial Owner	201
4		The US Model: The Legal Precedent for the OECD Proposal	203
	4.1	General Interpretation of Article 1(6) US Model	203
	4.1.1	The Reference to “ <i>Income, Profit or Gain</i> ”	204
	4.1.2	Income, Profit and Gain Derived “ <i>by or Through</i> ”	205

	4.1.3	The Reference to “ <i>Entities</i> ” (and Not <i>Arrangements</i>)	206
	4.1.4	“ <i>Wholly or Partial</i> ” Fiscal Transparency	206
4.2		Illustrations as Regards to the Application of Article 1(6) US Model	207
	4.2.1	Application of Article 1(6) US Model in Strict Bilateral Cases	207
	4.2.1.1	Example 1: Foreign Entity with U.S. Owners	207
	4.2.1.2	Example 2: U.S. Corporation with U.S. Owners	209
	4.2.1.3	Example 3: Foreign Partnership with U.S. Owners	211
	4.2.1.4	Example 4: Domestic Partnership with U.S. Owners	213
	4.2.2	Application of Article 1(6) US Model in Triangular Situations	214
	4.2.2.1	Example 5: Foreign Intermediary Entity with U.S. Owners	214
	4.2.2.2	Example 6: Foreign Entity Receiving U.S. Sourced Income	216
	4.2.2.3	Example 7: U.S. Intermediary Partnership	218
4.3		The Interplay of Article 1(6) US Model with Other Tax Treaty and Domestic Provisions	220
	4.3.1	The (Still Missed) Interplay with the Concept of <i>Beneficial Owner</i>	220
	4.3.1.1	Alternative Approaches Within the U.S. Tax Treaty Practice	221
	4.3.2	The Interplay with the “ <i>Saving Clause</i> ” (Article 1(4) US Model)	226
	4.3.3	Article 1(6) US Model and the CTB Regulations	228
	4.3.4	Article 1(6) US Model and I.R.C. Section 894(c)	230
5		The OECD Model’s Proposal: A Residence State’s Perspective	233
	5.1	General Interpretation of Article 1(2) OECD Model	233
	5.1.1	The Reference to “ <i>Income</i> ” (Only)	234
	5.1.2	Income Derived “ <i>by or Through</i> ”	235
	5.1.3	The Reference to “ <i>Entities or Arrangements</i> ”	236
	5.1.4	“ <i>Wholly and Partial</i> ” Fiscal Transparency	237
	5.2	Illustrations as Regards to the Application of Article 1(2) OECD Model	239
	5.2.1	Application of Article 1(2) OECD Model in Strict Bilateral Situations	240

Table of Contents

	5.2.1.1	Example 1	240
	5.2.1.2	Example 2	241
	5.2.1.3	Example 3	243
	5.2.1.4	Example 4	244
	5.2.2	Application of Article 1(2) OECD Model in Triangular Situations	245
	5.2.2.1	Example 5	246
	5.2.2.2	Example 6	247
	5.2.2.3	Example 7	249
5.3		Other Issues as Regards to the Application Article 1(2) OECD Model	250
	5.3.1	The (Repeated Missed) Interplay with the Concept of <i>Beneficial Owner</i>	250
	5.3.1.1	A “Deemed” <i>Beneficial Owner</i> : an Alternative Solution	255
	5.3.1.2	Testing the Proposal for a “Deemed” <i>Beneficial Owner</i>	259
	5.3.1.3	The Pragmatism of “Deemed” Rules: Criticism	262
	5.3.2	“ <i>Saving Clause</i> ” and Relief from Double Taxation	264
	5.3.2.1	A “ <i>Reverse Saving Clause</i> ” as an Alternative Solution	268
	5.3.3	Article 1(2) OECD Model and the Base Erosion of Developing Countries: A UN Model’s Proposal	269
6		Transparent Entities and the MLI: Some Brief Remarks	271
	6.1	Article 3(1) MLI: A Mirror of Article 1(2) OECD Model	271
	6.2	“ <i>Saving Clause</i> ” and Relief from Double Taxation	272
7		Final Remarks	273
PART III			
		Double Non-Taxation and Hybrid Entities: The New Trend of (<i>Mis</i>) Matching Outcomes	277
CHAPTER 5			
		Hybrid Mismatch Arrangements and <i>Linking Rules</i> : Creating Artificial (<i>Mis</i>)Matches	279
1		Introduction	279
2		The Concept of Hybrid Mismatch Arrangements (HMA)	281
	2.1	The “ <i>Hybrid Element</i> ”	282
	2.2	The Existence of a “ <i>Payment</i> ”	284
	2.3	A D/NI Outcome (Double Non-taxation)	288
	2.3.1	Deduction and Inclusion as Ordinary Income	288

	2.3.2	Is a D/NI Outcome a Presumption of Base Erosion: a Presumption of Abusive Practices or Both?	290
	2.4	Illustrations of HMAs with Respect to Hybrid Entities and Reverse Hybrid Entities	291
	2.4.1	Example 1: D/NI Using a Hybrid Entity	291
	2.4.2	Example 2: D/NI Using a Reverse Hybrid	295
	2.4.3	Example 3: Indirect D/NI: “ <i>Imported Mismatches</i> ”	297
3		<i>Linking Rules</i> and the New Era of BEPS	299
	3.1	Primary Response	300
	3.2	Defensive Rule	302
	3.3	“Limitations” Within the Scope of the <i>Linking Rules</i>	304
	3.3.1	Control Groups and “Acting Together” Test	305
	3.3.2	Structured Arrangements	308
	3.4	Tax Policy Concerns	312
	3.4.1	Circular Effect	312
	3.4.2	Dependency upon Foreign Laws	314
	3.4.3	Economic Double Taxation and Lack of Coherence	316
	3.5	Legal Concerns	319
	3.5.1	Compatibility with Tax Treaties	319
		3.5.1.1 General Structure of Article 24 OECD Model: Nondiscrimination	319
		3.5.1.2 <i>Linking Rules</i> and Article 24(4) OECD Model	321
		3.5.1.3 <i>Linking Rules</i> and Article 24(5) OECD Model	323
	3.5.2	Compatibility with EU Law	325
		3.5.2.1 EU Secondary Law	325
		3.5.2.2 EU Primary Law: Fundamental Freedoms	329
4		Interaction Between <i>Linking Rules</i> and Other Domestic Anti-avoidance and Anti-base Erosion Provisions	343
	4.1	<i>Linking Rules</i> and Domestic Interest Limitation Rules	343
	4.2	<i>Linking Rules</i> and CFC Rules	347
5		Final Remarks	351
CHAPTER 6			
		Hybrid Entities <i>Without</i> Double Non-taxation: An Alternative Approach	353
1		Introduction	353
2		<i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i> : A Domestic Alternative	354
	2.1	General Description of the Proposal	354
		2.1.1 “ <i>Entity</i> ” Understood in a Broad Sense	355

Table of Contents

	2.1.2	Home Country: Where the Entity Is Formally/Legally Organized	355
	2.1.3	<i>Home Country v. Source Country</i>	356
2.2		Scope of the Rule	357
2.3		Tax Policy Justifications	358
	2.3.1	Simplicity	358
	2.3.2	Coherence	359
	2.3.3	Administrability	360
2.4		Application of the <i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i>	360
	2.4.1	Application to Cases Concerning Payments Made by <i>Hybrid Entities</i>	361
	2.4.2	Application to Cases Concerning Payments Made to <i>Reverse Hybrid Entities</i>	362
	2.4.3	Advantages	363
		2.4.3.1 Noncontingent Application	363
		2.4.3.2 Disparities over Outcomes	363
		2.4.3.3 Complexity Is Reduced	364
	2.4.4	Disadvantages	364
		2.4.4.1 Legal Certainty	364
		2.4.4.2 Some Undesirable Effects	365
2.5		Similarities and Differences with Other Examples of Coordination	369
	2.5.1	The Spanish Example of Coordination and the <i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i>	369
	2.5.2	The Danish Rule and the <i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i>	370
	2.5.3	The EU ATAD I and II and the <i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i>	371
		2.5.3.1 The Proposal on EU ATAD I and the <i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i>	371
		2.5.3.2 Article 9a EU ATAD II and the <i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i>	372
3		Implications of the <i>Reactive Coordination Rule</i> Within Tax Treaties	373
	3.1	Bilateral Cases Using <i>Hybrid Entities</i> and <i>Reverse Hybrid Entities</i>	374
		3.1.1 Case A	374
		3.1.2 Case B	376
		3.1.3 Case C	379
		3.1.4 Case D	383
	3.2	Triangular Cases Using <i>Hybrid Entities</i> and <i>Reverse Hybrid Entities</i>	385
		3.2.1 Case E	386
		3.2.2 Case F	389
		3.2.3 Case G	391

	3.3	The “Switch-Off” and Article 1(2) OECD Model	395
4		Final Remarks	396
CHAPTER 7			
		Summary and Conclusions	399
1		Introduction	399
2		The Unnecessary International Concern on DNT	400
3		Hybrid Entities: Disparities as the True Core of the Issue	401
4		Hybrid Entities and the Entitlement to Tax Treaty Benefits	403
5		Avoiding the Artificial Link Between DNT and the Use of Hybrid Entities	405
6		The Alternative: The Reactive Coordination Rule	405
		List of References	409
		Index	439