

Current Tax Treaty Issues

50th Anniversary of the
International Tax Group

edited by
Prof. Guglielmo Maisto



Vol. 18
EC and International Tax Law Series

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements		v
Foreword		vii
Chapter 1:	A History of the International Tax Group	1
	<i>by John Avery Jones and Toshio Miyatake</i>	
1.1.	Introduction	1
1.2.	The background scene in the 1970s	2
1.3.	Communication	3
1.4.	Collaboration	4
1.5.	Topics	5
1.6.	Appendices	7
Part One		
Treaty Policy and General Considerations		
Chapter 2:	Writing Tax Treaty History	15
	<i>by Richard Vann</i>	
2.1.	Introduction	15
2.2.	How?	15
2.2.1.	Publications of international organizations	16
2.2.2.	Archives of international organizations	18
2.2.3.	Treaty practice	21
2.2.4.	Country tax history	22
2.2.5.	Significant persons	24
2.2.6.	Language and legal culture	25

Table of Contents

2.3.	Why?	29
2.3.1.	Applying the law	29
2.3.2.	Developing tax policy	30
2.3.3.	Matching with theories	33
2.3.4.	Historiography	35
2.4	Where are we with tax treaty history?	37
Chapter 3:	International Tax Policy and International Tax Institutions: Never the Twain?	41
	<i>by Richard Vann</i>	
3.1.	Introduction	41
3.2.	The beginning: League of Nations 1920-1946	42
3.2.1.	1920-1928	42
3.2.2.	1929-1946	47
3.3.	Snapshots 1946-1990	52
3.3.1.	United Nations 1946-1954	52
3.3.2.	OEEC/OECD 1954-1990	55
3.3.3.	International Monetary Fund 1944-1990	58
3.3.4.	United Nations 1967-1990	61
3.4.	The new international tax world? OECD, Global Forum on Transparency, Inclusive Framework, UN, IMF, 1991-2020	63
3.4.1.	Politics	64
3.4.2.	Economics and international tax policy	65
3.4.3.	Transition from business as usual to new, larger and combined projects	67
3.4.4.	Convergence and emergence of international tax institutions	72
3.4.5.	A new international tax order?	73
Chapter 4:	Four Comparisons of Tax Litigation between the Netherlands and the UK	77
	<i>by John Avery Jones and Frank Pötgens</i>	
4.1.	Introduction	77
4.2.	Administrative law or not	77

4.3.	The meaning of “binding”	79
4.3.1.	Common law: United Kingdom	79
4.3.2.	Civil law: Netherlands	82
4.3.3.	A comparison	85
4.4.	Burden of proof	88
4.5.	The use of supplementary materials in interpreting the law	92
4.5.1.	Netherlands	92
4.5.1.1.	Interpreting tax treaties	93
4.5.2.	United Kingdom	94
4.5.3.	Comparison	98
Chapter 5:	Preservation Principle	101
	<i>by Koichi Inoue and Toshio Miyatake</i>	
5.1.	Introduction	101
5.2.	Status of discussions about the Preservation Principle	104
5.2.1.	Japan	104
5.2.2.	United States and Canada	105
5.2.3.	Other countries	106
5.3.	Analysis of Preservation Principle in general	106
5.3.1.	Introduction	106
5.3.2.	Dualism and monism	107
5.3.3.	Hierarchical rank of income tax treaties	109
5.3.4.	Three related but different interpretation issues of income tax treaties	111
5.3.4.1.	Introduction	111
5.3.4.2.	Three issues identified	113
5.3.4.3.	First Issue: Direct taxing power	114
5.3.4.3.1.	Introduction	114
5.3.4.3.2.	Countries having the view that income tax treaties have no direct taxing power	114
5.3.4.3.2.1.	Grouping of legal grounds	114
5.3.4.3.2.2.	Constitutional reasons	115
5.3.4.3.2.3.	Legislative reasons	116
5.3.4.3.2.4.	Other reasons	117
5.3.4.3.3.	France has a unique position	119

Table of Contents

5.3.4.4.	Second Issue: Exclusively relieving	119
5.3.4.4.1.	France's position	119
5.3.4.4.2.	Countries having the view that treaties are not always relieving	120
5.3.4.4.3.	Countries having the view that treaties are exclusively relieving	120
5.3.4.5.	Third Issue: Preservation Principle in the narrow sense	122
5.3.4.5.1.	Introduction	122
5.3.4.5.2.	Countries making substantive discussions about the Preservation Principle	122
5.3.4.5.2.1.	United States	122
5.3.4.5.2.2.	Japan	124
5.3.4.5.2.3.	Canada	126
5.3.4.5.2.4.	Summary	126
5.3.4.5.3.	Countries making no substantive discussions on the Preservation Principle	126
5.3.4.6.	Summary	131
5.4.	Change of source rule	133
5.4.1.	Introduction	133
5.4.2.	Example 1	134
5.4.3.	Analysis	135
5.4.3.1.	Australia's analysis	135
5.4.3.2.	India's analysis	136
5.4.3.3.	Comparative analysis	137
5.4.3.3.1.	Introduction	137
5.4.3.3.2.	Countries having domestic provisions to give effect to inconsistent treaty source rules	138
5.4.3.3.3.	Countries having no domestic provisions to give effect to inconsistent treaty source rules	139
5.5.	PE threshold tests	141
5.5.1.	Introduction	141
5.5.2.	Example 2	141
5.5.3.	Analysis	142
5.5.3.1.	United States' analysis	142
5.5.3.2.	Japan's analysis	144
5.5.3.3.	Comparative analysis	145
5.5.3.3.1.	Introduction	145
5.5.3.3.2.	Countries having domestic provisions to give effect to inconsistent treaty provisions	146

5.5.3.3.3.	Countries having no domestic provisions to give effect to inconsistent treaty provisions	146
5.5.3.3.3.1.	Countries requiring the Consistency Rule	147
5.5.3.3.3.2.	Countries granting most favourable result to taxpayers	149
5.5.3.3.4.	Summary	150
5.5.3.4.	Implication of BEPS Project preventing artificial avoidance of PE status	151
5.6.	Taxation on business profits – Application of the AOA	153
5.6.1.	Introduction	153
5.6.2.	Example 3	153
5.6.3.	Analysis	154
5.6.3.1.	Japan’s analysis	154
5.6.3.2.	Netherland’s analysis	155
5.6.3.3.	Comparative analysis	155
5.7.	Conclusion	156
Chapter 6:	Constitutional Issues in Developing International Tax Norms: A Swedish Perspective	157
	<i>by Bertil Wiman</i>	
6.1.	The issue	157
6.2.	The OECD	160
6.3.	The European Union	163
6.4.	The Swedish tax legislative process	166
6.4.1.	The normal procedure	166
6.4.2.	The procedure in EU-related tax legislation	170
6.4.3.	The procedure with respect to tax treaties	172
6.5.	Discussion	173

Part Two
Treaty Definitions

Chapter 7:	Taxation of States under Tax Treaties <i>by Guglielmo Maisto</i>	181
7.1.	Introduction	181
7.2.	Tax treaty status of the (home) state	182
7.2.1.	The state as a “person”	183
7.2.1.1.	The state as “Contracting State” under the OECD Model (1963)	183
7.2.1.2.	The state as including other states or territories under article 30 OECD Model (territorial extension)	184
7.2.1.3.	The “State” excluding certain territories or possessions	186
7.2.1.4.	The confirmatory definition of “State”	187
7.2.1.5.	The “State” in “geographical sense”	189
7.2.1.6.	Conclusion	190
7.2.2.	The state as a “company”	190
7.2.2.1.	The state as a “body corporate”	190
7.2.2.2.	Territories not enjoying statehood	195
7.2.2.3.	Territories having statehood under international law that are not recognized by the other contracting state	197
7.2.3.	The state as a “resident”	201
7.2.3.1.	The “liable to tax” test	201
7.2.3.2.	The state as a treaty “resident” by virtue of the 1995 revision to article 4(1) OECD Model	205
7.2.3.3.	The meaning of “political subdivisions” and “local authorities”	214
7.2.3.3.1.	In general	214
7.2.3.3.2.	Can one entirely disregard the law of the state to which the “political subdivision” or “local authority” belongs?	218
7.2.3.3.3.	“Constituent units” of federal states	219
7.2.3.4.	“Agency and instrumentality”, “statutory body” and other state-owned entities	223
7.2.3.4.1.	In general	223
7.2.3.4.2.	The domestic law general meaning	225
7.2.3.4.3.	The “context” requiring a different interpretation	226
7.2.4.	Treaty practice	228

7.2.5.	Treaty definitions of “statutory body, “agency” and “instrumentality”	231
7.2.6.	Non-discrimination	233
7.3.	Conclusion	235
Chapter 8:	Limitations on Treaty Access by or through Commercial Entities	237
	<i>by Peter H. Blessing</i>	
8.1.	Introduction	237
8.1.1.	Selection and scope of topic	237
8.1.2.	Key themes	239
8.1.3.	Reasons for limiting access (the problem)	241
8.1.4.	Historical background of provisions specifically limiting treaty access	245
8.1.4.1.	Pre-BEPS measures	246
8.1.4.2.	BEPS initiative and thereafter	248
8.2.	Anti-conduit test (ACT)	250
8.2.1.	Theoretical groundings	251
8.2.2.	Historical background	252
8.2.3.	Approaches to address conduit treaty shopping	254
8.2.3.1.	Administrative determinations and judicial decisions	254
8.2.3.2.	Statutory and regulatory approaches	256
8.2.3.3.	Treaty approaches	257
8.2.4.	Relationship to international law	258
8.2.4.1.	General	258
8.2.4.2.	Theory of treaty interpretation	260
8.3.	Principal purpose test (PPT)	262
8.3.1.	Theoretical grounding	262
8.3.2.	Historical background of the PPT	263
8.3.2.1.	Treaty usage	264
8.3.2.2.	Case law	265
8.3.3.	Textual analysis and discussion	266
8.3.3.1.	General	266
8.3.3.2.	What do the examples tell us?	269
8.3.3.3.	PPT discretionary fallback relief provision	271
8.3.4.	Relationship to international law	272
8.3.5.	EU freedoms	273

Table of Contents

8.4.	Limitation on benefits test (LOBT)	275
8.4.1.	Theoretical grounding	275
8.4.2.	Historical background of the LOBT	277
8.4.3.	Overview	281
8.4.4.	Publicly traded entity	283
8.4.4.1.	Theoretical grounding	283
8.4.4.2.	Textual analysis and discussion	284
8.4.5.	50% ownership/base erosion	285
8.4.5.1.	Theoretical grounding	285
8.4.5.2.	Textual analysis and discussion	286
8.4.6.	Active business	287
8.4.6.1.	Theoretical grounding	287
8.4.6.2.	Textual analysis and discussion	288
8.4.7.	Derivative benefits	292
8.4.7.1.	Theoretical grounding	292
8.4.7.2.	Text and discussion	293
8.4.8.	Discretionary relief	295
8.4.8.1.	Theoretical grounding	295
8.4.8.2.	Textual analysis and discussion	296
8.4.8.3.	Administrative practice and jurisprudence	299
8.4.9.	EU freedoms	302
8.5.	Fault lines	304
8.5.1.	Holding company	304
8.5.2.	Financing company	305
8.5.3.	IP company	306
8.5.4.	CIV	306
8.5.5.	Private equity and other private non-CIV funds	307
8.5.6.	Investment manager	308
8.5.7.	Preferential tax regimes	309
8.6.	Assessment/comparison of regimes	309
8.6.1.	PPT	309
8.6.2.	LOBT	311
8.6.3.	Alternatives to the Action 6/MLI proposals	313
8.7.	Conclusion	316

Chapter 9:	Interpretation vs Qualification	319
	<i>by Angelo Nikolakakis</i>	
9.1.	Introduction	319
9.2.	Article 3(2) OECD Model	320
9.3.	Interpretation vs qualification	321
9.4.	Definitional provisions and deeming rules under domestic laws	324
9.5.	Undefined terms within definitions	333
9.6.	<i>Fowler</i>	334
9.7.	<i>McDonald's</i> State aid proceedings	343
9.8.	What to make of all of this	348
9.9.	<i>Pacta sunt servanda</i> and good faith	354
9.10.	Conclusions	356
Chapter 10:	Legal Considerations Arising from the Use of Memoranda of Understanding in Bilateral Tax Treaty Relations	359
	<i>by Johann Hattingh</i>	
10.1.	Introduction	359
10.2.	MOUs in treaty practice generally	360
10.2.1.	Introduction	360
10.2.2.	Reasons for using an MOU	362
10.2.3.	The dangers of using an MOU	363
10.2.4.	The general legal status of an MOU	365
10.2.4.1.	Legal effect in international law	365
10.2.4.2.	Legal effect in domestic law	367
10.2.5.	Should there be publication and scrutiny of MOUs that are “less than treaty test”?	369

Table of Contents

10.3.	Ancillary documents to bilateral treaties: Protocols, diplomatic notes and competent authority agreements distinguished from MOUs	370
10.3.1.	Protocols	370
10.3.2.	Exchange of notes	371
10.3.3.	Competent authority agreements	372
10.4.	Article 25 (mutual agreement) OECD Model: Competent authority agreements and MOUs	373
10.4.1.	Classification of competent authority agreements and their significance	373
10.4.1.1.	Specific case mutual agreements	374
10.4.1.2.	Interpretative mutual agreements	374
10.4.1.3.	Legislative mutual agreements	375
10.4.2.	The impact of changes to the 2017 OECD Model on the legal status of competent authority agreements	376
10.5.	The use of MOUs in bilateral tax treaty relations	380
10.5.1.	Sample analysis information	381
10.5.2.	The legal basis for MOU conclusion	382
10.5.2.1.	Indications in MOUs of a legal basis for their conclusion	382
10.5.2.2.	MOUs with no indication of a legal basis for their conclusion	384
10.5.3.	Usages of MOUs	387
10.5.3.1.	MOUs as binding contextual material: Recording treaty negotiation history and agreed interpretations	387
10.5.3.2.	Implementing, updating and subsequent interpretation of tax treaties	389
10.5.3.3.	Inter-state tax administration	391
10.5.3.4.	Attempts at retroactivity	392
10.5.3.5.	Attempts to legislate despite democratic deficit	394
10.5.4.	Proper publication and public access to MOUs	395
10.6.	Legal issues arising from the use of MOUs in tax treaty relations	398
10.6.1.	Self-regulating statements in MOUs	398
10.6.2.	At the international treaty law level	400
10.6.2.1.	MOUs as binding contextual material or (perhaps) treaties in own right	401
10.6.2.2.	MOUs evincing subsequent state practice	402

10.6.2.3.	MOUs as international “agreements” but not national law	402
10.6.3.	Under domestic law	403
10.6.3.1.	Authority to enter into MOUs, giving effect and scope of competent authority powers	403
10.6.3.1.1.	Authority to conclude does not equal effectiveness in domestic law	404
10.6.3.1.2.	Authorization does not include blanket statutory consent	406
10.6.3.1.3.	Scope of delegated authority requires specificity	409
10.6.3.1.4.	Competent authorities are not able to jointly overturn settled case law	411
10.6.3.2.	Constitutional domestication of MOUs	412
10.6.3.3.	Impact on taxpayers	415
10.7.	Concluding remarks	415
10.7.1.	General findings	415
10.7.2.	Further work is required: The status of mutual agreements in domestic law	417
10.7.3.	What needs to be done?	419
Appendix		421

Part Three
Taxing Rules

Chapter 11:	Some Thoughts on Jurisdiction and Nexus <i>by Philip Baker</i>	441
11.1.	Introduction	441
11.2.	Jurisdiction to tax	442
11.3.	The requirement of a nexus	445
11.4.	Why is it important to develop the theory of tax nexus?	446
11.5.	Where are issues of jurisdiction and tax nexus likely to arise?	450

Table of Contents

11.6.	The requirement of a tax nexus: Some points of terminology	451
11.7.	Some thoughts on the nature of the tax nexus requirement	453
11.7.1.	The nature of the nexus requirement will depend upon the type of tax involved	453
11.7.2.	The nature of the nexus required may depend upon the type of taxpayer involved	455
11.7.3.	The meaning of the connecting factors for purposes of nexus cannot purely be a matter of domestic law	457
11.7.4.	Not all forms of nexus are of equal weight – A weight may need to be ascribed to each form of nexus	458
11.7.5.	In determining the weight to be given to a particular form of nexus as the basis for a claim for jurisdiction, attention should also be paid to the administrative workability of that claim	459
11.7.6.	Where more than one claim to jurisdiction is made, based upon different forms of nexus, potential double taxation can be resolved by agreement or by comparing the relevant weight ascribed to the different claims	460
11.7.7.	The validity of a claim to jurisdiction based upon a particular nexus may change over time	461
11.7.8.	Jurisdiction, nexus and the avoidance of tax, and double non-taxation	462
11.8.	Concluding comments: The way ahead	464
Chapter 12:	PE and Dependent Agent: Where Do We Stand?	467
	<i>Stéphane Austry</i>	
12.1.	Introduction	467
12.2.	History of the provisions on dependent agent PE	468
12.2.1.	Pre-OECD Model history	468
12.2.2.	OECD Model history	472
12.3.	The dependent agent PE before the application of the MLI	473

12.3.1.	Structure of the agency provision	473
12.3.1.1.	Structure of article 5(5) of the OECD Model	473
12.3.1.2.	Alternative models	474
12.3.2.	Criteria of the agent PE of article 5(5)	477
12.3.2.1.	The twofold definition of the agent PE	477
12.3.2.2.	Criteria used by OECD countries to apply this definition	478
12.3.3.	Interpretation of article 5(5) among civil law jurisdictions	480
12.3.3.1.	France – <i>Sté Zimmer Ltd</i> case	480
12.3.3.2.	France – <i>Valueclick</i> case and <i>Google</i> case	483
12.3.3.3.	Norway – <i>Dell Products</i> case	483
12.3.3.4.	Italy – <i>Philip Morris</i> case	484
12.3.3.5.	Italy – <i>Boston Scientific</i> case	484
12.3.3.6.	Spain – <i>Roche Vitamins Europe</i> case	485
12.3.3.7.	Spain – <i>Dell Products</i> case	485
12.4.	The dependent agent PE after the application of the MLI	486
12.4.1.	Structure of the new provisions	486
12.4.2.	Analysis of the new provisions	487
12.4.3.	The practical impact of these new provisions on commissionaire arrangements and other similar contractual relations	490
12.5.	Conclusion	492
Chapter 13:	Taxation of Services	493
	<i>by Shefali Goradia</i>	
13.1.	Introduction	493
13.1.1.	What constitutes services?	493
13.1.2.	Is there a need for developing an approach for taxation of services independent from taxation of trade in goods?	495
13.1.3.	Basic principles underpinning taxation of services	498
13.2.	Developments in model conventions	502
13.2.1.	OECD Model	502
13.2.1.1.	Alternative Services PE threshold	505
13.2.2.	UN Model	507
13.2.3.	Conclusion	512

Table of Contents

13.3.	Detailed discussion on articles dealing specifically with taxation aspects of services in the OECD and UN Models	512
13.3.1.	Services PE	513
13.3.1.1.	Attribution of profits to Services PE	520
13.3.1.2.	Overlap of article 7 (dealing with business profits in general) with other articles dealing with specific services in the Model Conventions	522
13.3.2.	Independent personal services	522
13.3.3.	Insurance	523
13.3.4.	Fees for technical services	525
13.3.5.	Artistes and sportspersons	530
13.3.6.	Directors' fees	532
13.3.7.	Income from international shipping and air transport business	535
13.4.	Digital services	537
13.5.	Conclusion	538
Chapter 14:	Tax Treaty Practice Regarding Article 21 and Related OECD and UN Model Issues <i>by Kees van Raad</i>	541
14.1.	In general	541
14.1.1.	Role of the OECD Model	541
14.1.2.	State practice regarding deviations from the OECD Model	542
14.1.3.	Two structural issues with the OECD Model	543
14.2.	Mechanism of elimination of double taxation	543
14.2.1.	Distributive rules	543
14.2.2.	Items that may be taxed exclusively in the RS	544
14.2.3.	Items that may also be taxed in the OS	545
14.2.3.1.	No restriction of OS taxation	545
14.2.3.2.	Conditional restriction of OS taxation	546
14.2.4.	Distributive rules that combine sections 14.2.2. and 14.2.3.	548
14.2.5.	Relief of double taxation in case of OS taxation	549

14.3.	Restricted distributive rules	550
14.3.1.	Introduction	550
14.3.2.	Distributive rules that cover all income items of a given nature	552
14.3.3.	Distributive rules that do <i>not</i> cover all income items of a given nature	552
14.4.	Article 21	554
14.4.1.	Article 21 of the 1963 OECD Model	554
14.4.2.	Article 21 of the 1977 OECD Model	555
14.4.3.	Unrestricting the scope of the restricted distributive rules	556
14.5.	Overview and assessment of article 21 deviations in treaty practice	558
14.5.1.	Article 21.1 based on OECD Model	558
14.5.1.1.	Text article 21.1	558
14.5.1.2.	Text in substance identical to article 21.1 OECD 1963 or 1977	559
14.5.1.3.	Restrictions on the applicability of article 21.1: Conditions and exceptions	559
14.5.1.3.1.	Introduction	559
14.5.1.3.2.	Conditions	560
14.5.1.3.2.1.	No treaty abuse	560
14.5.1.3.2.2.	Income recipient is the beneficial owner (BO) thereof	562
14.5.1.3.2.3.	The recipient of the income is “subject to tax” in respect of the given income item	562
14.5.1.3.2.4.	Income items specifically excepted from the rule of article 21.1	563
14.5.1.4.	The word “only” is omitted, i.e. no restriction in paragraph 1	564
14.5.1.5.	Additional provision on non-arm’s length amounts	566
14.5.1.6.	Text fundamentally deviates from OECD and UN texts	568
14.5.1.6.1.	Irrespective where “arising”, any other income item “may be taxed” by each CS	568
14.5.1.6.2.	Unrestricted application of domestic law of each CS	569
14.5.2.	Article 21.3 based on UN Model	570
14.5.2.1.	Text article 21.3 UN Model	570
14.5.2.2.	Analysis of article 21.3 UN Model	571

Table of Contents

14.5.2.3.	Treaty practice regarding article 21.3 UN Model	573
14.5.2.3.1.	Paragraph 3 is integrated with paragraph 1	573
14.5.2.3.2.	Reversal of order of paragraph 3 and paragraph 1	574
14.5.2.3.3.	“Arising” is replaced by another term or by a concept	575
14.5.2.3.4.	Paragraph 3 exception is restricted to specified types of income	576
14.5.2.3.5.	Paragraph 3 exception is drafted as main rule (absence of paragraph 1)	577
14.5.2.3.6.	Paragraph 3 exception is drafted as main rule (absence of paragraph 1), but with exclusive OS taxation (“only”)	578
14.5.2.3.7.	Paragraph 3 exception applies only conditionally: If other income item is “not taxed” in the RS	579
14.6.	Summary and proposals	579

Part Four

Non-Discrimination and Beneficial Ownership

Chapter 15:	The Beneficial Ownership Limitation in Articles 10, 11 and 12 OECD Model and Conduit Companies in Pre- and Post-BEPS Tax Treaty Policy: Do We (Still) Need It?	585
	<i>by Robert J. Danon</i>	
15.1.	Introduction	585
15.2.	Beneficial ownership as a response to conduit company cases in pre-BEPS treaty policy	590
15.2.1.	Conduit company cases and improper use of DTAs	590
15.2.2.	Delineation between conduit company cases and other forms of treaty abuse	594
15.2.3.	Relation between beneficial ownership and conduit company cases	596
15.2.4.	Nature of beneficial ownership	597
15.2.5.	Meaning of beneficial ownership	602
15.2.5.1.	Some preliminary considerations under article 31 VCLT	602
15.2.5.2.	Meaning under the OECD Commentaries: The main milestones	605
15.2.5.2.1.	The 1977 Commentary	605

15.2.5.2.2.	The 1986 Conduit Report and 2003 Commentary	607
15.2.5.2.3.	The 2014 Commentary	609
15.2.5.3.	Meaning under tax treaty practice: Substance over form versus legal interpretation	611
15.2.5.3.1.	Court decisions following a substance-over-form interpretation	611
15.2.5.3.2.	Court decisions following a legal interpretation: <i>Prévost</i> and <i>Velcro</i>	618
15.2.5.3.2.1.	<i>Prévost</i>	618
15.2.5.3.2.2.	<i>Velcro</i>	620
15.2.5.3.2.3.	Critical thoughts	621
15.2.5.4.	Meaning of beneficial ownership in the ECJ's cases on directive shopping	625
15.2.5.5.	Debate on legal versus substance-oriented interpretation	626
15.2.5.6.	Reconciling common denominator: Legal substance	628
15.2.6.	Relation between beneficial ownership and abuse of rights	631
15.2.6.1.	Neglecting beneficial ownership for an abuse-of-rights analysis	632
15.2.6.2.	Building the notion of abuse of rights into beneficial ownership	642
15.2.7.	What if the beneficial owner is in a contracting state?	644
15.2.7.1.	From the perspective of the beneficial ownership limitation	645
15.2.7.2.	From the perspective of an abuse of rights doctrine	647
15.3.	Beneficial ownership as a response to conduit company cases after BEPS	651
15.3.1.	The new preamble to the OECD Model and beneficial ownership	652
15.3.1.1.	General considerations on the new preamble to the OECD Model	652
15.3.1.2.	Impact of the new preamble to the OECD Model on the interpretation of beneficial ownership	654
15.3.2.	The PPT and beneficial ownership	656
15.3.3.	Can beneficial ownership and the PPT lead to different results?	658
15.4.	Summary and conclusions: Do we still need beneficial ownership?	660

Chapter 16:	Should Courts in EU Member States Take Account of the ECJ’s Judgment in the Danish Beneficial Ownership Cases When Interpreting the Beneficial Ownership Requirement in Tax Treaties?	663
	<i>by Luc De Broe</i>	
16.1.	The meaning of “beneficial ownership” in the Interest & Royalty Directive according to the ECJ	663
16.1.1.	The OECD’s beneficial ownership concept	664
16.1.2.	The EU’s beneficial ownership concept in the IRD	667
16.1.3.	The ECJ’s judgments of 26 February 2019	673
16.1.4.	Some conclusions and observations on the judgments of 26 February 2019	675
16.1.4.1.	The IRD’s BO concept	675
16.1.4.2.	Relevance of the OECD’s BO concept	676
16.1.4.3.	Conclusion	680
16.2.	Should courts in Member States when interpreting tax treaties take into consideration the meaning of BO that follows from the ECJ judgment of 26 February 2019?	680
16.2.1.	Article 31(3)(c) of the VCLT	681
16.2.2.	Article 3(2) of the OECD Model	687
16.2.3.	The principle of consistent interpretation of EU directives	690
16.2.4.	Conclusion	694
Contributors		695