

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND TAX DISPUTES

Edited by

WERNER HASLEHNER

*Professor of Tax Law, Faculty of Law, Economics and Finance, University of Luxembourg,
Luxembourg*

TIMOTHY LYONS KC

Barrister at 39 Essex Chambers, UK

KATERINA PANTAZATOU

*Associate Professor of Tax Law, Faculty of Law, Economics and Finance, University of Luxembourg,
Luxembourg*

GEORG KOFLER

*Professor of Tax Law, Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law, Vienna University of
Economics and Business, Austria*

ALEXANDER RUST

*Professor of Tax Law, Institute for Austrian and International Tax Law, Vienna University of
Economics and Business, Austria*

ELGAR TAX LAW AND PRACTICE



Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© The Editors and Contributors Severally 2023

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 or photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
The Lypiatts
15 Lansdown Road
Cheltenham
Glos GL50 2JA
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
William Pratt House
9 Dewey Court
Northampton
Massachusetts 01060
USA

A catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023931499

This book is available electronically in the **Elgaronline**
Law subject collection
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781803920382>

ISBN 978 1 80392 037 5 (cased)
ISBN 978 1 80392 038 2 (eBook)

CONTENTS

<i>Extended contents</i>	vi
<i>List of contributors</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiv
1 The future of international tax dispute resolution post-BEPS and MLI <i>Daniel Gutmann</i>	1
2 What disputes does a MAP resolve? <i>Katerina Pantazatou</i>	17
3 Post-BEPS arbitration: last best offer versus reasoned opinion <i>Alexia Kardachaki and Sjoerd Douma</i>	41
4 Best practices for competent authorities to ensure effective and efficient arbitration <i>Laura Turcan</i>	68
5 The EU Dispute Resolution Directive <i>Georg Kofler and Alexander Rust</i>	103
6 Tax arbitration and the EU treaties <i>Werner Haslehner</i>	130
7 Taxpayers and their rights in alternative tax dispute resolution <i>Katerina Perrou</i>	151
8 Enforcement and judicial control of arbitration decisions <i>Paloma Schwarz</i>	171
9 Alternative dispute resolution through mediation <i>Peter Nias</i>	188
10 Relation between dispute resolution under double taxation conventions and investment treaties <i>Robert J. Danon</i>	215
11 The independence and impartiality of arbitrators <i>Arno E. Gildemeister</i>	236
12 Lessons from investment treaty arbitration <i>Javier García Olmedo</i>	255
13 Reflections on dispute resolution under GATT and the WTO and double tax treaty disputes <i>Timothy Lyons</i>	283

EXTENDED CONTENTS

<i>List of contributors</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiv
1 THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL TAX DISPUTE RESOLUTION POST-BEPS AND MLI	
A. THE WORLD OF BILATERALISM	1.05
1. Dispute resolution under a traditional model	1.05
2. Traditional dispute resolution after the MLI	1.07
B. THE WORLD OF MULTILATERALISM	1.14
1. Scenarios of potential disputes regarding the Pillars	1.17
a. Multilateral disputes as a result of Pillar One	1.17
2. Multilateral disputes as a result of Pillar Two	1.24
3. Lessons to be drawn from these scenarios	1.28
D. COMBINING BILATERALISM AND MULTILATERALISM	1.37
E. CONCLUSION	1.42
2 WHAT DISPUTES DOES A MAP RESOLVE?	
A. INTRODUCTION	2.01
B. A SHORT HISTORY OF THE MAP	2.04
C. MAP LEGAL FRAMEWORK	2.11
1. Article 25(1) OECD Model: 'Taxation not in accordance with the provisions of this Convention'	2.13
(a) Transfer-pricing cases	2.26
(b) Abusive transactions	2.30
(c) Other cases of denial of access to the MAP	2.36
2. Article 25(3) OECD Model	2.42
D. THE EU ARBITRATION CONVENTION	2.47
E. THE TAX DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIRECTIVE	2.57
F. CONCLUSIONS	2.64
3 POST-BEPS ARBITRATION: LAST BEST OFFER VERSUS REASONED OPINION	
A. INTRODUCTION	3.01
B. DIFFERENT TYPES OF ARBITRATION PROCEDURE: MAIN CHARACTERISTICS, ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES	3.04
1. Reasoned opinion	3.04
(a) Main characteristics	3.04
(b) Advantages and disadvantages	3.06
2. Last best offer	3.12
(a) Main characteristics	3.12
(b) Advantages and disadvantages	3.14
3. Interim conclusion	3.17
C. CURRENT STATE OF PLAY: TYPES OF ARBITRATION PROCEDURES OFFERED BY	

INTERNATIONAL- AND EUROPEAN-TAX LAW INSTRUMENTS	3.19
1. European instruments: reasoned opinion	3.19
(a) Tax Dispute Resolution Directive	3.19
(b) EU Arbitration Convention	3.24
2. OECD and UN instruments: last best offer	3.29
(a) OECD Model	3.29
(b) MLI	3.36
(c) UN Model	3.39
3. Interim conclusion	3.43
D. A GLIMPSE INTO THE FUTURE: POST-BEPS TAX ARBITRATION AND OTHER AREAS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION	3.45
1. Recent developments and expected tax dispute trends	3.45
2. Enhancing tax arbitration: areas for potential consideration	3.49
(a) Types of arbitration procedure: default choice and flexibility	3.49
(b) Other procedural issues	3.53
E. CONCLUSIONS	3.57
4 BEST PRACTICES FOR COMPETENT AUTHORITIES TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT ARBITRATION	
A. INTRODUCTION	4.01
1. Structure and content of the chapter	4.01
2. Background: BEPS Action 14, the OECD Peer Review and the OECD MAP Statistics	4.05
B. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	4.13
1. The definition of a 'CA'	4.13
2. Conceptualizing the role of the CA	4.18
(a) Legal aspects of the CA function	4.18
(b) Practical aspects of the CA function	4.30
C. LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE CA FUNCTION	4.40
1. CA functions influencing the effectiveness of arbitration	4.40
2. CA functions influencing the efficiency of arbitration	4.45
D. PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE CA FUNCTION	4.49
1. Evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of CAs based on the BEPS Action 14 Peer Review results	4.49
(a) Selecting the relevant minimum standards	4.49
(b) Effectiveness of the MAP	4.51
(c) Efficiency of the MAP	4.63
2. Evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of CAs based on the OECD MAP Statistics	4.76
(a) Statistical Data on the Effectiveness of MAP	4.76
(b) Statistical data on the efficiency of MAP	4.80
E. CONCLUSION	4.84
5 THE EU DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIRECTIVE	
A. INTRODUCTION	5.01
B. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS	5.07
1. Overview	5.07
2. Temporal scope	5.08
3. Territorial scope	5.09
4. Personal scope: who are the 'affected persons'?	5.10
5. Objective scope: what are 'disputes'?	5.15
C. THE PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK: MUTUAL AGREEMENT AND ARBITRATION PROCEDURE	5.28
1. Complaint	5.30
2. Mutual Agreement Procedure	5.37
3. Arbitration	5.41
D. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK	5.48

EXTENDED CONTENTS

6	TAX ARBITRATION AND THE EU TREATIES	
A.	INTRODUCTION	6.01
B.	INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS	6.05
1.	The Court of Justice as a tax treaty arbitrator	6.05
2.	Autonomy and unity of EU law	6.13
3.	Arbitration panels as 'courts'	6.19
C.	FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	6.24
1.	Applicability of EU fundamental rights to international tax disputes subject to arbitration	6.24
2.	EU fundamental rights of concern for international tax disputes	6.30
D.	INTERNAL MARKET	6.37
1.	State aid law	6.37
2.	Fundamental freedoms	6.42
E.	SUMMARY	6.45
7	TAXPAYERS AND THEIR RIGHTS IN ALTERNATIVE TAX DISPUTE RESOLUTION	
A.	INTRODUCTION	7.01
B.	The legal nature of the Specific-Case Map	7.04
C.	TAXPAYER RIGHTS IN MAP AND ARBITRATION	7.19
1.	The OECD approach	7.21
2.	The UN approach	7.30
3.	The EU approach	7.38
D.	THE RIGHTS OF THE TAXPAYER IN A MAP: TWO DOMESTIC COURTS' APPROACHES	7.46
E.	CONCLUDING REMARKS: WHAT TO EXPECT	7.58
8	ENFORCEMENT AND JUDICIAL CONTROL OF ARBITRATION DECISIONS	
A.	INTRODUCTION	8.01
B.	PRELIMINARY REMARKS	8.07
C.	OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE	8.09
D.	ENFORCEMENT	8.30
1.	General comments	8.30
2.	Enforcement under the TDRD	8.34
(a)	Time limits	8.35
(b)	Procedure for enforcement	8.39
3.	Enforcement under the MLI	8.46
E.	JUDICIAL REVIEW	8.50
1.	Judicial review by domestic courts	8.51
2.	Judicial review by international bodies	8.58
F.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	8.59
9	ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION THROUGH MEDIATION	
A.	INTRODUCTION	9.001
B.	OVERVIEW	9.006
C.	ADR	9.008
D.	MEDIATION	9.013
E.	THE USE OF ADR IN INTERNATIONAL TAX DISPUTE RESOLUTION	9.025
1.	OECD	9.026
2.	United Nations	9.036
3.	European Union	9.039
F.	EXISTING OECD FRAMEWORK FOR SDR	9.041
1.	Article 25(1) OECD Model cases	9.049
2.	Articles 25(3) and (4) OECD Model	9.051
3.	Benefits from using SDR techniques	9.057
G.	THE MEDIATION PROCESS	9.063

1. The Nature of Mediation	9.066
2. Preparation for the Mediation	9.068
3. The Function of the Mediator	9.070
4. The Choice of Mediator	9.075
5. The Stages of a Mediation	9.077
(a) The Introductory Stage	9.077
(b) The Exploratory Stage	9.078
(c) The discussion stage	9.079
(d) The concluding stage	9.080
6. Timing	9.082
H. SDR PROCESS PROTOCOL IN INTERNATIONAL TAX DISPUTES	9.084
I. WAY FORWARD	9.093
10 RELATION BETWEEN DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER DOUBLE TAXATION CONVENTIONS AND INVESTMENT TREATIES	
A. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT	10.01
1. Current challenges and weaknesses of dispute resolution under DTCs	10.01
2. Increased importance of investment arbitration to deal with tax-related disputes	10.09
B. RELATION BETWEEN DTCS AND IIAS: THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE CAIRN AWARD	10.17
1. The findings of the <i>Cairn</i> Tribunal on jurisdiction	10.17
2. Observations and Broader Considerations	10.30
(a) The fundamental distinction between a tax dispute and a tax-related investment dispute	10.30
(b) Can OECD/UN materials be relevant to give content to the FET Standard?	10.32
11 THE INDEPENDENCE AND IMPARTIALITY OF ARBITRATORS	
A. INTRODUCTION	11.01
B. THE STANDARDS OF IMPARTIALITY AND INDEPENDENCE	11.03
1. Commercial arbitration	11.03
2. Tax Treaty Arbitration	11.10
3. Possible criteria of application of the independence standard: the IBA Guidelines	11.24
(a) Examples of Non-Waivable Red List issues	11.32
(b) Examples of Waivable Red List issues	11.34
(c) Examples of Orange List Issues	11.37
(d) Example of a Green List issue	11.43
C. MECHANISMS TO SAFEGUARD THE IMPARTIALITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF ARBITRATORS	11.45
1. Rules on objections, challenge and replacement in tax treaty arbitration	11.48
2. Lack of independence and the enforceability of decisions	11.56
D. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK	11.62
12 LESSONS FROM INVESTMENT TREATY ARBITRATION	
A. INTRODUCTION	12.01
B. CONCERNS IN INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT LAW	12.05
1. Introductory remarks	12.05
2. Weaknesses of investment-treaty arbitration	12.17
(a) Impartiality and independence of arbitrators	12.18
(b) Inconsistent decisions	12.31
3. The asymmetric nature of investment treaties	12.44
C. MATCHING CONCERNS WITH SOLUTIONS	12.51
1. Investment treaty reforms	12.52
2. Multilateral reform – UNCITRAL Working Group III	12.72
D. CONCLUSIONS	12.83

EXTENDED CONTENTS

13	REFLECTIONS ON DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER GATT AND THE WTO AND DOUBLE TAX TREATY DISPUTES	
A.	INTRODUCTION	13.01
B.	A BRIEF REVIEW OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PROVISIONS UNDER GATT AND THE WTO	13.09
C.	THE ARBITRATION PROVISIONS IN THE MLI	13.32
D.	LEARNING FROM THE TRADE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PROVISIONS	13.44
1.	Independence and interdependence of states	13.46
2.	State control of the dispute resolution process	13.54
3.	Institutionalizing dispute resolution	13.63
4.	Third states in bilateral disputes	13.65
E.	TWO TRENDS – MULTILATERALISM AND FORMALISM	13.69
1.	Multilateralism	13.69
2.	Formalism	13.73
F.	CONCLUSION	13.78