



TAX TREATY ISSUES ARISING FROM CROSS-BORDER PENSIONS

PUBLIC DISCUSSION DRAFT

TAX TREATY ISSUES ARISING FROM CROSS-BORDER PENSIONS

PUBLIC DISCUSSION DRAFT

Important differences exist between the retirement pension arrangements found in countries that enter into tax treaties. Differences are also found in the tax treatment of these arrangements, of the contributions made to them and the benefits paid from them. Ageing populations in OECD countries, the increasing mobility of workers and, more generally, the globalisation of the economy have increased the importance of the tax issues arising from situations where cross-border pension contributions or benefits are paid.

Tax treaties have an important role to play in solving such issues. Article 18 of the OECD Model Tax Convention provides a general rule for the taxation of pensions paid in respect of past employment. Given the differences already noted, it is not surprising that the provisions found in bilateral tax treaties often diverge from or supplement the provisions of that Article. For this reason, Working Party No. 1, the subsidiary body of the OECD Committee on Fiscal Affairs that deals with tax treaty issues, is currently looking at how the OECD Model Tax Convention could provide more guidance on the tax problems related to cross-border pension arrangements, contributions and benefits.

This public discussion draft was prepared by Working Party No. 1 in the course of that work. It includes proposals for changes to the OECD Model Tax Convention that address various issues arising from the different treatment, in various countries, of pension benefits, of pension contributions and of income of pension funds as well as possible ways of addressing these issues. It was considered important to circulate these proposals for public comments before they were finalized. On the basis of the comments that will be received, the Working Party intends to conclude its work on these issues in 2004.

Comments on this draft should be sent by email **before 15 January 2004** to:

Jeffrey Owens
Head, Centre for Tax Policy and Administration
OECD
2, rue André Pascal
75775 Paris
FRANCE
e-mail: jeffrey.owens@oecd.org

TAX TREATY ISSUES ARISING FROM CROSS-BORDER PENSIONS

[In the following proposals for changes to the OECD Model Tax Convention, changes to the existing text of the Model appear in ***bold italics*** for additions and ~~strike through~~ for deletions.]

1. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COMMENTARY ON ARTICLE 18 CONCERNING THE TAXATION OF PENSIONS

Replace the existing Commentary on Article 18 of the OECD Model Tax Convention by the following:

“1. According to this Article, pensions paid in respect of private employment are taxable only in the State of residence of the recipient [*the rest of existing paragraph 1 would be included in paragraph 3*]. ***Various policy and administrative considerations support the principle that the taxing right with respect to this type of pensions, and other similar remuneration, should be left to the State of residence. For instance, the State of residence of the recipient of a pension is in a better position than any other State to take into account the recipient’s overall ability to pay tax, which mostly depends on worldwide income and personal circumstances such as family responsibilities. This solution also avoids imposing on the recipient of this type of pensions the administrative burden of having to comply with tax obligations in States other than that recipient’s State of residence.***

2. *Some States, however, are reluctant to adopt the principle of exclusive residence taxation of pensions and propose alternatives to the Article. Some of these alternatives and the issues that they raise are discussed in paragraphs 12 to 21 below, which deal with the various considerations related to the allocation of taxing rights with respect to pension benefits and the reasons supporting the Article as drafted.*

Scope of the Article

3. ~~According to this Article, pensions paid in respect of private employment are taxable only in the State of residence of the recipient. The provision also covers~~ ***The type of payments that are covered by the Article include not only pensions directly paid to former employees but also*** widows’ and orphans’ pensions and other similar payments such as annuities paid in respect of past employment. ~~The provision~~ ***Article*** also applies to pensions in respect of services rendered to a State or a political subdivision or local authority thereof which are not covered by the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 19. ***The Article only applies, however, to payments that are in consideration of past employment; it would therefore not apply, for example, to an annuity acquired directly by the annuitant from capital that has not been funded from an employment pension scheme.***

4. *Various payments may be made to an employee following cessation of employment. Whether or not such payments fall under the Article will need to be decided having regard to the consideration for these payments, as explained in the following two paragraphs.*

5. While the word “pension”, under the ordinary meaning of the word, covers only periodic payments, the words “other similar remuneration” are broad enough to cover non-periodic payments. A lump-sum payment in lieu of periodic pension payments that is made on or after cessation of employment may therefore fall within the Article.

6. Whether a particular lump-sum payment made on or after the cessation of employment is to be considered as other remuneration similar to a pension or as final remuneration for work performed falling under Article 15 is a question of fact. If it is shown that the consideration for the lump-sum payment is the commutation of the pension or the compensation for a reduced pension then the payment may be characterised as “other similar remuneration” falling under the Article. This would be the case, for example, where a person was entitled to elect upon retirement between the payment of a pension or a lump-sum computed either by reference to the total amount of the contributions or to the amount of pension to which that person would otherwise be entitled under the rules in force for the pension scheme. The source of the payment is an important consideration; payments made from a pension scheme would normally be covered by the Article. Other factors which could assist in determining whether the payment falls under the Article include: whether the recipient has reached the normal age of retirement with respect to that particular type of employment, the status of other recipients who qualify for the same type of lump-sum payment and whether the recipient is simultaneously eligible for other pension benefits. Reimbursement of pension contributions (e.g. after temporary employment) does not constitute “other similar remuneration” under Article 18. Some of these factors are also relevant in determining whether a series of payments may be considered as a pension within Article 18 or as deferred remuneration within Article 15. Where cases of difficulty arise in the taxation of such payments, the Contracting States should solve the matter by recourse to the provisions of Article 25.

7. Since the Article applies only to pensions and other similar remuneration that are paid in consideration for past employment, it does not cover other pensions such as those that are paid with respect to previous independent personal services. Some States, however, extend the scope of the Article to cover all types of pensions, including Government pensions.

Cross-border issues related to pensions

8. The globalisation of the economy and the development of international communications and transportation have considerably increased the international mobility of individuals, both for work-related and personal reasons. This has significantly increased the importance of cross-border issues arising from the interaction of the different pension arrangements which exist in various States and which were primarily designed on the basis of purely domestic policy considerations. As these issues often affect large numbers of individuals, it is desirable to address them in tax conventions so as to remove obstacles to the international movement of persons, and employees in particular.

9. Many such issues relate to mismatches resulting from differences in the general tax policy that States adopt with respect to retirement savings. In many States, tax incentives are provided for pension contributions. Such incentives frequently take the form of a tax deferral so that the part of the income of an individual that is contributed to a pension arrangement as well as the income earned in the scheme or any pension rights that accrue to the individual are exempt from tax. Conversely, the pension benefits from these arrangements are taxable upon receipt. Other States, however, treat pension contributions like other forms of savings and neither exempt these contributions nor the return thereon; logically, therefore, they do not tax pension benefits. Between these two approaches exist a variety of systems where contributions, the return thereon, the accrual of pension rights or pension benefits are partially taxed or exempt.

10. *Other issues arise from the existence of very different arrangements to provide retirement benefits. These arrangements are often classified under the following three broad categories:*

- *statutory social security schemes;*
- *occupational pension schemes;*
- *individual retirement schemes.*

The interaction between these three categories of arrangements presents particular difficulties. These difficulties are compounded by the fact that each State may have different tax rules for the arrangements falling in each of these categories as well as by the fact that there are considerable differences in the extent to which States rely on each of these categories to ensure retirement benefits to individuals (e.g. some States provide retirement benefits almost exclusively through their social security system while others rely primarily on occupational pension schemes or individual retirement schemes).

11. *The issues arising from all these differences need to be fully considered in the course of bilateral negotiations and, where appropriate, addressed through specific provisions. The following sections examine some of these cross-border issues.*

Allocation of taxing rights with respect to pension benefits

12. *As explained in paragraph 9 above, many States have adopted the approach under which, subject to various restrictions, tax is totally or partially deferred on contributions to, and earning in, pension schemes or on the accrual of pension rights, but is recovered when pension benefits are paid.*

13. *Some of these States are concerned about the loss of tax revenues that may result, under the provisions of the Article, because they would not be able to recoup the tax so deferred where the individual has ceased to be a resident before the payment of all or part of the pension benefits.*

14. *If the other State of which that individual then becomes a resident has adopted a similar approach and therefore taxes these pension benefits when received, the issue is primarily one of allocation of taxing rights between the two States. If, however, the individual becomes a resident of a State which adopts a different approach so as not to tax pension benefits, the mismatch in the approaches adopted by the two States will result in a situation where no tax will ever be payable on the relevant income.*

15. *For these reasons, some States seek to include in their tax conventions alternative provisions designed to secure either exclusive or limited source taxation rights with respect to pensions in consideration of past employment. The following are examples of provisions that some members have adopted in consequence of these policy and administrative considerations:*

a) *Provisions allowing exclusive source taxation of pension payments*

Under such a provision, the Article is drafted along the following lines:

“Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 19, pensions and other similar remuneration arising in a Contracting State and paid to a resident of the other Contracting State in consideration of past employment shall be taxable only in the first-mentioned State.”

b) *Provisions allowing non-exclusive source taxation of pension payments*

Under such a provision, the State of source is given the right to tax pension payments and the rules of Articles 23A or 23B results in that right being either exclusive or merely prior to that of the State of residence. The Article is then drafted along the following lines:

“Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 19, pensions and other similar remuneration paid to a resident of a Contracting State in consideration of past employment shall be taxable only in that State. However such pensions and other similar remuneration may also be taxed in the other Contracting State if they arise in that State.”

c) Provisions allowing limited source taxation of pension

Under such a provision, the State of source is given the right to tax pension payments but that right is subjected to a limit, usually expressed as a percentage of the payment. The Article is then drafted along the following lines:

“1. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 19, pensions and other similar remuneration paid to a resident of a Contracting State in consideration of past employment may be taxed in that State.

2. However such pensions and other similar remuneration may also be taxed in the Contracting State in which they arise and according to the laws of that State but the tax so charged shall not exceed [percentage] of the gross amount of the payment.”

Where such a provision is used, a reference to paragraph 2 of Article 18 is added to paragraph 2 of Article 23 A to ensure that the residence State, if it applies the exemption method, is allowed to tax the pension payments but needs to provide a credit for the tax levied by the source State.

d) Provisions allowing source taxation of pension payments only where the State of residence does not tax these payments

Such a provision is used by States that are primarily concerned with the structural mismatch described in paragraph 14 above. A paragraph 2 is then added along the following lines:

“2. However such pensions and other similar remuneration may also be taxed in the Contracting State in which they arise if these payments are not subject to tax in the other Contracting State under the ordinary rules of its tax law.”

16. Apart from the reasons presented in paragraphs 13 and 14 above, various policy and administrative considerations should be taken into account when considering such provisions.

17. First, the State of residence is in a better position to provide for adequate taxation of pension payments as it is easier for that State to take into account the worldwide income, and therefore the overall ability to pay tax, of the recipient so as to apply appropriate rates and personal allowances. By contrast, the source taxation of pensions may well result in excessive taxation where the source State imposes a final withholding tax on the gross amount paid. If little or no tax is levied in the residence State (e.g. because of available allowances), the pensioner may not be able to claim a credit in the residence State for the tax paid. However, some States have sought to relieve that problem by extending their personal allowances to non-residents who derive almost all their income from these States. Also, some States have allowed the pension payments made to non-resident recipients to be taxed at the marginal rate that would be applicable if that recipient were taxed on worldwide income (that system, however, involves administrative difficulties as it requires a determination of the worldwide income of the non-resident only for the purpose of determining the applicable rate of tax).

18. Second, equity considerations could be relevant since the level of pensions paid in the source State will generally have been set factoring local rates of tax. In this situation, an individual who has emigrated to another State with different tax rates will either be advantaged or disadvantaged by receiving an after-tax pension that will be different from that envisaged under the pension scheme.

19. *Third, alternative provisions under which there is either exclusive or limited source taxation rights with respect to pensions having their source in a State or being derived from that State may create difficulties in the case of individuals who work in more than one State, change residence during their career or derive pensions from funds established in a State other than that in which they have worked. For example, many individuals now spend significant parts of their careers outside the State in which their pension funds are established and from which their pension benefits are ultimately paid. In such triangular cases, if taxation rights are not allocated exclusively to the residence State, it would seem fair to regard as the State of source the State of employment which has previously allowed deductions, as opposed to the State in which the fund has been established. This solution, however, would raise considerable administrative difficulties for both taxpayers and tax authorities, particularly in the case of individuals who have worked in many States during their career. States that wish to use such alternative provisions may therefore want to clarify which State should be considered the State of source of a pension payment. They may also want to deal with the administrative aspects of the solution that they adopt in that respect. Since a reference to a pension “arising in” a Contracting State could be construed as meaning either a pension paid by a fund established in that State or a pension derived from work performed in that State, clarification is necessary to avoid situations where two States would claim to have source taxation rights on the same pension.*

20. *Fourth, another argument against these alternative provisions is that exclusive taxation by the State of residence means that pensioners only need to comply with the tax rules of their State of residence as regards payments covered by Article 18. Where, however, limited or exclusive source taxation of pensions is allowed, the pensioner will need to comply with the tax rules of both Contracting States.*

21. *Exclusive residence taxation may, however, give rise to concerns about the non-reporting of foreign pension income. Exchange of information coupled with adequate taxpayer compliance systems will, however, reduce the incidence of non-reporting of foreign pension payments.*

Exempt pensions

22. *As mentioned in paragraph 9 above, some States do not tax pension payments generally or otherwise exempt particular categories or parts of pension payments. In these cases, the provisions of the Article, which provides for taxation of pensions in the State of residence, may result in the taxation-by that State of pensions which were designed not to be taxed and the amount of which may well have been determined having regard to that exemption. This may result in undue financial hardship for the recipient of the pension.*

23. *To avoid the problems resulting from this type of mismatches, some States include in their tax treaties provisions to preserve the exempt treatment of pensions arising in a Contracting State when the recipient is a resident of the other Contracting State. These provisions may be restricted to specific categories of pensions or may address the issue in more comprehensive way. An example of that latter approach would be a provision drafted along the following lines:*

“Notwithstanding any provision of this Convention, any amount paid from a pension scheme to a resident of a Contracting State which arises from sources in the other Contracting State shall be exempt from tax in the first-mentioned State if that pension or other amount would be exempt from tax in the other State if the recipient were a resident of that other State.”

Issues related to statutory social security schemes

24. *Depending on the circumstances, social security payments can fall under the Article as “pensions and other similar remuneration in consideration of past employment”, under Article 19 as “pension paid by, or out of funds created by, a Contracting State [...] in respect of services rendered to that State...” or under Article 21 as “items of income [...] not dealt with in the foregoing Articles”. Social security pensions fall under the Article when they are paid in consideration of past employment, unless paragraph 2 of Article 19 applies (see below). A social security pension may be said to be “in consideration of past employment” if employment is a condition for that pension. For instance, this will be the case where, under the relevant social security scheme:*

- the amount of the pension is determined on the basis of either or both the period of employment and the employment income so that years when the individual was not employed do not give rise to pension benefits,*
- the amount of the pension is determined on the basis of contributions to the scheme that are made under the condition of employment and in relation to the period of employment, or*
- the amount of the pension is determined on the basis of the period of employment and either or both the contributions to the scheme and the investment income of the scheme.*

25. *Paragraph 2 of Article 19 will apply to a social security pension that would fall within Article 18 except for the fact that the past employment in consideration of which it is paid constituted services rendered to a State or a political subdivision or a local authority thereof, other than services referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 19.*

26. *Social security payments that do not fall within Articles 18 or 19 fall within Article 21. This would be the case, for instance, of payments made to self-employed persons as well as a pension purely based on resources, on age or disability which would be paid regardless of past employment or factors related to past employment (such as years of employment or contributions made during employment) .*

27. [OLD 2]. Some States, *however*, consider pensions paid out under a public pension scheme which is part of their social security system similar to Government pensions. Such States argue on that basis that the State of source, i.e. the State from which the pension is paid, should have a right to tax *all* such pensions. Many conventions concluded by these States contain provisions to that effect, sometimes including also other payments made under the social security legislation of the State of source. ~~Such payments are for instance sickness benefits, unemployment benefits and benefits on account of industrial injury.~~ Contracting States having that view may agree bilaterally on an additional paragraph to the Article giving the State of source a right to tax payments made under its social security legislation. A paragraph of that kind could be drafted along the following lines:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1, pensions and other payments made under the social security legislation of a Contracting State may be taxed in that State."

Where the State of which the recipient of such payments is a resident applies the exemption method the payments will be taxable only in the State of source while States using the credit method may tax the payments and give credit for the tax levied in the State of source. Some States using the credit method as the general method in their conventions may, however, consider that the State of source should have an exclusive right to tax such payments. Such States should then substitute the words "shall be taxable only" for the words "may be taxed" in the above draft provision.

28. *Although the above draft provision refers to the social security legislation of each Contracting State, there are limits to what it covers. "Social security" generally refers to a system of mandatory protection that a State puts in place in order to provide its population with a minimum level of income or retirement benefits or to mitigate the financial impact of events such as unemployment, employment-related injuries, sickness or death. A common feature of social security systems is that the level of benefits is determined by the State. Payments that may be covered by the provision include retirement pensions available to the general public under a public pension scheme, old age pension payments as well as unemployment, disability, maternity, survivorship, sickness, social assistance, and family protection payments that are made by the State or by public entities constituted to administer the funds to be distributed. As there may be substantial differences in the social security systems of the Contracting States, it is important for the States that intend to use the draft provision to verify, during the course of bilateral negotiations, that they have a common understanding of what will be covered by the provision.*

Issues related to individual retirement schemes

29. *In many States, preferential tax treatment (usually in the form of the tax deferral described in paragraph 9 above) is available to certain individual private saving schemes established to provide retirement benefits. These individual retirement schemes are usually available to individuals who do not have access to occupational pension schemes; they may also, however, be available to employees who wish to supplement the retirement benefits that they will derive from their social security and occupational pension schemes. These schemes take various legal forms. For example, they may be bank savings accounts, individual investment funds or individually subscribed full life insurance policies. Their common feature is a preferential tax treatment which is subject to certain contribution limits.*

30. *These schemes raise many of the cross-border issues that arise in the case of occupational schemes, such as the tax treatment, in one Contracting State, of contributions to such a scheme established in the other State (see paragraphs 31 to 65 below). There may be, however, issues that are specific to individual retirement schemes and which may need to be addressed separately during the negotiation of a bilateral convention. One such issue is the tax treatment, in each State, of income accruing in such a scheme established in the other State. Many States have rules (such as foreign income funds (FIF) rules, rules that attribute the income of a trust to a settlor or beneficiary in certain circumstances or rules that provide for the accrual taxation of income with respect to certain types of investment, including full life insurance policies) that may, in certain circumstances, result in the taxation of income accruing in an individual retirement scheme established abroad. States which consider that result inappropriate in light of their approach to the taxation of retirement savings may wish to prevent such taxation. A provision dealing with the issue and restricted to those schemes which are recognised as individual retirement schemes could be drafted along the following lines:*

“For purposes of computing the tax payable in a Contracting State by an individual who is a resident of that State and who was previously a resident of the other Contracting State, any income accruing under an arrangement

- a) that has been established outside that State in order to secure retirement benefits for that individual,*
- b) in which the individual participates and has participated when he was a resident of the other State,*
- c) that is accepted by the competent authority of the first-mentioned State as generally corresponding to an individual retirement scheme recognized as such for tax purposes by that State,*

shall be treated as income accruing in an individual retirement scheme established in that State. This paragraph shall not restrict in any manner the taxation of any benefit distributed under the arrangement.”

The tax treatment of contributions to foreign pension schemes

A. General comments

4 31. It is characteristic of multinational enterprises that their staff are expected to be willing to work outside their home country from time to time. The terms of service under which staff are sent to work in other countries are of keen interest and importance to both the employer and the employee. One consideration is the pension arrangements that are made for the employee in question. *Similarly, individuals who move to other countries to provide independent services are often confronted with cross-border tax issues related to the pension arrangements that they have established in their home country.*

5 32. ~~Employees sent abroad to work~~ *Individuals working abroad* will often wish to continue contributing to a pension scheme (*including a social security scheme that provides pension benefits*) in their home country during their absence abroad. This is both because switching schemes can lead to a loss of rights and benefits, and because many practical difficulties can arise from having pension arrangements in a number of countries.

6 33. The tax treatment accorded to pension contributions *made by or for individuals working outside* ~~employees who are assigned to work outside~~ their home country varies both from country to country and depending on the circumstances of the individual case. Before taking up an overseas assignment *or contract*, *pension contributions made by or for these individuals* ~~employees~~ commonly qualify for tax relief ~~on pension contributions paid in the home country~~. When *the individual works* ~~assigned~~ abroad, ~~employees-the contributions~~ in some cases continue to qualify for relief. Where ~~an-the~~ individual, for example, remains resident and fully taxable in the home country, pension contributions made to a pension scheme established in the home country will generally continue to qualify for relief there. But frequently, contributions paid in the home country by an individual ~~assigned to working~~ abroad do not qualify for relief under the domestic laws of either the home country or the host country. Where this is the case it can become expensive, if not prohibitive, to maintain membership of a pension scheme in the home country during a foreign *assignment or contract*. Paragraph 4 37 below suggests a provision which Member countries can, if they wish, include in bilateral treaties to provide reliefs for the pension contributions *made by or for individuals* ~~of employees assigned to working~~ outside their home country.

7 34. However, some Member countries may not consider that the solution to the problem lies in a treaty provision, preferring, for example, the pension scheme to be amended to secure deductibility of contributions in the host State. Other countries may be opposed to including the provision *below* in treaties where domestic legislation allows ~~deductions only for relief~~ only with respect to contributions paid to residents. In such cases it may be inappropriate to include the suggested provision in a bilateral treaty.

8 35. ~~The suggested provision does not address itself to contributions made to social security schemes (general State pension schemes dependent upon contribution records, whether or not contributors are employees) as the right or obligation to join a social security scheme is primarily a matter of social legislation rather than tax law. Many Member countries have entered into bilateral social security totalisation agreements which may help to avoid the problem with respect to contributions to social security schemes. The provision also does not contain provisions relating either to the deductibility by the employer of employer pension contributions in respect of employees working abroad or to the treatment of income~~

accrued within the plan. All of these issues can be dealt with in bilateral negotiations. *The suggested provision covers contributions made to all forms of pension schemes, including individual retirement schemes as well as social security schemes. Many Member countries have entered into bilateral social security totalisation agreements which may help to partially avoid the problem with respect to contributions to social security schemes; these agreements, however, usually do not deal with the tax treatment of cross-border contributions. In the case of an occupational scheme to which both the employer and the employees contribute, the provision covers both these contributions. Also, the provision is not restricted to the issue of the deductibility of the contributions as it deals with all aspects of the tax treatment of the contributions as regards the individual who derive benefits from a pension scheme. Thus the provision deals with issues such as whether or not the employee should be taxed on the employment benefit that an employer's contribution constitutes and whether or not the investment income derived from the contributions should be taxed in the hands of the individual. It does not, however, deal with the taxation of the pension fund on its income (this issue is dealt with in paragraph 69 below). Contracting States wishing to modify the scope of the provision with respect to any of these issues may do so in their bilateral negotiations.*

9. — The provision is confined to the tax treatment of contributions to pension schemes by or on behalf of individuals who exercise employments within the meaning of Article 15 away from their home State. It does not deal with contributions by individuals who perform business activities covered by Article 7. However, States may wish, in bilateral negotiations, to agree on a provision covering individuals rendering services within both Article 7 and Article 15.

B. Aim of the provision

40 36. The aim of the provision is to ensure that, as far as possible, ~~an employee is~~ *individuals are* not discouraged from taking up ~~an overseas work assignment~~ by the tax treatment of his ~~their~~ contributions made to a home country pension scheme ~~by an employee working abroad~~. The provision seeks, first, to determine the general equivalence of pension plans in the two countries and then to establish limits to the deductibility of ~~employee contributions~~ *contributions to which the tax relief applies* based on the limits in the laws of both countries.

C. Suggested provision

44 37. The following is the suggested text of the provision that could be included in bilateral conventions to deal with the problem identified above:

- " *I. a)* Contributions ~~borne by~~ *made by or on behalf of* an individual who renders services ~~in the course of an employment~~ in a Contracting State to a pension scheme established in and recognised for tax purposes in the other Contracting State shall, *for the purposes of*
- a) determining the individual's tax payable in the first-mentioned State and,*
 - b) determining the profits of an enterprise which may be taxed in the first-mentioned State,*
- ~~be deducted, in the first-mentioned State, in determining the individual's taxable income, and be treated in that State in the same way and subject to the same conditions and limitations as contributions made to a pension scheme that is recognised for tax purposes in that first-mentioned State, provided that:~~
- c) (i) the individual was not a resident of that State, and was ~~contributing to~~ participating in the pension scheme, immediately before beginning to provide services he began to exercise employment in that State; and*

d) (ii) the pension scheme is accepted by the competent authority of that State as generally corresponding to a pension scheme recognised as such for tax purposes by that State.

2.b) For the purposes of *paragraph 1* ~~sub-paragraph a)~~:

a)(i) the term "a pension scheme" means an arrangement in which the individual participates in order to secure retirement benefits payable in respect of the *services employment* referred to in *paragraph 1* ~~sub-paragraph a)~~; and

b)(ii) a pension scheme is recognised for tax purposes in a State if the contributions to the scheme would qualify for tax relief in that State."

38. *The above provision is restricted to pension schemes established in one of the two Contracting States. As it is not unusual for individuals to work in a number of different countries in succession, some States may wish to extend the scope of the provision to cover situations where an individual moves from one Contracting State to another while continuing to make contributions to a pension scheme established in a third State. Such an extension may, however, create administrative difficulties if the host State cannot have access to information concerning the pension scheme (e.g. through the exchange of information provisions of a tax convention concluded with the third State); it may also create a situation where relief would be given on a non-reciprocal basis because the third State would not grant similar relief to an individual contributing to a pension scheme established in the host State. States which, notwithstanding these difficulties, want to extend the suggested provision to funds established in third States can do so by adopting an alternative version of the suggested provision drafted along the following lines:*

"1. Contributions made by or on behalf of an individual who renders services in a Contracting State to a pension scheme

a) *recognised for tax purposes in the other Contracting State,*

b) *in which the individual participated immediately before beginning to provide services in the first-mentioned State,*

c) *in which the individual participated at a time when that individual was employed in, or was a resident of, the other State, and*

d) *that is accepted by the competent authority of the first-mentioned State as generally corresponding to a pension scheme recognized as such for tax purposes by that State,*

shall, for the purposes of

e) *determining the individual's tax payable in the first-mentioned State and,*

f) *determining the profits of an enterprise which may be taxed in the first-mentioned State,*

be treated in that State in the same way and subject to the same conditions and limitations as contributions made to a pension scheme that is recognised for tax purposes in that first-mentioned State.

2. *For the purposes of paragraph 1:*

a) *the term "a pension scheme" means an arrangement in which the individual participates in order to secure retirement benefits payable in respect of the services employment referred to in paragraph 1 sub-paragraph a); and*

b) *a pension scheme is recognised for tax purposes in a State if the contributions to the scheme would qualify for tax relief in that State."*

D. Characteristics of the suggested provision

39. The following paragraphs discuss the main characteristics of the suggested provision found in paragraph 37 above.

12 40. ~~Sub-paragraph a)~~ **Paragraph 1** of the suggested provision lays down the characteristics of both the *individual* employee and the contributions *in respect of* to which the provision applies. It also provides the principle that contributions *made by or on behalf of* ~~borne by~~ an individual rendering services ~~in the course of an employment within the meaning of Article 15~~ in one Contracting State (the host State) to a defined pension scheme in the other Contracting State (the home State) are to be ~~relieved from tax~~ **treated for tax purposes** in the host State; **in the same way and** subject to the same conditions and limitations as relief for contributions to domestic pension schemes of the host State.

13 41. Tax relief ~~for~~ **with respect** to contributions to the home country pension scheme under the conditions outlined can be given by either the home country, being the country where the pension scheme is situated or by the host country, where the economic activities giving rise to the contributions are carried out.

14 42. A solution in which relief would be given by the home country might not be effective, since the ~~employee~~ *individual* might have no or little taxable income in that country. Practical considerations therefore suggest that it would be preferable for relief to be given by the host country and this is the solution adopted in the suggested provision.

15 43. In looking at the characteristics of the ~~employee~~ *individual*, ~~sub-paragraph a)~~ **paragraph 1** makes it clear that, in order to get the relief from taxation in the host State, the ~~employee~~ *individual* must not have been resident in the host State immediately prior to working there.

16 44. ~~Sub-paragraph a)~~ **Paragraph 1** does not, however, limit the application of the provision to ~~seconded~~ *individuals* who become resident in the host State. In many cases, ~~employees~~ *individuals* working abroad who remain resident in their home State will continue to qualify for relief there, but this will not be so in all cases. The suggested provision therefore applies to non-residents working in the host State as well as to ~~seconded~~ *individuals* ~~to the host State~~ who attain residence status there. In some Member countries the domestic legislation may restrict deductibility to contributions borne by residents, and these Member countries may wish to restrict the suggested provision to cater for this. Also, States with a special regime for non-residents (e.g. taxation at a special low rate) may, in bilateral negotiations, wish to agree on a provision restricted to residents.

17 45. In the case where individuals temporarily cease to be resident in the host country in order to join a pension scheme in a country with more relaxed rules, individual States may want a provision which would prevent the possibility of abuse. One form such a provision could take would be a nationality test which could exclude from the suggested provision individuals who are nationals of the host State.

18 46. As *already noted*, it is not unusual for ~~employees to be seconded to~~ *individuals to work in* a number of different countries in succession; **for that reason**, the suggested provision is not limited to ~~employees~~ *individuals* who are residents of the home State immediately prior to ~~exercising employment~~ **providing services** in the host State. The provision covers an ~~employee~~ *individual* coming to the host State from a third country as it is only limited to ~~employees~~ *individuals* who were not resident in the host country before ~~taking up employment~~ **starting to work** there. However, Article 1 restricts the scope of the Convention to residents of one or both Contracting States. An ~~employee~~ *individual* who is neither a resident of the host State nor of

the home State where the pension scheme is established is therefore outside the scope of the Convention between the two States.

19 47. The suggested provision places no limits on the length of time for which an **employee individual** can work in a host State. It could be argued that, if an **employee individual** works in the host State for long enough, it in effect becomes his home country and the provision should no longer apply. Indeed, some host countries already restrict relief for contributions to foreign ~~employee/employer~~ pension schemes to cases where the ~~seconded employees~~ **individuals** are present on a temporary basis.

20 48. In addition, the inclusion of a time limit may be helpful in preventing the possibility of abuse outlined in paragraph 17 45 above. In bilateral negotiations, individual countries may find it appropriate to include a limit on the length of time for which an **employee individual** may ~~exercise an employment~~ **provide services** in the host State after which reliefs granted by the suggested provision would no longer apply.

21 49. In looking at the characteristics of the contributions, ~~sub-paragraph a)~~ **paragraph 1** provides a number of tests. It makes it clear that the provision applies only to contributions ~~borne~~ **by-made by or on behalf of** an individual to a pension scheme established in and recognised for tax purposes in the home State. The phrase "recognised for tax purposes" is further defined in ~~subdivision b)(ii)~~ **sub-paragraph 2b)** of the suggested provision. *The phrase "made by or on behalf of" is intended to apply to contributions that are made directly by the individual as well as to those that are made for that individual's benefit by an employer or another party (e.g. a spouse). While paragraph 4 of Article 24 ensures that the employer's contributions to a pension fund resident of the other Contracting State are deductible under the same conditions as contributions to a resident pension fund, that provision may not be sufficient to ensure the similar treatment of employer's contributions to domestic and foreign pension funds. This will be the case, for example, where the employer's contributions to the foreign fund are treated as a taxable benefit in the hands of the employee or where the deduction of the employer's contributions is not dependent on the fund being a resident but, rather, on other conditions (e.g. registration with tax authorities or the presence of offices) which have the effect of generally excluding foreign pension funds. For these reasons, employer's contributions are covered by the suggested provision even though paragraph 4 of Article 24 may already ensure a similar relief in some cases.*

22 50. The second test applied to the characteristics of the contributions is that the contributions should be made to a home State scheme recognised by the competent authority of the host State as generally corresponding to a scheme recognised as such for tax purposes by the host State. This operates on the premise that only contributions to recognised schemes qualify for relief in Member countries. This limitation does not, of course, necessarily secure equivalent tax treatment of contributions paid where an **employee individual** was working abroad and of contributions while working in the home country. If the host State's rules for recognising pension schemes were narrower than those of the home State, the **employee individual** could find that contributions to his home country pension scheme were less favourably treated when he was working in the host country than when working in the home country.

23 51. However, it would not be in accordance with the stated aim of securing, as far as possible, equivalent tax treatment of ~~employee~~ contributions to **foreign schemes** to give relief for contributions which do not—at least broadly—correspond to domestically recognised schemes. To do so would mean that the amount of relief in the host State would become dependent on legislation in the home State. In addition, it could be hard to defend treating ~~employees~~ **individuals** working side by side differently depending on whether their pension scheme was at home or abroad (and if abroad, whether it was one country rather than another). By limiting the suggested provision to schemes which generally correspond to those in the host country such difficulties are avoided.

24 52. The suggested provision makes it clear that it is for the competent authority of the host State to determine whether the scheme in the home State generally corresponds to recognised schemes in the host State. Individual States may wish, in bilateral negotiations, to *specify expressly to which existing schemes the provision will apply or to* establish what interpretation the competent authority places on the term "generally corresponding"; for example how widely it is interpreted and what tests are imposed.

25 53. The contributions covered by the provision are limited to payments to schemes ~~to~~ *in* which the employee *individual* was ~~contributing~~ *participating* before *beginning* to exercise his employment *provide services* in the host State. This means that contributions to new pension schemes which an employee *individual* joins while in the host State are excluded from the suggested provision.

26 54. It is, however, recognised that special rules may be needed to cover cases where new pension schemes are substituted for previous ones. For instance, in some Member countries the common practice may be that, if a company employer is taken over by another company, the existing company pension scheme for its employees may be ended and a new scheme opened by the new employer. In bilateral negotiations, therefore, individual States may wish to supplement the provision to cover such substitution schemes.

27 55. ~~Sub-paragraph a)~~ *Paragraph 1* also sets out the relief to be given by the host State if the characteristics of the employee *individual* and the contributions fall within the terms of the provision. In brief, the relief is to be given in a way which corresponds to the manner in which relief would be given contributions *must be treated for tax purposes in a way which corresponds to the manner in which they would be treated* if these contributions were to a scheme established in the host State. *Thus, the contributions will qualify for the same tax relief (e.g. be deductible), for both the individual and his employer (where the individual is employed and contributions are made by the employer) as if these contributions had been made to a scheme in the host State. Also, the same treatment has to be given as regards the taxation of an employee on the employment benefit derived from an employer's contribution to either a foreign or a local scheme (see paragraph 58 below).*

28 56. This measure of relief does not, of course, necessarily secure equivalent tax treatment given to contributions paid when an employee *individual* is working abroad and contributions paid when he is working in the home country. Similar considerations apply here to those discussed in paragraphs ~~22 and 23~~ *50 and 51* above. The measure does, however, ensure equivalent treatment of the contributions of ~~colleagues~~ *co-workers*. The following example is considered. The home country allows relief for pension contributions subject to a limit of 18 % of income. The host country allows relief subject to a limit of 20 %. The suggested provision in paragraph ~~41-37~~ would require the host country to allow relief up to its domestic limit of 20 %. Countries wishing to adopt the limit in the home country would need to amend the wording of the provision appropriately.

29 57. The amount and method of giving the relief would depend upon the domestic tax treatment of pension contributions by the host State. This would settle such questions as whether contributions qualify for relief in full, or only in part, and whether relief should be given as a deduction in computing taxable income (and if so, which income, e.g. *in the case of an individual*, only employment *or business* income or all income) or as a tax credit.

30 58. *For an individual who participates in an occupational pension scheme*, ~~B~~ being assigned to work abroad may not only mean that ~~an~~ *this* employee's contributions to a pension scheme in his home country cease to qualify for tax relief. It may also mean that contributions to the pension scheme by the employer are regarded as the employee's income for tax purposes. In some Member countries employees are taxed on employer's contributions to domestic schemes whilst working in the home country whereas in others these contributions remain exempt. ~~The provision, therefore, is silent on the treatment of such contributions,~~

although Member countries may wish to extend the suggested provision in bilateral treaties, to *Since it applies to both employees' and employer's contributions*, the suggested provision ensures that employers contributions in the context of the employees' tax liability are accorded the same treatment that such contributions to domestic schemes would receive.

~~31~~ **59.** ~~Subdivision b)(i)~~ *Sub-paragraph 2 a)* defines a pension scheme for the purposes of ~~sub-paragraph 1 a)~~. It makes it clear that, for these purposes, a pension scheme is an arrangement in which the individual who makes the payments participates in order to secure retirement benefits. These benefits must be payable in respect of *services exercised of the employment provided* in the host State. All the above conditions must apply to the pension scheme before it can qualify for relief under the suggested provision.

~~32~~ **60.** ~~Subdivision b)(i)~~ *Sub-paragraph 2 a)* refers to the participation of the individual in the pension scheme in order to secure retirement benefits. This definition is intended to ensure that the proportion of contributions made to secure benefits other than periodic pension payments on retirement, e.g. a lump sum on retirement, will also qualify for relief under the provision.

~~33~~ **61.** The initial definition of a pension scheme is "an arrangement". This is a widely drawn term, the use of which is intended to encompass the various forms which pension schemes (*whether social security, occupational or individual retirement schemes*) may take in ~~individual~~ *different* Member countries.

~~34~~ **62.** Although ~~subdivision b)(i)~~ *sub-paragraph 2 a)* sets out that participation in this scheme has to be by the individual who ~~exercises the employment~~ *provides services* referred to in *paragraph 1 sub-paragraph a)*, there is no reference to the identity of the recipient of the retirement benefits secured by participation in the scheme. This is to ensure that any proportion of contributions intended to generate a widow or dependent's pension may be eligible for relief under the suggested provision.

~~35~~ **63.** The definition of a pension scheme makes no distinction between pensions paid from State-run occupational pension schemes and similar privately-run schemes. Both are covered by the scope of the provision. *Social security schemes are therefore covered by the provision to the extent that contributions to such schemes can be considered to be with respect to the services provided in the host State by an individual, whether as an employee or in an independent capacity.* Any pensions, such as pensions from general State pension schemes dependent on contribution records whether or not contributors are employees, are excluded from the provision as the individual will not contribute to such schemes in order to receive benefits payable in respect of his employment.

~~36~~ **64.** ~~Subdivision b)(ii)~~ *Sub-paragraph 2 b)* further defines the phrase "recognised for tax purposes". As the aim of the provision is, so far as possible, to ensure that contributions are neither more nor less favourably treated for tax purposes than they would be if the ~~employee-individual was were~~ resident in his home State, it is right to limit the *scope of the* provision to contributions which would have qualified for relief if the ~~employee-individual~~ had remained in the home State. The provision seeks to achieve this aim by limiting its scope to contributions made to a scheme only if contributions to this scheme would qualify for tax relief in that State.

~~37~~ **65.** This method of attempting to achieve parity of treatment assumes that in all Member countries only contributions to recognised pension schemes qualify for relief. The tax treatment of contributions to pension schemes under Member countries' tax systems may differ from this assumption. It is recognised that, in bilateral negotiations, individual countries may wish to further define the qualifying pension schemes in terms that match the respective domestic laws of the treaty partners. *They may also wish to define other terms used in the provision, such as "renders services" and "provides services"*.

Tax obstacles to the portability of pension rights

66. *Another issue, which also relates to international labour mobility, is that of the tax consequences that may arise from the transfer of pension rights from a pension scheme established in one Contracting State to another scheme located in the other Contracting State. When an individual moves from one employer to another, it is frequent for the pension rights that this individual accumulated in the pension scheme covering his first employment to be transferred to a different scheme covering his second employment. Similar arrangements may exist to allow for the portability of pension rights to or from an individual retirement scheme.*

67. *Such transfers usually give rise to a payment representing the actuarial value, at the time of the transfer, of the pension rights of the individual or representing the value of the contributions and earnings that have accumulated in the scheme with respect to the individual. These payments may be made directly from the first scheme to the second one; alternatively, they may be made by requiring the individual to contribute to the new pension scheme all or part of the amount that he has received upon withdrawing from the previous scheme. In both cases, it is frequent for tax systems to allow such transfers, when they are purely domestic, to take place on a tax-free basis.*

68. *Problems may arise, however, where the transfer is made from a pension scheme located in one Contracting State to a scheme located in the other State. In such a case, the Contracting State where the individual resides may consider that the payment arising upon the transfer is a taxable benefit. A similar problem arises when the payment is made from a scheme established in a State to which the relevant tax convention gives source taxing rights on pension payments arising therefrom as that State may want to apply that taxing right to any benefit derived from the scheme. Contracting States that wish to address that issue are free to include a provision drafted along the following lines:*

“Where pension rights or amounts have accumulated in a pension scheme established in and recognised for tax purposes in one Contracting State for the benefit of an individual who is a resident of the other Contracting State, any transfer of these rights or amounts to a pension scheme established in and recognised for tax purposes in that other State shall, in each State, be treated for tax purposes in the same way and subject to the same conditions and limitations as if it had been made from one pension scheme established in and recognised for tax purposes in that State to another pension scheme established in and recognised for tax purposes in the same State.”

The above provision could be modified to also cover transfers to or from pensions funds established and recognised in third States (this, however, could raise similar concerns as those described in the preamble of paragraph 38 above).

Exemption of the income of a pension fund

69. *Where, under their domestic law, two States follow the same approach of generally exempting from tax the investment income of pension funds established in their territory, these States, in order to achieve greater neutrality with respect to the location of capital, may want to extend that exemption to the investment income that a pension fund established in one State derives from the other State. In order to do so, States sometimes include in their conventions a provision drafted along the following lines:*

“Notwithstanding any provision of this Convention, income arising in a Contracting State that is derived by a resident of the other Contracting State that was constituted and is operated exclusively to administer or provide pension benefits and has been accepted by the

competent authority of the first-mentioned State as generally corresponding to a pension scheme recognised as such for tax purposes by that State, shall be exempt from tax in the first-mentioned State.” “

2. PROPOSED CHANGES TO ARTICLE 19 ON GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Replace the existing Article 19 of the OECD Model Tax Convention by the following:

“Article 19

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

1. *a)* Salaries, wages and other similar remuneration paid by a Contracting State or a political subdivision or a local authority thereof to an individual in respect of services rendered to that State or subdivision or authority shall be taxable only in that State.
 - b)* However, such salaries, wages and other similar remuneration shall be taxable only in the other Contracting State if the services are rendered in that State and the individual is a resident of that State who:
 - (i)* is a national of that State; or
 - (ii)* did not become a resident of that State solely for the purpose of rendering the services.
2. *a)* ***Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1, a***Any pension ***or other similar remuneration*** paid by, or out of funds created by, a Contracting State or a political subdivision or a local authority thereof to an individual in respect of services rendered to that State or subdivision or authority shall be taxable only in that State.
 - b)* However, such pension ***or other similar remuneration*** shall be taxable only in the other Contracting State if the individual is a resident of, and a national of, that State.
3. The provisions of Articles 15, 16, 17, and 18 shall apply to salaries, wages, ~~and other similar remuneration, and to pensions,~~ ***and other similar remuneration*** in respect of services rendered in connection with a business carried on by a Contracting State or a political subdivision or a local authority thereof.”

3. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COMMENTARY ON ARTICLE 19 CONCERNING THE TAXATION OF REMUNERATION IN RESPECT OF GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Replace the existing paragraphs 4 to 6 of the Commentary on Article 19 of the OECD Model Tax Convention by the following:

“4. An exception from the principle of giving exclusive taxing power to the paying State is contained in sub-paragraph *b*) of paragraph 1. It is to be seen against the background that, according to the Vienna Conventions mentioned above, the receiving State is allowed to tax remuneration paid to certain categories of personnel of foreign diplomatic missions and consular posts, who are permanent residents or nationals of that State. Given that pensions paid to retired government officials ought to be treated for tax purposes in the same way as salaries or wages paid to such employees during their active time, an exception like the one in sub-paragraph *b*) of paragraph 1 is incorporated also in sub-paragraph *b*) of paragraph 2 regarding pensions. Since the condition laid down in subdivision *b*)(*ii*) of paragraph 1 cannot be valid in relation to a pensioner, the only pre-requisite for the receiving State's power to tax the pension is that the pensioner must be one of its own residents and nationals. ~~It should be noted that the expression "out of funds created by" in sub-paragraph *a*) of paragraph 2 covers the situation where the pension is not paid directly by the State, a political subdivision or a local authority but out of separate funds created by them.~~

5. According to Article 19 of the 1963 Draft Convention, the services rendered to the State, political subdivision or local authority had to be rendered "in the discharge of functions of a governmental nature". That expression was deleted in the 1977 Model Convention. Some OECD Member countries, however, thought that the exclusion would lead to a widening of the scope of the Article. Contracting States who are of that view and who feel that such a widening is not desirable may continue to use, and preferably specify, the expression "in the discharge of functions of a governmental nature" in their bilateral conventions.

5.1 While the word "pension", under the ordinary meaning of the word, covers only periodic payments, the words "other similar remuneration", which were added to paragraph 2 in ____, are broad enough to cover non-periodic payments. For example, a lump-sum payment in lieu of periodic pension payments that is made to a former State employee after cessation of employment may fall within paragraph 2 of the Article. Whether a particular lump-sum payment made in these circumstances is to be considered as other remuneration similar to a pension falling under paragraph 2 or as final remuneration for work performed falling under paragraph 1 is a question of fact which can be resolved in light of the factors presented in paragraph 5 of the Commentary on Article 18.

5.2 It should be noted that the expression "out of funds created by" in sub-paragraph *a*) of paragraph 2 covers the situation where the pension is not paid directly by the State, a political subdivision or a local authority but out of separate funds created by a government body. In addition, the original capital of the fund would not need to be provided by the State, a political subdivision or a local authority. The phrase would cover payments from a privately administered fund established for the government body.

5.3 An issue arises where pensions are paid for combined private and government services. This issue may frequently arise where a person has been employed in both the private and public sector and receives one pension in respect of both periods of employment. This may occur either because the person participated in the same scheme throughout the employment or because the person's pension rights were

portable. A trend towards greater mobility between private and public sectors may increase the significance of this issue.

5.4 Where a civil servant having rendered services to a State has transferred his right to a pension from a public scheme to a private scheme the pension payments would be taxed only under Article 18 because such payment would not meet the technical requirement of subparagraph 2 a).

5.5 Where the transfer is made in the opposite direction and the pension rights are transferred from a private scheme to a public scheme, some States tax the whole pension payments under Article 19. Other States, however, apportion the pension payments based on the relative source of the pension entitlement so that part is taxed under Article 18 and another part under Article 19. In so doing, some States consider that if one source has provided by far the principal amount of the pension, then the pension should be treated as having been paid exclusively from that source. Nevertheless, it is recognised that apportionment often raises significant administrative difficulties.

5.6 Contracting States may be concerned about the revenue loss or the possibility of double non-taxation if the treatment of pensions could be changed by transferring the fund between public and private schemes. Apportionment may counter this; however, to enable apportionment to be applied to pensions rights that are transferred from a public scheme to a private scheme, Contracting States may, in bilateral negotiations, consider extending subparagraph 2 a) to cover the part of any pension or other similar remuneration that it is paid in respect of services rendered to a Contracting State or a political subdivision or a local authority thereof. Such a provision could be drafted as follows:

"2. a) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1, the part of any pension or other similar remuneration that is paid in respect of services rendered to a Contracting State or a political subdivision or a local authority thereof shall be taxable only in that Contracting State."

Alternatively Contracting States may address the concern by subjecting all pensions to the same treatment.

6. Paragraphs 1 and 2 do not apply if the services are performed in connection with business carried on by the State, or one of its political subdivisions or local authorities, paying the salaries, wages, ~~or other similar remuneration or the pensions~~ **or other similar remuneration**. In such cases the ordinary rules apply: Article 15 for wages and salaries, Article 16 for directors' fees and other similar payments, Article 17 for artistes and sportsmen, and Article 18 for pensions. Contracting States, wishing for specific reasons to dispense with paragraph 3 in their bilateral conventions, are free to do so thus bringing in under paragraphs 1 and 2 also services rendered in connection with business. In view of the specific functions carried out by certain public bodies, e.g. State Railways, the Post Office, State-owned theatres etc., Contracting States wanting to keep paragraph 3 may agree in bilateral negotiations to include under the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 salaries, wages, ~~and other similar remuneration, and pensions, and other similar remuneration~~ paid by such bodies, even if they could be said to be performing business activities."