www.pwc.com/eudtg 22 June 2018



## PwC's EU Direct Tax Group

EUDTG is PwC's pan-European network of EU law experts. We specialise in all areas of direct tax, including the fundamental freedoms, EU directives and State aid rules. You will be only too well aware that EU direct tax law is moving quickly, and it's difficult to keep up. But, it is crucial that taxpayers with an EU or EEA presence understand the impact as they explore their activities, opportunities and investment decisions. Find out more on: www.pwc.com/eudtg

Interested in receiving our free EU tax news? Send an e-mail to eudtg@nl.pwc.com with "subscription EU Tax News".

For more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact:

Alina Macovei – PwC Luxembourg + 352 49 48 48 3122 alina.macovei@lu.pwc.com

Laurent Mahaux - PwC Luxembourg +352 49 48 48 2128 laurent.mahaux@lu.pwc.com

Jonathan Hare – PwC UK +44 (0)20 7804 6772 jonathan.hare@pwc.com

Emmanuel Raingeard - PwC France +33 155 574 014 emmanuel.raingeard@pwcavocats.

Or contact any of the other members of **PwC's State Aid Working Group.** 



# EU Direct Tax Newsalert

EU Commission finds that Luxembourg gave State aid to GDF Suez (now Engie)

On 20 June 2018 the European because the borrower deducted expenses Commission ("EC") issued a press release concerning its final decision in the State aid investigation into tax rulings granted by the Luxembourg tax authorities to GDF Suez group (now Engie) ("the Group") in relation to the treatment of certain financing transactions. The EC considered that the Group received an undue advantage and requested recovery of up to EUR 120 million of tax.

The text of the final decision has not yet Takeaway been made public by the EC.

### **Background**

The formal investigation concerned the treatment of certain interest-free convertible loans ("instruments") issued by Luxembourg group subsidiaries ("borrowers") to two other Luxembourg companies of the Group ("lenders"). According to the description in the press release:

- the borrowers treated the instruments as debt and recorded in their accounts provisions for financing charges which were deductible at their level;
- the borrowers did not make payments on the instruments to the lenders under the terms of the instruments;
- the lenders converted the instruments into shares in the borrowers that they subsequently cancelled for the receipt of cash/profits which had been accumulated by the borrowers.

#### Decision

The EC considered that the two sets of tax rulings governing the treatment of the instruments incorrectly lowered the tax basis of the Luxembourg companies.

The press release does not contain details regarding the legal argumentation of the EC but mentions that the EC considered that the Luxembourg tax treatment of the instruments did not reflect economic reality. The EC also considered that the rulings endorsed an inconsistent treatment of the same transaction as both debt and equity leading to non-taxation at all levels

similar to interest on the loan while the creditor did not pay tax because Luxembourg tax rules exempt income from equity investments. The EC considered that this is a more favourable treatment than that generally available under Luxembourg tax rules, which exempt from taxation income received by a shareholder from its subsidiary, provided that income is in general taxed at the level of the subsidiary.

- The decision is the latest in a number of high profile cases concerning EC's approach to State aid and taxation.
- While a number of the recent cases concern transfer pricing matters, the decision in GDF Suez's case appears to focus on the fact that the arrangement gives rise to a deduction of an expense without a corresponding income inclusion. The EC's concerns perhaps have some echoes of the BEPS Actions and the matters which have been further addressed through the European Union Anti Tax Avoidance Directives ("ATAD I" and "ATAD II").
- However, the text of the final decision will be important for the understanding of the EC's detailed argumentation and position in the case.
- As with the prior cases, it can be expected that the decision will be appealed by Luxembourg to the General Court of the EU.
- In the meantime it is perhaps interesting to note that the appeals in respect of a number of the earlier cases will be heard in front of the General Court over the course of the next few weeks.

© 2018 PwC. All rights reserved. Not for further distribution without the permission of PwC. "PwC" refers to the network of member firms of PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited (PwCIL), or, as the context requires, individual member firms of the PwC network. Each member firm is a separate legal entity and does not act as agent of PwCIL or any other member firm. PwCIL does not provide any services to clients. PwCIL is not responsible or liable for the acts or omissions of any of its member firms nor can it control the exercise of their professional judgment or bind them in any way. No member firm is responsible or liable for the acts or omissions of any other member firm nor can it control the exercise of another member firm's professional judgment or bind another member firm or PwCIL in any way.