

***tax notes
international***



**Languishing Italy-U.S. Tax Treaty
Would Revise Mutual
Agreement Procedure**

by Luigi Perin

Reprinted from *Tax Notes Int'l*, 26 August 2002, p. 1056

TAX NOTES INTERNATIONAL

Copyright 2002, Tax Analysts

ISSN 1048-3306

Editor: Robert Goulder

Managing Editor: Maryam Enayat

Deputy Editor: Cathy Phillips

Editorial Assistants: Andrew Horsfield, Erin Scott

Online Magazine Editor: Paul M. Doster

Chief of Correspondents: Cordia Scott (cscott@tax.org)

Senior Editor: Deborah L. Aiken

Consulting Editor: Robert Manning

Publisher: Thomas F. Field

Correspondents

Albania: Adriana Civici, Ministry of Finance, Tirana
Angola: Trevor Wood, Ernst & Young, Lisbon
Anguilla: Alex Richardson, Anguilla Offshore Finance Centre, Anguilla
Antigua: Donald B. Ward, PricewaterhouseCoopers Center, St. John's
Argentina: Cristian E. Rosso Alba, Hope, Duggan & Silva, Buenos Aires
Armenia: Suren Adamyan, Tax Inspectorate, Yerevan
Australia: Richard Vann, University of Sydney Faculty of Law, Sydney; Graeme S. Cooper, University of Melbourne, Parkville; Richard Krever, Deakin University, Melbourne.
Austria: Friedrich Rödler, PricewaterhouseCoopers AG, Vienna
Bahamas: Hywel Jones, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce Trust Company (Bahamas) Ltd., Nassau
Bangladesh: M. Mushtaqe Ahmed, Ernst & Young, Dhaka
Barbados: Patrick B. Toppin, Pannell Kerr Forster, Christ Church
Belgium: Werner Heyvaert, Nauta Dutilh, Brussels
Bermuda: Wendell Hollis, Mello, Hollis, Jones & Martin, Hamilton
Bolivia: Gonzalo Ruiz Ballivián, KPMG Peat Marwick, Cochabamba
Botswana: I.O. Sennanyana, Deputy Director, Tax Policy, Ministry of Finance & Development Planning, Gaborone
Brazil: David Roberto Ressoa e Soares da Silva, Senior Tax Attorney, Farroco & Lobo Advogados — Associated with Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, São Paulo
British Virgin Islands: William L. Blum, Counsel to Grunert Stout Bruch & Moore, St. Thomas, U.S.V.I.
Bulgaria: Todor Tabakov, Sofia; Vladimir Vassilev, O.R.A.C. Law Firm, Sofia
Cameroon: Edwin N. Forelemu, International Tax Program, Harvard University, Cambridge
Canada: Brian J. Arnold, Goodmans, Toronto, Ontario; Jack Bernstein, Aird & Berlis, Toronto, Ontario
Caribbean: Bruce Zagaris, Berliner, Corcoran, and Rowe, Washington, D.C.
Cayman Islands: Timothy Ridley, Maples & Calder Asia, Hong Kong
Chile: Barbara Vidaurre Miller, Carey y Cia Ltda., Tax Department, Santiago; Macarena Navarrete, Ernst & Young, Santiago
China (P.R.C.): David D. Liu, Sidley & Austin, Shanghai; Professor Jinyan Li, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario; Lawrence Sussman, O'Melveny & Myers LLP, Beijing
Colombia: Mario Andrade and Mario A. de Castro, Deloitte & Touche, Santafé de Bogotá
Cook Islands: David R. McNair, Southpac Trust Limited, Rarotonga
Costa Rica: Humberto Pacheco, Pacheco Coto, San José
Croatia: Hrvoje Zgombic, Ernst & Young — Tax & Finance Consulting Ltd., Zagreb
Cyprus: Theodoros Philippou, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Nicosia
Czech Republic: Michal Dlouhy, White & Case, Prague
Denmark: Thomas Froebert, Philip & Partners, Copenhagen
Dominican Republic: Dr. Fernando Ravelo Alvarez, Santo Domingo
Ecuador: Miguel Andrade, Estudio Jurídico Teran & Teran, Quito
Egypt: Farouk Metwally, Ernst & Young, Cairo
El Salvador: Horacio Alfredo Castellanos, Castellanos Campos y Cia, San Salvador
Estonia: Erki Uustalu, Estonian Taxpayers' Association and Leiden LL.M. Program in International Taxation, the Netherlands
European Union: Tracy Kaye, Basel; Joann Weiner, Brussels
Fiji: Bruce Sutton, KPMG Peat Marwick, Suva
Finland: Marjaana Helminen, University of Helsinki in the Faculty of Law, Helsinki
France: Patrick Donsimoni, Cabinet HSD Ernst & Young, Paris; Arnaud P. Jouanjani, Triplett et associés, Marseille; Marcellin N. Mbwa-Mboma, Baker & McKenzie, New York; Mathieu Pouletty, Anthony & Cie, Sophia Antipolis
Gambia: Samba Ebrima Saye, Income Tax Division, Banjul
Germany: Dr. Jörg-Dietrich Kramer, Federal Academy of Finance, Bonn; Rosemarie Portner, Linklaters Oppenhoff & Rädler, Cologne; Klaus Sieker, Flick Gocke Schauburg, Frankfurt
Ghana: Seth Terkper, Chartered Accountant/Tax Expert, Accra
Gibraltar: Charles D. Serruya, Ernst & Young, Gibraltar
Greece: Alexandra Gavrielides, Athens
Guam: Stephen A. Cohen, Assistant Attorney General and General Counsel for the Guam Department of Revenue and Taxation, Tamuning, Guam
Guernsey: Neil Crocker, PricewaterhouseCoopers, St. Peter Port
Guyana: Lancelot A. Atherly, Georgetown
Hong Kong: Colin Farrell, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Hong Kong
Hungary: Dr. Daniel Deák, College of Finance & Accountancy, Budapest
Iceland: Indridi H. Thorkalsson, Reykjavik
India: Nishith M. Desai, Nishith Desai Associates, Mumbai; Homi B. Mistry, RSM & Co., Mumbai
Indonesia: Indonesia: Freddy Karyadi, Trisakti University, Jakarta
Iran: Mohammad Tavakkol, Maliyat Journal, College of Economic Affairs, Tehran
Ireland: Kevin McLoughlin, Ernst & Young, San Jose
Isle of Man: Richard Vanderplank, Cains Advocates & Notaries, Douglas
Israel: Joel Lubell, Teva Pharmaceutical Industries, Ltd., Petach Tikva; Doron Herman, S. Friedman & Co. Advocates & Notaries, Tel-Aviv
Italy: Alessandro Adelchi Rossi and Luigi Perin, George R. Funaro & Co., P.C., New York; Federico Maria Giuliani, Studio Uckmar, Milan
Japan: Gary Thomas, White & Case, Tokyo; Kohji Mori, Mori Law & Tax Office, Tokyo; Shimon Takagi, Baker & McKenzie, Tokyo; Grant Beaumont, Andersen, Tokyo
Jersey: J. Paul Frith, Ernst & Young, St. Helier
Kazakhstan: Robert M. Ames and Erlan B. Dosymbekov, Arthur Andersen, Almaty
Kenya: Graham Glenday, Fellow, Harvard Institute for International Development, Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Ministry of Finance, Nairobi
Korea: Chang Hee Lee, Seoul National Univ. College of Law, Seoul, Korea
Kuwait: Abdullah Kh. Al-Ayoub, Kuwait
Kyrgyzstan: Ian Slater, Arthur Andersen, Almaty
Latvia: Andrejs Birums, Tax Policy Department, Ministry of Finance, Riga
Lebanon: Fuad S. Kaware, Beirut
Libya: Ibrahim Baruni, Ibrahim Baruni & Co., Tripoli
Liechtenstein: Reto H. Silvani, Coopers & Lybrand, Liechtenstein
Lithuania: Nora Vitkuniene, International Tax Division, Ministry of Finance, Vilnius
Luxembourg: Julie Hornsby, Arthur Andersen & Co., Luxembourg
Malawi: Clement L. Mononga, Assistant Commissioner of Tax, Blantyre
Malaysia: Adeline Wong, Wong & Partners, Kuala Lumpur
Malta: Dr. Antoine Fiott, Zammit Tabona Bonello & Co., and Lecturer in Taxation, Faculty of Law, University of Malta, Valletta
Mauritius: Ram L. Roy, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Port Louis
Mexico: Jaime Gonzalez-Bendixsen, Baker & McKenzie, Chihuahua
Middle East: Aziz Nishtar, Karachi, Pakistan
Moldova: Iurie Lungu, Graham & Levintsa, Chisinau
Monaco: Eamon McGregor, Moores Rowland Corporate Services, Monte Carlo
Mongolia: Baldangiin Ganuhleg, General Department of State Taxation, Ministry of Finance, Ulaanbaatar
Morocco: Mohamed Marzak, Agadir
Myanmar: Timothy J. Holzer, Baker & McKenzie, Singapore
Nauru: Peter H. MacSporran, Melbourne
Nepal: Prem Karki, Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation, Katmandu
Netherlands: Eric van der Stoel, Allen & Overy, Amsterdam; Dick Hofland, Freshfields, Amsterdam; Michaela Vrouwenvelder, Loyens & Loeff, New York; Jan Ter Wisch, Allen & Overy, Amsterdam
Netherlands Antilles: Dennis Cijntje, KPMG Meijburg & Co., Curaçao; Koen Lozie, Deurle
New Zealand: Adrian Sawyer, University of Canterbury, Christchurch
Nigeria: Elias Aderemi Sulu, Lagos
Northern Mariana Islands: John A. Manglona, Saipan
Norway: Frederik Zimmer, Department of Public and International Law, University of Oslo, Oslo
Oman: Fadli R. Talyarkhan, Ernst & Young, Muscat
Panama: Leroy Watson, Arias, Fabrega & Fabrega, Panama City
Papua New Guinea: Lutz K. Heim, Ernst & Young, Port Moresby
Peru: Alex Morris, Rodrigo, Elias & Medrano, Abogados, Lima
Philippines: Benedicta Du Baladad, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Manila
Poland: Dr. Janusz Fiszer, Warsaw University/White & Case, Warsaw
Portugal: Francisco de Sousa da Câmara, Moraes Leitao & J. Galvão Teles, Lisbon
Porto Rico: José R. Cacho, O'Neill & Borges, Hato Rey; Rosa M. González, Lugo, O'Neill & Borges, San Juan
Qatar: Finbar Sexton, Ernst & Young, Doha
Romania: Sorin Adrian Anghel, Senior Finance Officer & Vice President, The Chase Manhattan Bank, Bucharest
Russia: Scott C. Antel, Arthur Andersen, Moscow; Joel McDonald, Salans Hertzfeld & Heilbronn, Moscow
Saint Kitts-Nevis: Mario M. Novello, Nevis Services Limited, Red Bank
Saudi Arabia: Fauzi Awad, Saba, Abulkhair & Co., Dammam
Sierra Leone: Shakib N.K. Basma and Berthan Macaulay, Basma & Macaulay, Freetown
Singapore: Linda Ng, White & Case, Tokyo, Japan
Slovakia: Alzbeta Harvey, Principal, KPMG New York
South Africa: Peter Surtees, Deneys Reitz, Roggebaai
Taiwan: José M. Calderón, University of La Coruña, La Coruña
Sri Lanka: D.D.M. Waidyasekera, Mt. Lavinia
Switzerland: Roger von der Weid, Baer & Karrer, Zurich
Tanzania: Keye S. Wu, Baker & McKenzie, Taipei; Yu Ming-i, Ministry of Finance, Taipei
Tanzania: Awadhi Mushi, Dar-es-Salaam
Thailand: Edwin van der Bruggen, E.S.F. (Thailand) Limited, Bangkok
Trinidad & Tobago: Rolston Nelson, Port of Spain
Tunisia: Lassaad M. Bediri, Hamza, Bediri & Co., Legal and Tax Consultants, Tunis
Turkey: Mustafa Çamlica, Arthur Andersen, Istanbul
Turks & Caicos Islands, British West Indies: Ariel Misick, Misick and Stanbrook, Grand Turk
Uganda: Frederick Ssekandi, Kampala
Ukraine: Victor Gladun, Taxware, a division of govONE Solutions, Salem, MA.
United Arab Emirates: Nicholas J. Love, Ernst & Young, Abu Dhabi
United Kingdom: Trevor Johnson, Trevor Johnson Associates, Wirral; Eileen O'Grady, barrister, London; Jefferson P. VanderWolk, Baker & McKenzie, London
United States: Richard Doernberg, Emory Univ. School of Law, Atlanta GA.; James Fuller, Fenwick & West, Palo Alto
U.S. Virgin Islands: Marjorie Rawls Roberts, Attorney at Law, St. Thomas, USVI
Uruguay: Dr. James A. Whitelaw, Whitelaw Attorneys, Uruguay
Uzbekistan: Ian P. Slater, Arthur Andersen, Almaty
Vanuatu: Bill L. Hawkes, KPMG, Port Vila
Venezuela: Ronald Evans, Baker & McKenzie, Caracas
Vietnam: Frederick Burke and Thomas Treutler, Baker & McKenzie, Ho Chi Minh City
Western Samoa: Maiava V.R. Peteru, Kamu & Peteru, Apia
Yugoslavia: Danijel Pantic, Economic Institute, Belgrade
Zambia: W.Z. Mwanza, KPMG Peat Marwick, Lusaka
Zimbabwe: Prof. Ben Hatshwayo, University of Zimbabwe, Harare

Languishing Italy-U.S. Tax Treaty Would Revise Mutual Agreement Procedure

by Luigi Perin

Luigi Perin is a partner with George R. Funaro & Co., P.C. in New York.

A tax treaty signed by the United States and Italy on 25 August 1999, and subsequently ratified by the U.S. Senate, still has not been ratified by Italy, leaving the 1984 treaty between the two countries in force. Following is an analysis of the provisions contained in article 25 (mutual agreement procedure) of the new treaty.

Under the new treaty, when a taxpayer believes that it has been, or could be, affected by measures taken by the tax administration of either the United States or Italy that are not in accordance with the treaty, the taxpayer may present its case to the competent authority of the country where it is resident (or a citizen).¹ That administrative remedy is provided in addition to the ordinary administrative and judicial remedies available to the taxpayer under the domestic tax laws of its country of residence.²

Before a mutual agreement procedure (or MAP) can actually begin, the competent authority must consider a taxpayer's objection justified. In addition, the competent authority must not be able to arrive at a satisfactory solution without the intervention of the competent authority of the other country. Therefore, if for any reason the competent authority considers a case unworthy of resolution, or decides to adopt a unilateral measure to solve the case, the mutual agreement procedure will not begin.³

The 1999 treaty provides that a taxpayer must submit its case before the competent authority within three years of the initial notice of assessment that is deemed inconsistent with the provisions of the treaty. That provision, which is similar to one in the OECD Model, is intended to protect the tax administrations from late objections by taxpayers.

Several treaty provisions call for the involvement of the competent authorities to address specific issues.⁴ In addition, article 25 not only delegates

¹Article 3(1)(e) identifies the competent authorities as, in the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate and, in Italy, the Ministry of Finance.

²Under Article 1(15) of the 1984 treaty protocol, in the case of Italy, invoking the MAP did not relieve a taxpayer of the obligation to initiate domestic legal procedures for resolving tax disputes. That provision has not been reproduced in the 1999 treaty. Therefore, an Italian taxpayer presumably now may opt not to initiate the appeals process under Italian domestic law, without limiting its rights to double taxation relief under the treaty.

³In both Italy and the United States, the decision of the competent authority about whether to assist a taxpayer is not subject to judicial review. See C. Garbarino, *La Tassazione del Reddito Transnazionale*, Padova, 1990, p. 585; P.H. Blessing, *Income Tax Treaties of the United States*, 1996, pp. 23-30.

⁴Protocol article 1(16) gives the competent authorities power to apply the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 19 (government service) to employees of organizations that perform functions of a governmental nature; protocol article 1(19) provides that the competent authorities may agree that the conditions for the application of paragraph 10 of article 10 (dividends), paragraph 9 of article 11 (interest), paragraph 8 of article 12 (royalties), or paragraph 3 of article 22 (other income) of the treaty are met.

The new treaty's MAP provisions encourage informal communication between the two tax administrations.

to the competent authorities the general resolution of questions about the interpretation and application of the treaty, but also the elimination of double taxation cases falling beyond the scope of the treaty.⁵

The competent authorities are under no obligation to resolve the case. In fact, the treaty provides that the tax administrations must merely “endeavor” to reach a solution.⁶ While the U.S. competent authority claims to have successfully resolved most of the cases presented to date, the Italian competent authority’s approach to resolving double taxation cases is questionable.

Once the competent authorities have settled a case, the new MAP provisions of the 1999 treaty mandate implementation of the measures adopted, regardless of any time limits provided by the Italian or U.S. domestic tax systems. That is a strong improvement over the MAP provisions under the 1984 treaty, and it will assist taxpayers initiating MAPs in cases for which the time limit for refund claims under the domestic tax laws has already expired.

The new treaty’s MAP provisions encourage informal communication between the two tax administrations. The competent authorities are not required to access diplomatic channels in order to communicate. Furthermore, they may form ad hoc commissions for the purposes of exchanging opinions and reaching agreements. Those provisions are in line with the recommendations of the OECD Committee on Fiscal Affairs, according to which any unnecessary formalities involved in the MAP should be eliminated.⁷

Provisions addressing the possible introduction of an arbitration procedure are perhaps the most innovative measures in the 1999 treaty. The purpose of those provisions is to ensure that double taxation disputes are not left unresolved because of conflicting views by the two competent authorities. Under that circumstance, and subject to the consent of both competent authorities and the taxpayer, a case may be remitted to an arbitration board for resolution. The decision of the arbitration board is binding for all the parties involved. Unfortunately, the treaty does not, of itself, implement the arbitration procedure. It merely requires the United States and Italy to consult, within three years of the treaty’s entry into force, to evaluate the appropriateness of implementing the arbitration procedure.

As a result, while it is unlikely that any arbitration process would be implemented without a delay of a number of years, the competent authorities may choose not to take advantage of the arbitration provisions until both sides gain sufficient experience with the arbitration of international

⁵For example, in triangular cases involving third-country-resident permanent establishments.

⁶Under article 1(15) of the 1984 treaty protocol, any adjustment to tax under the MAP could be made only before the “final determination” of tax. In addition, in the case of Italy, the MAP did not relieve a taxpayer of the obligation to initiate procedures required under Italian domestic law to resolve tax disputes. That was in sharp contrast to article 25(2) of the 1996 U.S. Model Treaty, under which any agreement reached by means of the MAP was to be implemented regardless of any time limits or other procedural limitations in the domestic laws of the contracting states. As a general rule, under Italian tax law, the statute of limitation is four years. However, until recently, a refund claim could be filed only within 18 months of payment of the tax. Accordingly, under the 1984 treaty, it was extremely difficult to obtain relief from double taxation in Italy unless a protective claim for a refund was filed.

⁷See OECD Model Commentary on article 25, paragraph 30(a).

tax disputes. While the U.S. competent authority has extensive experience resolving international double taxation issues in general, and transfer pricing disputes in particular, the same cannot be said of the Italian competent authority.

U.S. Competent Authority Carol Dunahoo told a Tax Council Policy Institute symposium in Washington in February that she is “in favor of exploring arbitration if [it is] properly designed” to resolve competent authority disputes. (For prior coverage, see *2002 WTD 31-6*, or *Doc 2002-3853 (3 original pages)*.) Hopefully, the Italian authorities gradually will also become more involved in that area, considering the required administration of the EU arbitration procedure.⁸ ♦

⁸Convention 436 of 23 July 1990, ratified by Italy with law 99 of 22 March 1993. With that multilateral convention, EU members have agreed that certain cases of double taxation arising in the context of transfer pricing disputes that have not been resolved through the MAP must be submitted for arbitration.