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Context

• Fair and efficient corporate tax system: priority of the Commission
• Action Plan for Fair and Effective Taxation (June 2015)
• Automatic Exchange of Information on Tax rulings (December 2015)
• Anti-Tax Avoidance Package (January 2016)
Context

• Extensive work done by the G20/OECD on the Base Erosion and Profit Shifting project
• Need for a strong analytical basis focused on EU
• Study launched beginning of 2015 and published in January 2016
Context

Anti Tax Avoidance Package

Chapeau Communication

- Anti Tax Avoidance Directive
- Recommendation on Tax Treaties
- Revised Administrative Cooperation Directive
- Communication on External Strategy

Staff Working Document

Study on Aggressive Tax Planning
Objectives of the study

• Definition of the Identification of model ATP structures
• Identification of critical factors that facilitate or allow ATP (indicators)
• Review of MS' tax rules & practices which can expose MS to ATP
Scope

- Aggressive Tax Planning: "taking advantage of the technicalities of a tax system or of mismatches between two or more tax systems for the purpose of reducing tax liability,"
- National rules and practices, not tax treaties
- General corporate income tax systems of 28 MS, complemented by a review of possible role of overseas countries and territories
- Wide coverage in terms of number of MS and indicators ... more limited level of details per MS
How was the study conducted?

Identification of Structures of Aggressive Tax Planning (ATP) → Deriving ATP Indicators from structures + add others → Data collection by network of tax experts → Assessment per MS & general conclusions → Review by MS representatives → Discussion of preliminary results with MS & Finalisation
ATP structures

- Identification of 7 relevant ATP structures
  - Offshore loan ATP structure
  - Hybrid loan ATP structure
  - Hybrid entity ATP structure
  - Interest-free loan ATP structure
  - Patent box ATP structure
  - Two-tiered IP ATP structure
  - IP and cost contribution agreement ATP structure
Example: Offshore Loan Structure
# Indicators derived from Offshore Loan ATP Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State A</th>
<th>State B</th>
<th>State C</th>
<th>State D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant indicators</td>
<td>Relevant indicators</td>
<td>Relevant indicators</td>
<td>Relevant indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too generous tax-exemption of dividends received.</td>
<td>Tax deduction for interest costs.</td>
<td>Tax deduction for interest costs.</td>
<td>No withholding tax on dividends paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CFC Rules.</td>
<td>Tax deduction does not depend on the tax treatment in the creditor's state.</td>
<td>Tax deduction does not depend on the tax treatment in the creditor's state.</td>
<td>Nil corporate tax rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest-limitation rules and no thin-capitalization</td>
<td>No withholding tax on interest payments.</td>
<td>No withholding tax on interest payments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No beneficial-owner test for reduction of withholding tax.</td>
<td>No beneficial-owner test for reduction of withholding tax.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral ruling on interest spread.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group taxation with acquisition holding company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No general or specific anti-avoidance rules to counter the model ATP structures.</td>
<td>No general or specific anti-avoidance rules to counter the model ATP structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators

• Derived from the model ATP Structures
• Capture the risk that the model ATP structures are set up.
• Correspond to specific piece of legislation or case law, or absence of those
Categories of indicators

• 33 indicators
• **Active** indicators
  • *can directly promote or prompt an ATP-structure*
  • *e.g. patent box, notional interest deduction, ...*
• **Passive** indicators
  • *does not by itself promote or prompt any ATP structure*
  • *but is needed in order to allow the setting up of an ATP structure.*
  • *e.g. lack of withholding tax, interest deductibility within a group, ...*
Categories of indicators

• Lack of anti-abuse provisions
  • Lack of rules that aimed at countering ATP
  • e.g. lack of CFC rules, absence of thin-cap rules, ...

• Combination of passive indicators and lack of anti-abuse provisions
  • Routing of dividends through a MS
  • Base erosion by means of financing costs
  • Base erosion by means of IP costs
## Overview of some indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Income from certain hybrid instruments non-taxable</td>
<td>Lack of anti-abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No deemed income from interest-free loan (non-arm's-length transactions)</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tax deduction for intra-group interest costs</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest costs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tax deduction does not depend on the tax treatment in the creditor's state</td>
<td>Lack of anti-abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tax deduction allowed for deemed interest costs on interest-free debt</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No taxation of benefit from interest-free debt</td>
<td>Lack of anti-abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No thin-capitalization rules</td>
<td>Lack of anti-abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No interest-limitation rules</td>
<td>Lack of anti-abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No withholding tax on interest payments (absent under domestic law)</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No beneficial-owner test for reduction of withholding tax on interest</td>
<td>Lack of anti-abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFC rules</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No CFC rules</td>
<td>Lack of anti-abuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MS assessment

• Information collection structured around the 33 indicators
• Information provided by network of national tax experts
• Filled in questionnaire submitted to MS for comments
Conclusions from the study

• Large differences across MS
• Some indicators are particularly relevant
  • Lack of CFC rules
  • Base erosion by means of financing costs intra-group
  • Lack of rules to counter mismatches in entities qualification
  • Dividend flow-through
  • Patent boxes
• Role of third countries jurisdictions
Relevance for the ATAP

- CFC rules
- GAAR
- Interest Limitation rules
- Hybrid mismatches
- Switchover rules
- Exit and Capital gains tax rules
- Role of third-country jurisdictions
Offshore Loan Structure
Hybrid Loan

[Diagram showing the concept of hybrid loans with nodes labeled as Equity, Dividend, Interest, and a flow of funds indicated by arrows with labels such as "No tax".]
Hybrid Entity

Loan

No tax

Interest

No tax

Taxation and Customs Union
Interest Free Loan

Equity → Dividend

Loan → Interest

No tax → A

No tax → B

No tax → C

No tax → D
Patent Box ATP Structure
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Two Tiered IP Structure