



# ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

## Corporate Tax 2019

**15th Edition**

A practical cross-border insight into corporate tax work

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

Blackwood & Stone LP  
Boga & Associates  
Braekhus Advokatfirm DA  
Carey

Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama Legal Practitioners  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Greenwoods & Herbert Smith Freehills  
GSK Stockmann

Houthoff

Lenz & Staehelin

LEX Law Offices

Maples and Calder

Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal

Mul & Co

Nagashima Ohno & Tsunematsu

Nithya Partners

Noerr LLP

Puri Bracco Lenzi e Associati

Rui Bai Law Firm

Sameta

Schindler Attorneys

Sele Frommelt & Partners Attorneys at Law Ltd.

Slaughter and May

SMPS Legal

Stavropoulos & Partners Law Office

T. P. Ostwal & Associates LLP, Chartered Accountants

Tirard, Naudin

Totalserve Management Limited

Utumi Advogados

Vivien Teu & Co LLP

Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz

Waselius & Wist

WH Partners

Wong & Partners



global legal group

**Contributing Editor**

William Watson,  
Slaughter and May

**Sales Director**

Florjan Osmani

**Account Director**

Oliver Smith

**Sales Support Manager**

Toni Hayward

**Sub Editor**

Jenna Feasey

**Senior Editors**

Suzie Levy  
Caroline Collingwood

**CEO**

Dror Levy

**Group Consulting Editor**

Alan Falach

**Publisher**

Rory Smith

**Published by**

Global Legal Group Ltd.  
59 Tanner Street  
London SE1 3PL, UK  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720  
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk  
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

**GLG Cover Design**

F&F Studio Design

**GLG Cover Image Source**

iStockphoto

**Printed by**

Ashford Colour Press Ltd  
November 2018

Copyright © 2018

Global Legal Group Ltd.  
All rights reserved  
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-912509-43-0

ISSN 1743-3371

**Strategic Partners**



**General Chapters:**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | <b>Fiscal State Aid – Some Limits Emerging at Last?</b> – William Watson, Slaughter and May        | 1 |
| 2 | <b>Taxing the Digital Economy</b> – Sandy Bhogal & Panayiota Burquier, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP | 9 |

**Country Question and Answer Chapters:**

|    |                       |   |     |
|----|-----------------------|---|-----|
| 3  | <b>Albania</b>        | Boga & Associates: Genc Boga & Alketa Uruçi   | 15  |
| 4  | <b>Argentina</b>      | Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal: Walter C. Keiniger & María Inés Brandt                            | 21  |
| 5  | <b>Australia</b>      | Greenwoods & Herbert Smith Freehills: Richard Hendriks & Cameron Blackwood                    | 28  |
| 6  | <b>Austria</b>        | Schindler Attorneys: Clemens Philipp Schindler & Martina Gatterer                             | 37  |
| 7  | <b>Brazil</b>         | Utumi Advogados: Ana Claudia Akie Utumi   | 46  |
| 8  | <b>Chile</b>          | Carey: Jessica Power & Ximena Silberman   | 52  |
| 9  | <b>China</b>          | Rui Bai Law Firm: Wen Qin   | 58  |
| 10 | <b>Cyprus</b>         | Totalserve Management Limited: Petros Rialas & Marios Yenagrites                              | 64  |
| 11 | <b>Finland</b>        | Waselius & Wist: Niklas Thibblin & Mona Numminen  | 71  |
| 12 | <b>France</b>         | Tirard, Naudin: Maryse Naudin   | 77  |
| 13 | <b>Germany</b>        | Noerr LLP: Dr. Martin Haisch & Dr. Carsten Heinz  | 86  |
| 14 | <b>Greece</b>         | Stavropoulos & Partners Law Office: Ioannis Stavropoulos & Aimilia Stavropoulou               | 92  |
| 15 | <b>Hong Kong</b>      | Vivien Teu & Co LLP : Vivien Teu & Kenneth Yim  | 99  |
| 16 | <b>Iceland</b>        | LEX Law Offices: Garðar Viðir Gunnarsson & Guðrún Lilja Sigurðardóttir                        | 106 |
| 17 | <b>India</b>          | T. P. Ostwal & Associates LLP, Chartered Accountants: T. P. Ostwal & Siddharth Banwat         | 112 |
| 18 | <b>Indonesia</b>      | Mul & Co: Mulyono   | 120 |
| 19 | <b>Ireland</b>        | Maples and Calder: Andrew Quinn & David Burke   | 128 |
| 20 | <b>Italy</b>          | Puri Bracco Lenzi e Associati: Guido Lenzi & Pietro Bracco, Ph.D.                             | 135 |
| 21 | <b>Japan</b>          | Nagashima Ohno & Tsunematsu: Shigeki Minami   | 142 |
| 22 | <b>Kosovo</b>         | Boga & Associates: Genc Boga & Alketa Uruçi   | 151 |
| 23 | <b>Liechtenstein</b>  | Sele Frommelt & Partners Attorneys at Law Ltd.: Heinz Frommelt                                | 156 |
| 24 | <b>Luxembourg</b>     | GSK Stockmann: Mathilde Ostertag & Katarzyna Chmiel   | 163 |
| 25 | <b>Malaysia</b>       | Wong & Partners: Yvonne Beh   | 171 |
| 26 | <b>Malta</b>          | WH Partners: Ramona Azzopardi & Sonia Brahmi  | 177 |
| 27 | <b>Mexico</b>         | SMPS Legal: Ana Paula Pardo Lelo de Larrea & Alexis Michel                                    | 183 |
| 28 | <b>Netherlands</b>    | Houthoff: Paulus Merks & Wieger Kop   | 190 |
| 29 | <b>Nigeria</b>        | Blackwood & Stone LP: Kelechi Ugbeva  | 196 |
| 30 | <b>Norway</b>         | Braekhus Advokatfirm DA: Toralv Follestad & Charlotte Holmedal Gjelstad                       | 201 |
| 31 | <b>Russia</b>         | Sameta: Sofia Kriulina  | 207 |
| 32 | <b>Sri Lanka</b>      | Nithya Partners: Naomal Goonewardena & Savini Tissera   | 213 |
| 33 | <b>Switzerland</b>    | Lenz & Staehelin: Pascal Hinny & Jean-Blaise Eckert   | 219 |
| 34 | <b>United Kingdom</b> | Slaughter and May: Zoe Andrews & William Watson   | 229 |
| 35 | <b>USA</b>            | Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz: Jodi J. Schwartz & Swift S.O. Edgar                           | 238 |
| 36 | <b>Zambia</b>         | Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama Legal Practitioners: Joseph Alexander Jalasi & Mailesi Undi | 247 |

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

**Disclaimer**

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

---

## EDITORIAL

---

Welcome to the fifteenth edition of *The International Comparative Legal Guide to: Corporate Tax*.

This guide provides corporate counsel and international practitioners with a comprehensive worldwide legal analysis of the laws and regulations of corporate tax

It is divided into two main sections:

Two general chapters, offering an insight into tax and state aid, and tax in relation to the digital economy.

Country question and answer chapters. These provide a broad overview of common issues in corporate tax laws and regulations in 34 jurisdictions.

All chapters are written by leading corporate tax lawyers and industry specialists and we are extremely grateful for their excellent contributions.

Special thanks are reserved for the contributing editor William Watson of Slaughter and May for his invaluable assistance.

Global Legal Group hopes that you find this guide practical and interesting.

The *International Comparative Legal Guide* series is also available online at [www.iclg.com](http://www.iclg.com).

Alan Falach LL.M.  
Group Consulting Editor  
Global Legal Group  
[Alan.Falach@glgroup.co.uk](mailto:Alan.Falach@glgroup.co.uk)

---

# Luxembourg

Mathilde Ostertag



Katarzyna Chmiel



GSK Stockmann

## 1 Tax Treaties and Residence

### 1.1 How many income tax treaties are currently in force in your jurisdiction?

As at September 2018, Luxembourg has 83 tax treaties currently in force and an additional 12 under negotiation.

In addition, Luxembourg was one of 68 jurisdictions that signed the Multilateral Convention to Implement Tax Treaty Related Measures to Prevent BEPS (the “MLI”) during the signing ceremony held by the OECD in Paris on 7 June 2017. The Bill n° 7333 was submitted to the Luxembourg parliament on 3 July 2018. It is expected that the MLI will become effective for Luxembourg purposes in 2020.

### 1.2 Do they generally follow the OECD Model Convention or another model?

Tax treaties concluded by Luxembourg are usually based on the OECD Model Tax Convention (the “OECD MC”). Luxembourg has agreed with most of the treaty countries to implement a provision on the exchange of information in line with Article 26 of the OECD MC. Although not yet ratified, the new tax treaty signed with France on 20 March 2018 reflects all the post-BEPS changes and the 2017 version of the OECD MC; *inter alia*, the treaty changes the definition of a permanent establishment to include *commissionaire* arrangements and restricts the scope of the “preparatory and auxiliary” activities. It further changes the distributive rules for payments of dividends, interest and royalties in line with the 2017 OECD MC.

A few treaties signed by Luxembourg deviate from the OECD MC. A notable example is the treaty concluded with the USA which follows the US Model Income Tax Convention. A more recent example is the treaty signed with Senegal which more closely resembles the UN model.

### 1.3 Do treaties have to be incorporated into domestic law before they take effect?

All tax treaties are incorporated into domestic law pursuant to the following procedure: the legislator adopts a consenting law (*loi d’adaptation*) that authorises the Grand Duke to ratify the tax treaty. Before the treaty takes effect, it is submitted for approval by the

parliament (*Chambre des députés*). The parliament’s approval takes the form of a law (*loi d’approbation*). After the aforementioned procedure is completed, the treaty will take effect once it is ratified by the Grand Duke. The treaty must then be published in the *Mémorial* in order to be in force in Luxembourg.

Tax treaties signed by Luxembourg generally specify an exact date on which the treaty enters into force.

### 1.4 Do they generally incorporate anti-treaty shopping rules (or “limitation on benefits” articles)?

As a general rule, tax treaties concluded by Luxembourg do not include anti-treaty shopping rules. However, a limitation on benefits (“LOB”) clause is used in the treaties signed with *i.a.* Hong Kong, Poland, Senegal, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, and the USA. Interestingly, the new treaty signed with France contains a specific anti-treaty shopping rule in its new Article 28 (“Denial of benefits under the Convention”).

In addition the MLI signed by Luxembourg contains a general anti-abuse provision in the preamble to all of its tax treaties, which includes the express statement to eliminate double taxation without creating opportunities for reduced taxation or non-taxation. Such provision is a minimum standard and cannot be opted out by any of the signatories to the MLI. In the context of Article 7 (prevention of treaty abuse) countries may choose to apply either the Principle Purpose Test (“PPT”) or the detailed LOB provisions. Like most of the signatories to the MLI, Luxembourg chose to apply the PPT.

### 1.5 Are treaties overridden by any rules of domestic law (whether existing when the treaty takes effect or introduced subsequently)?

Luxembourg applies the hierarchy of norms. The constitution is the highest source of law, followed by laws and regulations. It is worth noting that relationship between international law and domestic law is governed entirely by case law. Such established case law states that tax treaties incorporated into internal legislation by a ratification law should constitute a superior law. Therefore, if a conflict between the provisions of an international treaty and those of a national law occurs, international law should take precedence over the national law.

Further to the above and under the general principles of Luxembourg public law, treaties are considered a “*lex specialis*” and therefore take precedence over the national provisions.

## 1.6 What is the test in domestic law for determining the residence of a company?

According to Article 159 of the Luxembourg income tax law (“LITL”), an entity is treated as a resident of Luxembourg for direct tax purposes if it has (i) its registered office (*siège statutaire*) in Luxembourg, or (ii) its central administration (*administration centrale*, i.e. the place of effective management) located in Luxembourg.

## 2 Transaction Taxes

### 2.1 Are there any documentary taxes in your jurisdiction?

Under Luxembourg law, certain acts such as official acts, acts of estate agents and transfer of ownership of certain goods are required to be registered with the Luxembourg *Administration de l’Enregistrement, des Domaines et de la TVA*. Registration duties are fixed or proportional, depending on the nature of the acts and transfers that are subject to them. A fixed fee of €12 is levied on all acts which do not contain a movement of securities, while a proportional duty (ranging from 0.01% to 14.4% depending on the transaction and the nature of the underlying asset) is levied on acts and conventions involving a movement of securities.

For instance, payment obligations are subject to a proportional 0.24% registration duty (which tax is calculated on the principal or highest amount stated in the document), if stated in a loan agreement physically attached to a deed subject to mandatory registration (such as a notarial deed).

With regard to the transfer of real estate, the registration duty is of 6% (or 9% for Luxembourg City), increased by an additional transcription tax of 1%. Should the real estate property be acquired for resale, the registration duty is increased to 7.2% (10.8% for real estate located in Luxembourg City). A reduction of the registration duty is available in case of a resale within two to four years from the acquisition.

In cases where Luxembourg real estate is contributed to a company (whether Luxembourg resident or foreign) against the issuance of shares, a reduced real estate transfer tax of 1.1% is due (or 1.4% for real estate located in Luxembourg city).

### 2.2 Do you have Value Added Tax (or a similar tax)? If so, at what rate or rates?

Luxembourg applies Value Added Tax (“VAT”) pursuant to the law of 12 February 1979 as amended (the “VAT Law”). Currently four rates are applicable: 17% standard rate; an intermediary rate of 14%; a reduced rate of 8%; and a super-reduced rate of 3%. Annexes A, B and C provide for a detailed list of services and goods that are subject to the reduced rates. Such Annexes are to be interpreted strictly.

### 2.3 Is VAT (or any similar tax) charged on all transactions or are there any relevant exclusions?

Luxembourg as a Member State of the EU follows the partially harmonised VAT system and applies exemptions as prescribed for by the Council Directive 2006/112/EC, as amended (the “VAT

Directive”). Such exemptions are granted *i.a.* in the context of financial services, fund management or medical services. An important point to highlight is that Luxembourg does not allow for an “opt in/opt out” mechanism for activities that are exempt, with the exception of rent, in which case the taxable person can choose to either apply VAT or not.

### 2.4 Is it always fully recoverable by all businesses? If not, what are the relevant restrictions?

In accordance with EU VAT rules, companies registered for VAT can deduct input VAT to the extent it is linked with their output VATable economic activity. In the past a *pro rata* deduction was used based on the percentage of VATable and non-VATable activities. However, after the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union (the “CJEU”) in *BLC Baumarkt GmbH & Co. KG* (C-511/10) the VAT directive must be interpreted as allowing Member States to use a more accurate method than the one of the general *pro rata*. In Circular n° 765 of 15 May 2013, the Luxembourg VAT authorities referred to a direct allocation or another key allocation method. The general *pro rata* deduction should not be used if a more precise allocation method can be applied.

As per the Circular n° 765-1 of 11 June 2018 the VAT tax administration extended the regime applicable in Circular n° 765 to persons carrying out both economic and non-economic activities for VAT purposes. The former Circular referred only to persons carrying out an economic activity partially exempt for VAT purposes.

### 2.5 Does your jurisdiction permit VAT grouping and, if so, is it “establishment only” VAT grouping, such as that applied by Sweden in the *Skandia* case?

In its judgment of 4 May 2017, the CJEU ruled that the Luxembourg implementation of the VAT group regime was not compatible with the VAT Directive, as it extended the benefits of the exemption to taxable activities that were not directly necessary for the exempt or out-of-scope activities of the VAT group. In the light of the above decision, Luxembourg has repealed its old regime and implemented a new VAT group regime as per the law of 6 August 2018 (in line with the *Skandia* case (C-7/13)).

The new VAT group regime treats all of the transactions between its members as “out of the scope” of the VAT. One of the major differences between the new and the former regime is that the VAT group regime is restricted to persons established in Luxembourg and Luxembourg branches of foreign companies, whereas the former regime allowed for grouping with other Member States of the EU.

### 2.6 Are there any other transaction taxes payable by companies?

A fixed registration fee of €75 is due in some specific cases determined by law such as but not limited to: upon incorporation or subsequent capital increase and migration of a company to Luxembourg.

### 2.7 Are there any other indirect taxes of which we should be aware?

There are custom and excise duties applicable for certain goods.

### 3 Cross-border Payments

#### 3.1 Is any withholding tax imposed on dividends paid by a locally resident company to a non-resident?

Dividends paid to residents as well as non-residents are in principle subject to a 15% withholding tax (“WHT”) in Luxembourg. It is possible, however, to benefit either from a reduced rate or an exemption under a double tax treaty or from the domestic participation exemption regime.

Domestic participation exemption is granted if, at the time of the dividend distribution:

- the parent company is a Luxembourg fully taxable company, or a resident company of a Member State of the EU as defined in Article 2 of the EU Parent-Subsidiary Directive 2011/96, as amended (the “PSD”), or a Swiss resident capital company that is subject to an income tax in Switzerland without being exempt from tax, or a foreign joint-stock company which is subject in its country of residence to an income tax regime corresponding to the Luxembourg corporate income tax (“CIT”);
- said company holds or commits to hold a participation of at least 10% (or with an acquisition price of at least €1.2 million) in the nominal share capital of the distributing company; and
- such qualifying participation has been held for an uninterrupted period of at least 12 months.

If the shareholder is an EU company within the scope of the PSD, the exemption applies subject to the additional general anti-abuse rule (“GAAR”) below:

- the EU parent company is not used for the main purpose or as one of the main purposes of obtaining a tax advantage that defeats the object of the PSD.

Liquidation proceeds are not subject to dividend WHT. If properly structured a partial liquidation may as well not be subject to the WHT.

In addition dividend payments made by certain type of vehicles, e.g. SPFs, SICAV, SICAR and securitisation vehicles are not subject to WHT.

#### 3.2 Would there be any withholding tax on royalties paid by a local company to a non-resident?

There has been no WHT on royalties in Luxembourg since 1 January 2004.

#### 3.3 Would there be any withholding tax on interest paid by a local company to a non-resident?

There is no WHT on arm’s length interest payments in Luxembourg. Interest paid under certain hybrid instruments or not at arm’s length may be subject to a 15% WHT if reclassified as dividend payments by the tax authorities.

#### 3.4 Would relief for interest so paid be restricted by reference to “thin capitalisation” rules?

There is currently no legislation concerning the thin capitalisation ratio specifically but, in practice, the tax administration uses a debt-to-equity ratio of 85:15 for the intra-group financing of participations. In case a taxpayer fails to comply with this ratio, the surplus of interest may be requalified as a hidden dividend distribution. Such requalification would result in a lack of deductibility for

those payments and possible application of a 15% WHT (subject to applicable tax treaty or participation exemption if applicable). Back-to-back financing is not subject to the abovementioned ratio.

As of 1 January 2019, Luxembourg will introduce interest deduction limitation rules in its legislation (currently under the draft law n° 7318 submitted on 19 June 2018, implementing the ATAD 1 and *i.a.* introducing a new Article 168bis LITL).

The interest limitation rule will be applicable to Luxembourg corporate taxpayers which are subject to CIT, as well as to permanent establishments of foreign companies. According to the draft law “financial undertakings”, “standalone entities”, as well as securitisation vehicles that are governed by Article 2(2) of the EU Regulation (2017/2402), are excluded from the scope of application of the rule thereto. Loans that were concluded before 17 June 2016 should as well be grandfathered (as long as the terms of the loans have not been modified since).

#### 3.5 If so, is there a “safe harbour” by reference to which tax relief is assured?

The only safe harbour rule is set out in the Circular n° 56/1-56bis/1 in relation to transfer pricing rules. The rule stipulates that for entities providing financial services to group companies and acting as a simple intermediary, a minimum return of 2% after tax is considered as a transaction performed at arm’s length. It should be noted that the safe harbour rule applies only at the level of the Luxembourg tax administration and other tax administrations may consider the transaction as not at arm’s length.

#### 3.6 Would any such rules extend to debt advanced by a third party but guaranteed by a parent company?

Debts guaranteed by a parent company (other than pledging the shares of the Luxembourg debtor to the creditor) are treated as a shareholder loan and as a result, in the absence of a transfer pricing report, the 85:15 debt-to-equity ratio will most likely be used.

#### 3.7 Are there any other restrictions on tax relief for interest payments by a local company to a non-resident?

If the interest payments are made not at arm’s length or are paid under a profit participating debt instrument, there is a risk of reclassification of the interest payments as dividend payment, with the tax consequences set above under question 3.4.

#### 3.8 Is there any withholding tax on property rental payments made to non-residents?

Luxembourg does not levy any WHT on property rental payments made to non-residents nor residents.

#### 3.9 Does your jurisdiction have transfer pricing rules?

Luxembourg transfer pricing rules are embedded in the revised Article 56 LITL, which incorporates the concept of the arm’s length principle based on Article 9 OECD MC. The amended provision, however, goes further and reflects the spirit set out in BEPS actions 8–10 such as the concept of comparability analysis and a GAAR that allows the disregarding of a transaction that has been made without any valid commercial or business justification.

On 27 December 2016, the Luxembourg tax authorities issued the Circular n° 56/1-56bis/1 which has reshaped the transfer pricing framework for companies carrying out intra-group financing activities in Luxembourg. The Circular provided additional guidance in terms of substance and transfer pricing requirements in line with the OECD Guidelines. In particular, it provided substantial details on how to conduct the comparability and functional analyses in a way consistent with the OECD principles. Furthermore, the Circular requires the performance of a comprehensive risk analysis in order to determine the adequate level of equity capital.

## 4 Tax on Business Operations: General

### 4.1 What is the headline rate of tax on corporate profits?

Luxembourg levies CIT on the annual net worldwide profits of Luxembourg resident companies and on source-based profits of non-resident companies. Income exceeding €30,000 is taxed at a rate of 18%. In addition a 7% solidarity surcharge for the employment fund and a 6.75% municipal business tax (“**MBT**”) for companies registered in Luxembourg City are levied. For companies located outside of the Luxembourg City a different rate of MBT may apply. The above amounts to an aggregate tax rate for Luxembourg-City domiciled companies of 26.01%.

It is worth noting that in the past (from 1 January 2011 up until 31 December 2015) companies were subject to a minimum CIT in the amount of €3,210. However, since that provision was rendered as incompatible with the EU PSD, Luxembourg abolished minimum CIT and introduced a minimum net wealth tax as of 1 January 2016 which amounts to €4,815.

### 4.2 Is the tax base accounting profit subject to adjustments, or something else?

As a general rule, companies in Luxembourg follow Luxembourg general accounting principles (“**LuxGAAP**”) under which both upward and downward adjustments are allowed.

### 4.3 If the tax base is accounting profit subject to adjustments, what are the main adjustments?

Profits in the commercial accounts differ from the taxable profits mainly for the following reasons:

- tax-exempt profits (e.g. as per the participation exemption regime applicable for dividends and capital gains);
- add-back expenses (e.g. interest expenses on assets generating tax-exempt income);
- adjustment to the tax results from the transactions that were not at arm’s length (e.g. the interest rate set was not at market conditions, or interest payments were reclassified as hidden dividend distribution and hence not tax deductible anymore); and
- discrepancies between the application of different valuation rules in accounting and in tax (e.g. amortisation, rollover relief).

Under certain conditions a tax balance sheet may be prepared in a way which deviates from the statutory accounts.

### 4.4 Are there any tax grouping rules? Do these allow for relief in your jurisdiction for losses of overseas subsidiaries?

Luxembourg allows a group of companies to apply a fiscal unity (or tax consolidation). Under such regime, the respective taxable profits of each company in the consolidated group are pooled or offset to be taxed on the aggregate amount, which means that the group is effectively treated as a single taxpayer.

Generally, the conditions to qualify for a fiscal unity are as follows:

- each company that is part of the tax unity is a Luxembourg resident fully taxable company (the top entity may be a Luxembourg permanent establishment of a fully taxable non-resident company) (the “**Eligible Company**”);
- at least 95% of each subsidiary’s capital is directly or indirectly held by an Eligible Company;
- each company’s fiscal year starts and ends on the same date; and
- the fiscal unity is applied for at least five financial years.

The taxable income/loss of the fiscal unity is calculated as the sum of the taxable income/loss of each constitutive entity. The vertical fiscal unity regime has been extended since 1 January 2016 in accordance with the CJEU case law in particular to allow horizontal integrations. Eligible Companies (at least two Luxembourg companies) that are held by a common parent established in any EEA country and subject to tax comparable to Luxembourg’s CIT in its country of residence are now also permitted to form a fiscal unity. Companies consolidated for CIT are also automatically consolidated for MBT. However, there is no tax consolidation for net wealth tax (“**NWT**”) purposes.

Securitisation entities and venture capital companies are excluded from the possibility to form a fiscal unity in order to prevent tax evasion schemes.

### 4.5 Do tax losses survive a change of ownership?

Companies resident in Luxembourg can carry forward their losses for 17 years for financial losses realised as from the financial year closing after 31 December 2016 (before that, tax losses could be carried forward indefinitely; losses incurred between 1 January 1991 and 31 December 2016 are, however, grandfathered in) and offset them against any future profits if the following conditions are met cumulatively:

- the losses have not already been offset;
- the company has maintained proper accounting in the loss-making period; and
- the losses are offset by the company that incurred them.

Based on Luxembourg case law, companies should have a right to carry forward tax losses in case of change of ownership, unless an abuse of law has been established. Such condition should be interpreted in the meaning of corporate law and not solely on economic rationale. The right to offset the losses based on the hereinabove conditions should only be interpreted in light of the definition of a company based on corporate law. As a consequence, amendments to articles of association relating to sale of shares of the company do not lead to the creation of a new legal entity and hence do not prohibit that entity from the carrying forward of losses.

However, application of the tax carry forward may be denied if the transaction occurred purely for tax reasons; the so-called “*Mantelkauf*” theory.

It should be noted that the tax losses may be offset against CIT and MBT but not against NWT.

#### 4.6 Is tax imposed at a different rate upon distributed, as opposed to retained, profits?

Luxembourg taxes retain and distribute profits in the same manner. However, distributed profits may be subject to withholding tax unless a domestic or treaty exemption applies. It should also be noted that undistributed profits might also be subject to NWT.

#### 4.7 Are companies subject to any significant taxes not covered elsewhere in this chapter – e.g. tax on the occupation of property?

Yes, Luxembourg levies net wealth tax (“NWT”) on Luxembourg corporate tax residents. NWT is assessed on 1 January of each year on the basis of the estimated realisable value of the company’s net operating assets (total assets minus total liabilities, the so-called unitary value). There is a possibility of reduction of the NWT up to the CIT paid for the previous fiscal year. NWT of 0.5% is levied on the unitary value of up to €500 million (inclusive) and 0.05% for the unitary value exceeding this threshold.

A minimum NWT of €4,815 is due by Luxembourg corporate taxpayers holding financial assets representing at least 90% of their total assets and having a balance sheet exceeding €350,000.

Exemptions are available for securitisation vehicles, SICARs, SEPCAVs, ASSEPs, and RAIFs that invest exclusively into risk capital-related securities – which only pay the minimum flat NWT of €4,815. A Luxembourg resident company can also benefit from a NWT exemption on qualifying participations under the same conditions applicable for the participation exemption on dividend income, except that no minimum holding period is required.

## 5 Capital Gains

#### 5.1 Is there a special set of rules for taxing capital gains and losses?

In principle capital gains arising from the sale of assets are treated as ordinary income and taxed as such, unless participation exemption as specified in question 5.2 below applies.

#### 5.2 Is there a participation exemption for capital gains?

Capital gains exemption is available under the following conditions:

At the time the capital gains are realised:

- the Luxembourg company has held a direct participation representing at least 10% of the nominal paid-up share capital of its subsidiary (or if below 10%, a direct participation having an acquisition price of at least € 6 million);
- it has held such qualifying participation for an uninterrupted period of at least 12 months; and
- the subsidiary entity is (i) a Luxembourg resident entity fully subject to Luxembourg income taxes, or (ii) a non-resident capital company liable for an income tax in its country of residence comparable to the Luxembourg CIT, or (iii) an entity resident in a Member State of the European Union (as defined in Article 2 of the PSD).

It is important to note that the GAAR does not apply to capital gains deriving from qualifying subsidiaries benefitting from the Luxembourg participation exemption, regardless of their location.

#### 5.3 Is there any special relief for reinvestment?

Yes, Article 54 LITL provides for a reinvestment relief if fixed assets consisting of a building or non-depreciable assets are disposed of during the course of operations, provided that certain conditions are met. The purpose of this article is that the profit on the disposal of assets should not be taxed if the funds released are retained in the business and will be used to invest in other capital assets.

#### 5.4 Does your jurisdiction impose withholding tax on the proceeds of selling a direct or indirect interest in local assets/shares?

Luxembourg does not impose WHT on the sale of a direct or indirect interest in local assets/shares as such profits are taxed as capital gains.

## 6 Local Branch or Subsidiary?

#### 6.1 What taxes (e.g. capital duty) would be imposed upon the formation of a subsidiary?

A €75 registration duty is due upon formation of a subsidiary; the same duty is paid in case its articles of association are amended.

#### 6.2 Is there a difference between the taxation of a local subsidiary and a local branch of a non-resident company (for example, a branch profits tax)?

Branch is a corporate law term; therefore the classification of an entity/activities as a branch is not imperative for the determination of its tax treatment. Instead tax law uses the term of permanent establishment to determine whether an entity is taxable in Luxembourg.

Branches and subsidiaries fall under the same tax regime. In addition all transactions between the head office and the branch are disregarded for tax purposes, e.g. there is no WHT on any payments.

#### 6.3 How would the taxable profits of a local branch be determined in its jurisdiction?

In principle, Luxembourg branches of foreign companies should be taxed the same way as resident companies (subject to the provisions of a relevant tax treaty) with the exception that transactions between a branch and a head office are disregarded.

#### 6.4 Would a branch benefit from double tax relief in its jurisdiction?

It depends on the domestic law of the jurisdiction where the head office is located and the applicable double tax treaty. However, as a general rule, a permanent establishment is not considered as a resident under a tax treaty and cannot claim the benefits of such treaty on its own.

#### 6.5 Would any withholding tax or other similar tax be imposed as the result of a remittance of profits by the branch?

No, transactions between the branch and the head office are not subject to WHT or any similar tax.

## 7 Overseas Profits

### 7.1 Does your jurisdiction tax profits earned in overseas branches?

As a general rule, in the absence of a double tax treaty, profits realised by an overseas branch would be included in the taxable basis of the Luxembourg head office (as it is taxed on its worldwide income). However, within the framework of double tax treaties, Luxembourg generally exempts profit of a permanent establishment which are taxed in the other Contracting State.

It should be noted that profits of an overseas branch would not be subject to MBT, as this tax is applicable to commercial activities carried on in Luxembourg only.

### 7.2 Is tax imposed on the receipt of dividends by a local company from a non-resident company?

Yes, all dividends received from abroad are calculated in the taxable profits of a company.

Such income might be exempt under the applicable tax treaty or the domestic participation exemption.

Under the domestic participation exemption, dividend income (and liquidation proceeds) is exempt if, at the time the income is put at the disposal of the taxpayer:

- the subsidiary entity is (i) a Luxembourg resident entity fully subject to Luxembourg income taxes, (ii) an entity resident in a Member State of the European Union (as defined in Article 2 of the PSD), or (iii) a non-resident capital company liable to an income tax in its country of residence comparable to the Luxembourg CIT;
- the Luxembourg company holds a direct participation representing at least 10% of the nominal paid-up share capital of its subsidiary (or if below 10%, a direct participation having an acquisition price of at least €1.2 million); and
- it has held (or commits itself to hold) such qualifying participation for an uninterrupted period of at least 12 months.

If the dividends are distributed by an EU subsidiary which is listed in Article 2 of the PSD, the exemption applies subject to the two additional conditions below:

- the EU subsidiary is not used for the main purpose or as one of the main purposes of obtaining a tax advantage that defeats the object of the PSD (GAAR); and
- the dividend/profit distribution from the EU subsidiary have not been deducted from its taxable base (anti-hybrid rule).

### 7.3 Does your jurisdiction have “controlled foreign company” rules and, if so, when do these apply?

Based on the aforementioned draft law n° 7318 transposing ATAD 1, Luxembourg will introduce CFC rules. The ATAD 1 CFC rules are the mere implementation of BEPS Action 3. In a nutshell, the CFC rule redistributes income of a 50% owned direct or indirect foreign subsidiary or permanent establishment to Luxembourg (i.e. the jurisdiction of the controlling entity), in cases where the actual corporate tax paid on that subsidiary’s or permanent establishment’s profits is lower than half the CIT that would have been paid in Luxembourg. The rule, however, excludes Luxembourg MBT from the scope of the CFC provisions.

## 8 Taxation of Commercial Real Estate

### 8.1 Are non-residents taxed on the disposal of commercial real estate in your jurisdiction?

Yes, non-residents are subject to capital gains tax upon disposal of a real estate located in Luxembourg as per domestic law. Such position might be overruled under double tax treaties signed with Luxembourg.

### 8.2 Does your jurisdiction impose tax on the transfer of an indirect interest in commercial real estate in your jurisdiction?

Luxembourg does not impose such tax unless the sale is done by a tax transparent entity from a Luxembourg point of view; then the non-resident company directly above the tax transparent entity is taxable on capital gains realised on the sale of the real estate in question.

### 8.3 Does your jurisdiction have a special tax regime for Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs) or their equivalent?

No, Luxembourg does not have any special tax regime for REITs.

## 9 Anti-avoidance and Compliance

### 9.1 Does your jurisdiction have a general anti-avoidance or anti-abuse rule?

Luxembourg has implemented the provisions of the Directive 2014/86/EC of 8 July 2014 amending the PSD introducing a GAAR on the participation exemption regime. The rule denies the benefits of the PSD to an arrangement, or series of arrangements, which have been effected for the main purpose, or one of the main purposes, of achieving a tax advantage that defeats the object or purpose of the PSD, and is/are not commercially genuine having regard to all relevant facts and circumstances. An arrangement is considered as not genuine if it has not been put into place for valid commercial reasons which reflect economic reality.

In light of the implementation of the GAAR rule as prescribed by ATAD 1, the draft law n° 7318 will replace the existing abuse of law provision with the harmonised GAAR. Such provision reproduces *mutatis mutandis* the GAAR deriving from the amended PSD. However, one shall remember that the GAAR is still subject to EU law and its interpretation by the CJEU. In this context the CJEU *Cadbury Schweppes* case-law and the notion of wholly artificial arrangements should be taken into account when applying the GAAR.

### 9.2 Is there a requirement to make special disclosure of avoidance schemes?

In accordance with DAC 6 (the fifth amendment to the Directive 2011/16/EU as regards to mandatory automatic exchange of information in the field of taxation in relation to reportable cross-border arrangements), cross-border arrangements indicating a potential risk of tax avoidance should be disclosed to the tax

authorities. The directive entered into force on 25 June 2018 and must be introduced into national law by 31 December 2019.

### 9.3 Does your jurisdiction have rules which target not only taxpayers engaging in tax avoidance but also anyone who promotes, enables or facilitates the tax avoidance?

According to DAC 6, intermediaries, i.e. persons who design, market, organise or make the arrangement available for implementation, are responsible for filing the information on reportable cross-border arrangements to the tax authorities. National law may give the intermediary the right to a waiver from filing information if the reporting obligation would breach the legal professional privilege. For example, lawyers have a legal obligation to maintain professional secrecy under the Luxembourg Criminal Code.

### 9.4 Does your jurisdiction encourage “co-operative compliance” and, if so, does this provide procedural benefits only or result in a reduction of tax?

A corporate entity may approach the tax administration and request an advance tax ruling, which constitutes a binding agreement with the tax authorities and a confirmation of the tax treatment.

## 10 BEPS and Tax Competition

### 10.1 Has your jurisdiction introduced any legislation in response to the OECD’s project targeting Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS)?

Luxembourg implemented many changes to align its law with the BEPS Action Plan:

- Action 1: implementation of EU VAT directive addressing VAT on business to customer’s digital services.
- Actions 2–4: implementation of ATAD that addresses CFCs and interest deduction limitation rules, with effect as of 1 January 2019 (hybrid rules are to be implemented by 1 January 2020).
- Action 5: Luxembourg introduced a BEPS-compliant new IP box regime as of the fiscal year starting in 2018.
- Actions 8–10: introduction of the new Article 56bis to the LITL (please refer to question 3.9 above).
- Action 12: as per the introduction into domestic law of DAC 6 (please refer to question 9.2 above).
- Action 13: transfer pricing documentation as requested by the new transfer pricing rules (please refer to question 3.9 above); country-by-country reporting (“CbCR”) which is applicable in Luxembourg for financial years starting on or after 1 January 2016.
- Action 14: Luxembourg chose to opt for mandatory arbitration under the MLI.
- Action 15: Luxembourg signed the MLI.

### 10.2 Does your jurisdiction intend to adopt any legislation to tackle BEPS which goes beyond what is recommended in the OECD’s BEPS reports?

No, Luxembourg is implementing all the mandatory measures which derive from the EU parliament initiative. However, as a competitive jurisdiction it does not plan to impose measures that

would go beyond other recommendations of the BEPs report. The interesting exception to that is the introduction of the mandatory binding arbitration, which is not required under the MLI instrument. Also, it is worth noting that the Luxembourg law on transfer pricing expressly makes reference to the OECD transfer pricing guidelines, when interpreting the law.

### 10.3 Does your jurisdiction support public Country-by-Country Reporting (CbCR)?

Yes, Luxembourg has transposed the EU Directive 2016/881 concerning automatic and mandatory exchange of tax information by the law of 23 December 2016 concerning the CbCR. The law requires the annual filing of a CbCR declaration by every ultimate parent company residing in Luxembourg for tax purposes (or a designated reporting entity). The CbCR must be filed within 12 months from the last day of the fiscal year in question. There is also an obligation to submit a notification stating whether the entity is either the ultimate parent of the group, a substitute parent or the designated reporting entity, and if it performs none of these functions, the notification shall clearly state the identity and fiscal residence of the reporting group entity no later than on the last day of the fiscal year of the group. The notification is submitted electronically.

### 10.4 Does your jurisdiction maintain any preferential tax regimes such as a patent box?

Yes, the law dated 22 March 2018 replaced the IP box regime that was abolished in 2016. It introduced a new Article 50ter LITL that provides for an 80% exemption on income derived from the commercialisation of certain intellectual property (“IP”) rights, as well as a full exemption from NWT. The new rules are applicable as from the fiscal year 2018. Qualifying assets include the following IP rights:

- patents (broadly defined) and functionally equivalent rights that are legally protected by utility models, extensions of patent protection for certain drugs and phyto-pharmaceutical products, plant breeder’s rights, and orphan drug designations; and
- copyrighted software.

In line with the BEPS – Action 5 recommendations, marketing-related IPs can no longer benefit from the IP box regime.

Qualifying income includes the following:

- income derived from the use of, or a concession to use, qualifying IP rights (i.e. royalty income);
- IP income embedded in the sales price of products or services directly related to the eligible IP asset. The principles of Article 56bis ITL must be used to separate income unrelated to the IP (e.g. marketing and manufacturing returns);
- capital gains derived from the sale of the qualifying IP rights; and
- indemnities based on an arbitration ruling or a court decision directly linked to a breach of a qualifying IP right.

The regime applies on a net income basis, meaning that expenses relating to the qualifying IP assets need to be deducted from the gross qualifying income. The proportion of qualifying net income entitled to the benefits will be determined based on the ratio of qualifying expenditures and overall expenditures (nexus ratio). The previously-qualifying IP assets can continue to benefit from the old regime during the grandfathering period, running until 30 June 2021.

## 11 Taxing the Digital Economy

### 11.1 Has your jurisdiction taken any unilateral action to tax digital activities or to expand the tax base to capture digital presence?

No, as any digital service tax would be detrimental to the fiscal politics of Luxembourg.

It is worth noting that the Luxembourg VAT Authorities issued Circular n° 787 of 11 June 2018 to extend the VAT exemption applicable to financial transactions to virtual currencies (which follows the CJEU's position in the *Hedqvist* case (C-264/14)).

Concurrently therewith, the Luxembourg direct tax administration issued Circular n° 14/5-99/3-99bis/3 of 26 July 2018 which classifies virtual currencies as intangible assets for CIT, MBT and NTW rather than a currency. It is an interesting point to note that both tax administrations have a diverging interpretation on the assessment of cryptocurrencies.



#### Mathilde Ostertag

GSK Stockmann  
44, Avenue John F. Kennedy  
L-1855  
Luxembourg

Tel: +352 2718 0200  
Email: [mathilde.ostertag@gsk-lux.com](mailto:mathilde.ostertag@gsk-lux.com)  
URL: [www.gsk-lux.com](http://www.gsk-lux.com)

Mathilde Ostertag heads the tax practice at GSK Stockmann in Luxembourg. She practised within a Benelux and an international law firm in Luxembourg for the past nine years prior to joining GSK Stockmann (Luxembourg bar, 2008). Her areas of expertise include domestic and international tax law, in particular tax planning, private equity, real estate, start-ups and other foreign investment structures. She also has in-depth knowledge on capital market transactions, cross-border restructurings, *i.a.* inbound and outbound migrations, mergers and acquisitions and debt restructuring. Mathilde holds a Master's degree from the Université Robert Schuman, Strasbourg and a postgraduate degree in Corporate and Tax Law (DJCE).

Mathilde is a board member of the Ladies in Law Luxembourg Association ("LILLA") which aims at actively promoting gender diversity and women in senior positions in the legal sector. She is also a member of the International Fiscal Association ("IFA") and the International Bar Association ("IBA"); she publishes regularly.

Mathilde is fluent in French, English, German and Portuguese.

Web: <https://www.gsk.de/en/person/en.mathilde.ostertag>.

### 11.2 Does your jurisdiction support the European Commission's interim proposal for a digital services tax?

Luxembourg does not support the digital service tax to be implemented only on the EU level as it may hurt its competitiveness. However, it believes that such tax should be consulted with the USA and accepted on the OECD level.

During his state visit to France, Luxembourg finance minister Pierre Gramegna said that Luxembourg was in favour of taxation of digital giants. However, he said that the initiative "alone", without the consensus of the OECD countries (or G20) could harm the European Union. Luxembourg's finance minister believes that Europe should consult with the USA before going ahead with any taxation plans on large digital firms like Google. European authorities have said that the United States has demonstrated willingness to discuss the issue. Gramegna added that there is a "consensus inside the European Union that we need to find a new model to address the issue of digital economy".



#### Katarzyna Chmiel

GSK Stockmann  
44, Avenue John F. Kennedy  
L-1855  
Luxembourg

Tel: +352 2718 0200  
Email: [katarzyna.chmiel@gsk-lux.com](mailto:katarzyna.chmiel@gsk-lux.com)  
URL: [www.gsk-lux.com](http://www.gsk-lux.com)

Katarzyna Chmiel is an Associate at GSK Stockmann in Luxembourg. She graduated from Maastricht University with an LL.B. ("European Law School") and an LL.M. in International and European Tax Law. Prior to joining GSK Stockmann Katarzyna gained experience in BIG 4 advisory firms in Luxembourg and Poland and completed a traineeship at the European Parliament in Brussels.

Practice areas of Katarzyna include international and European tax law, domestic Luxembourg taxation, tax planning and restructuring. She is passionate about the taxation of sharing economy and virtual property.

Katarzyna is a member of the International Fiscal Association ("IFA") and speaks English, Polish, and French.

Web: <https://www.gsk.de/en/person/en.katarzyna.chmiel>.

# GSK STOCKMANN

GSK Stockmann is a leading, independent business law firm with international reach and offices in Berlin, Frankfurt am Main, Hamburg, Heidelberg, Munich and Luxembourg.

We advise international and domestic clients across a wide range of areas in relation to Corporate/M&A, Private Equity, Investment Funds, Tax, Capital Markets and Banking and Finance.

GSK Stockmann is the trusted advisor of leading financial institutions, asset managers, private equity houses, insurance companies, corporates and innovative FinTech and start-up companies, having both a local and global reach. GSK Stockmann thrives to provide the highest quality legal advice and responsiveness combined with a pragmatic approach to the transactions. Solution driven, we tailor our services to the exact business needs of our clients. Teamwork is one of our core values, as is respect, solidarity and integrity. This combination ensures that we work efficiently for the benefit of our clients.

## Current titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Anti-Money Laundering
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Cybersecurity
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Financial Services Disputes
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Investor-State Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Investment Funds
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms

**glg** global legal group

59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: [info@glgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@glgroup.co.uk)

[www.iclg.com](http://www.iclg.com)