Abkommen zwischen (Staat A) und (Staat B) auf dem Gebiete der Steuern und Einkommen von Vermögen

OECD-Musterabkommen 2000 idF 2008

Einleitung

Präambel

Abkommen zwischen (Staat A) und (Staat B) auf dem Gebiete der Steuern vom Einkommen und vom Vermögen

OECD-Musterkommentar*

INTRODUCTION

1. International juridical double taxation can be generally defined as the imposition of comparable taxes in two (or more) States on the same taxpayer in respect of the same subject matter and for identical periods. Its harmful effects on the exchange of goods and services and movements of capital, technology and persons are so well known that it is scarcely necessary to stress the importance of removing the obstacles that double taxation presents to the development of economic relations between countries.

2. It has long been recognised among the member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development that it is desirable to clarify, standardise, and confirm the fiscal situation of taxpayers who are engaged in commercial, industrial, financial, or any other activities in other countries through the application by all countries of common solutions to identical cases of double taxation.

3. This is the main purpose of the OECD *Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital*, which provides a means of settling on a uniform basis the most common problems that arise in the field of international juridical double taxation. As recommended by the Council of the OECD,[1] member countries, when concluding or revising bilateral conventions, should conform to this Model Convention as interpreted by the Commentaries thereon and having regard to the reservations contained therein and their tax authorities should follow these Commentaries, as modified from time to time and subject to their observations thereon, when applying and interpreting the provisions of their bilateral tax conventions that are based on the Model Convention.

A. Historical background

4. Progress had already been made towards the elimination of double taxation through bilateral conventions or unilateral measures when the Council of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) adopted its first Recommendation concerning double taxation on 25 February 1955. At that time, 70 bilateral general conventions had been signed between countries that are now members of the OECD. This was to a large extent due to the work commenced in 1921 by the League of Nations. This work led to the drawing up in 1928 of the first

* OECD (2014), Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital: Condensed Version 2014, OECD Publishing.

1 See Annex.

model bilateral convention and, finally, to the Model Conventions of Mexico (1943) and London (1946), the principles of which were followed with certain variants in many of the bilateral conventions concluded or revised during the following decade. Neither of these Model Conventions, however, was fully and unanimously accepted. Moreover, in respect of several essential questions, they presented considerable dissimilarities and certain gaps.

5. The increasing economic interdependence and co-operation of the member countries of the OEEC in the post-war period showed increasingly clearly the importance of measures for preventing international double taxation. The need was recognised for extending the network of bilateral tax conventions to all member countries of the OEEC, and subsequently of the OECD, several of which had so far concluded only very few conventions and some none at all. At the same time, harmonization of these conventions in accordance with uniform principles, definitions, rules, and methods, and agreement on a common interpretation, became increasingly desirable.

6. It was against this new background that the Fiscal Committee set to work in 1956 to establish a draft convention that would effectively resolve the double taxation problems existing between OECD member countries and that would be acceptable to all member countries. From 1958 to 1961, the Fiscal Committee prepared four interim Reports, before submitting in 1963 its final Report entitled *Draft Double Taxation Convention on Income and Capital*.[1] The Council of the OECD adopted, on 30 July 1963, a Recommendation concerning the avoidance of double taxation and called upon the Governments of member countries, when concluding or revising bilateral conventions between them, to conform to that Draft Convention.

7. The Fiscal Committee of the OECD had envisaged, when presenting its Report in 1963, that the Draft Convention might be revised at a later stage following further study. Such a revision was also needed to take account of the experience gained by member countries in the negotiation and practical application of bilateral conventions, of changes in the tax systems of member countries, of the increase in international fiscal relations, and of the development of new sectors of business activity and the emergence of new complex business organisations at the international level. For all these reasons, the Fiscal Committee and, after 1971, its successor the Committee on Fiscal Affairs, undertook the revision of the 1963 Draft Convention and of the commentaries thereon. This resulted in the publication in 1977 of a new Model Convention and Commentaries.[2]

8. The factors that had led to the revision of the 1963 Draft Convention continued to exert their influence and, in many ways, the pressure to update and adapt the Model Convention to changing economic conditions progressively increased. New technologies were developed and, at the same time, there were fundamental changes taking place in the ways in which cross-borders transactions were undertaken. Methods of tax avoidance and evasion became more sophisticated. The globalisation and liberalisation of OECD economies also accelerated rapidly in the 1980s. Consequently, in the course of its regular work programme, the Committee on Fiscal Affairs and, in particular, its Working Party No. 1, continued af-

1 *Draft Double Taxation Convention on Income and Capital,* OECD, Paris, 1963.
2 *Model Double Taxation Convention on Income and on Capital,* OECD, Paris, 1977.

ter 1977 to examine various issues directly or indirectly related to the 1977 Model Convention. This work resulted in a number of reports, some of which recommended amendments to the Model Convention and its Commentaries.[1]

9. In 1991, recognizing that the revision of the Model Convention and the Commentaries had become an ongoing process, the Committee on Fiscal Affairs adopted the concept of an ambulatory Model Convention providing periodic and more timely updates and amendments without waiting for a complete revision. It was therefore decided to publish a revised updated version of the Model Convention which would take into account the work done since 1977 by integrating many of the recommendations made in the above-mentioned reports.

10. Because the influence of the Model Convention had extended far beyond the OECD member countries, the Committee also decided that the revision process should be opened up to benefit from the input of non-member countries, other international organisations and other interested parties. It was felt that such outside contributions would assist the Committee on Fiscal Affairs in its continuing task of updating the Model Convention to conform with the evolution of international tax rules and principles.

11. This led to the publication in 1992 of the Model Convention in a loose-leaf format. Unlike the 1963 Draft Convention and the 1977 Model Convention, the revised Model was not the culmination of a comprehensive revision, but rather the first step of an ongoing revision process intended to produce periodic updates and thereby ensure that the Model Convention continues to reflect accurately the views of member countries at any point in time.

11.1 Through one of these updates, produced in 1997, the positions of a number of non-member countries on the Model Convention were added in a second volume in recognition of the growing influence of the Model Convention outside the OECD countries (see below). At the same time, reprints of a number of previous reports of the Committee which had resulted in changes to the Model Convention were also added.

B. Influence of the OECD Model Convention

12. Since 1963, the OECD Model Convention has had wide repercussions on the negotiation, application, and interpretation of tax conventions.

13. First, OECD member countries have largely conformed to the Model Convention when concluding or revising bilateral conventions. The progress made towards eliminating double taxation between member countries can be measured by the increasing number of conventions concluded or revised since 1957 in accordance with the Recommendations of the Council of the OECD. But the importance of the Model Convention should be measured not only by the number of conventions concluded between member countries[2] but also by the fact that, in accordance with the Recommendations of the Council of the OECD, these conventions follow the pattern and, in most cases, the main provisions of the Model

1 A number of these reports were published and appear in Volume II of the loose-leaf version of the OECD Model Tax Convention.

2 See Appendix I in Volume II of the full version of the OECD Model Tax Convention for the list of these conventions.

Convention. The existence of the Model Convention has facilitated bilateral negotiations between OECD member countries and made possible a desirable harmonization between their bilateral conventions for the benefit of both taxpayers and national administrations.

14. Second, the impact of the Model Convention has extended far beyond the OECD area. It has been used as a basic document of reference in negotiations between member and non-member countries and even between non-member countries, as well as in the work of other worldwide or regional international organisations in the field of double taxation and related problems. Most notably, it has been used as the basis for the original drafting and the subsequent revision of the *United Nations Model Double Taxation Convention between Developed and Developing Countries*,[1] which reproduces a significant part of the provisions and Commentaries of the OECD Model Convention. It is in recognition of this growing influence of the Model Convention in non-member countries that it was agreed, in 1997, to add to the Model Convention the positions of a number of these countries on its provisions and Commentaries.

15. Third, the worldwide recognition of the provisions of the Model Convention and their incorporation into a majority of bilateral conventions have helped make the Commentaries on the provisions of the Model Convention a widely-accepted guide to the interpretation and application of the provisions of existing bilateral conventions. This has facilitated the interpretation and the enforcement of these bilateral conventions along common lines. As the network of tax conventions continues to expand, the importance of such a generally accepted guide becomes all the greater.

C. Presentation of the OECD Model Convention

Title of the Model Convention

16. In both the 1963 Draft Convention and the 1977 Model Convention, the title of the Model Convention included a reference to the elimination of double taxation. In recognition of the fact that the Model Convention does not deal exclusively with the elimination of double taxation but also addresses other issues, such as the prevention of tax evasion and non-discrimination, it was subsequently decided to use a shorter title which did not include this reference. This change has been made both on the cover page of this publication and in the Model Convention itself. However, it is understood that the practice of many member countries is still to include in the title a reference to either the elimination of double taxation or to both the elimination of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion.

Broad lines of the Model Convention

17. The Model Convention first describes its scope (Chapter I) and defines some terms (Chapter II). The main part is made up of Chapters III to V, which settle to what extent each of the two Contracting States may tax income and capital and how international juridical double taxation is to be eliminated. Then follow the Special Provisions (Chapter VI) and the Final Provisions (entry into force and termination, Chapter VII).

---

1 United Nations Model Double Taxation Convention between Developed and Developing Countries, United Nations Publications, New York, 1980, third edition 2001.

Scope and definitions

18. The Convention applies to all persons who are residents of one or both of the Contracting States (Article 1). It deals with taxes on income and on capital, which are described in a general way in Article 2. In Chapter II, some terms used in more than one Article of the Convention are defined. Other terms such as "dividends", "interest", "royalties" and "immovable property" are defined in the Articles that deal with these matters.

Taxation of income and capital

19. For the purpose of eliminating double taxation, the Convention establishes two categories of rules. First, Articles 6 to 21 determine, with regard to different classes of income, the respective rights to tax of the State of source or situs and of the State of residence, and Article 22 does the same with regard to capital. In the case of a number of items of income and capital, an exclusive right to tax is conferred on one of the Contracting States. The other Contracting State is thereby prevented from taxing those items and double taxation is avoided. As a rule, this exclusive right to tax is conferred on the State of residence. In the case of other items of income and capital, the right to tax is not an exclusive one. As regards two classes of income (dividends and interest), although both States are given the right to tax, the amount of tax that may be imposed in the State of source is limited. Second, insofar as these provisions confer on the State of source or situs a full or limited right to tax, the State of residence must allow relief so as to avoid double taxation; this is the purpose of Articles 23 A and 23 B. The Convention leaves it to the Contracting States to choose between two methods of relief, *i.e.* the exemption method and the credit method.

20. Income and capital may be classified into three classes, depending on the treatment applicable to each class in the State of source or situs:

— income and capital that may be taxed without any limitation in the State of source or situs,

— income that may be subjected to limited taxation in the State of source, and

— income and capital that may not be taxed in the State of source or situs.

21. The following are the classes of income and capital that may be taxed without any limitation in the State of source or situs:

— income from immovable property situated in that State (including income from agriculture or forestry), gains from the alienation of such property and capital representing it (Article 6 and paragraph 1 of Articles 13 and 22) as well as gains from the alienation of shares deriving more than 50 per cent of their value from such property (paragraph 4 of Article 13);

— profits of a permanent establishment situated in that State, gains from the alienation of such a permanent establishment, and capital representing movable property forming part of the business property of such a permanent establishment (Article 7 and paragraph 2 of Articles 13 and 22); an exception is made, however, if the permanent establishment is maintained for the purposes of international shipping, inland waterways transport, and international air transport (see paragraph 23 below);

— income from the activities of entertainers and sportspersons exercised in that State, irrespective of whether such income accrues to the artiste or sportsman himself or to another person (Article 17);

— directors' fees paid by a company that is a resident of that State (Article 16);

— remuneration in respect of an employment in the private sector, exercised in that State, unless the employee is present therein for a period not exceeding 183 days in any twelve month period commencing or ending in the fiscal year concerned and certain conditions are met; and remuneration in respect of an employment exercised aboard a ship or aircraft operated internationally or aboard a boat, if the place of effective management of the enterprise is situated in that State (Article 15);

— subject to certain conditions, remuneration and pensions paid in respect of government service (Article 19).

22. The following are the classes of income that may be subjected to limited taxation in the State of source:

— dividends: provided the holding in respect of which the dividends are paid is not effectively connected with a permanent establishment in the State of source, that State must limit its tax to 5 per cent of the gross amount of the dividends, where the beneficial owner is a company that holds directly at least 25 per cent of the capital of the company paying the dividends, and to 15 per cent of their gross amount in other cases (Article 10);

— interest: subject to the same proviso as in the case of dividends, the State of source must limit its tax to 10 per cent of the gross amount of the interest, except for any interest in excess of a normal amount (Article 11).

23. Other items of income or capital may not be taxed in the State of source or situs; as a rule they are taxable only in the State of residence of the taxpayer. This applies, for example, to royalties (Article 12), gains from the alienation of shares or securities (paragraph 5 of Article 13, subject to the exception of paragraph 4 of Article 13), private sector pensions (Article 18), payments received by a student for the purposes of his education or training (Article 20), and capital represented by shares or securities (paragraph 4 of Article 22). Profits from the operation of ships or aircraft in international traffic or of boats engaged in inland waterways transport, gains from the alienation of such ships, boats, or aircraft, and capital represented by them, are taxable only in the State in which the place of effective management of the enterprise is situated (Article 8 and paragraph 3 of Articles 13 and 22). Business profits that are not attributable to a permanent establishment in the State of source are taxable only in the State of residence (paragraph 1 of Article 7).

24. Where a resident of a Contracting State receives income from sources in the other Contracting State, or owns capital situated therein, that in accordance with the Convention is taxable only in the State of residence, no problem of double taxation arises, since the State of source or situs must refrain from taxing that income or capital.

25. Where, on the contrary, income or capital may, in accordance with the Convention, be taxed with or without limitation in the State of source or situs, the State of residence has the obligation to eliminate double taxation. This can be accomplished by one of the following two methods:

— exemption method: income or capital that is taxable in the State of source or situs is exempted in the State of residence, but it may be taken into account in determining the rate of tax applicable to the taxpayer's remaining income or capital;

— credit method: income or capital that is taxable in the State of source or situs is subject to tax in the State of residence, but the tax levied in the State of source or situs is credited against the tax levied by the State of residence on such income or capital.

25.1 It follows from the preceding explanations that, throughout the Convention, the words "may be taxed in" a Contracting State mean that that State is granted the right to tax the income to which the relevant provision applies and that these words do not affect the right to tax of the other Contracting State, except through the application of Article 23 A or 23 B when that other State is the State of residence.

Special provisions

26. There are a number of special provisions in the Convention. These provisions concern:

— the elimination of tax discrimination in various circumstances (Article 24);
— the establishment of a mutual agreement procedure for eliminating double taxation and resolving conflicts of interpretation of the Convention (Article 25);
— the exchange of information between the tax authorities of the Contracting States (Article 26);
— the assistance by Contracting States in the collection of each other's taxes (Article 27);
— the tax treatment of members of diplomatic missions and consular posts in accordance with international law (Article 28);
— the territorial extension of the Convention (Article 29).

General remarks on the Model Convention

27. The Model Convention seeks, wherever possible, to specify for each situation a single rule. On certain points, however, it was thought necessary to leave in the Convention a certain degree of flexibility, compatible with the efficient implementation of the Model Convention. Member countries therefore enjoy a certain latitude, for example, with regard to fixing the rate of tax at source on dividends and interest and the choice of method for eliminating double taxation. Moreover, for some cases, alternative or additional provisions are mentioned in the Commentaries.

Commentaries on the Articles

28. For each Article in the Convention, there is a detailed Commentary that is intended to illustrate or interpret its provisions.

29. As the Commentaries have been drafted and agreed upon by the experts appointed to the Committee on Fiscal Affairs by the Governments of member countries, they are of special importance in the development of international fiscal law. Although the Commentaries are not designed to be annexed in any manner to the conventions signed by member countries, which unlike the Model are legally binding international instruments, they can nevertheless be of great assistance in the application and interpretation of the conventions and, in particular, in the settlement of any disputes.

29.1 The tax administrations of member countries routinely consult the Commentaries in their interpretation of bilateral tax treaties. The Commentaries are

useful both in deciding day-to-day questions of detail and in resolving larger issues involving the policies and purposes behind various provisions. Tax officials give great weight to the guidance contained in the Commentaries.

29.2 Similarly, taxpayers make extensive use of the Commentaries in conducting their businesses and planning their business transactions and investments. The Commentaries are of particular importance in countries that do not have a procedure for obtaining an advance ruling on tax matters from the tax administration as the Commentaries may be the only available source of interpretation in that case.

29.3 Bilateral tax treaties are receiving more and more judicial attention as well. The courts are increasingly using the Commentaries in reaching their decisions. Information collected by the Committee on Fiscal Affairs shows that the Commentaries have been cited in the published decisions of the courts of the great majority of member countries. In many decisions, the Commentaries have been extensively quoted and analysed, and have frequently played a key role in the judge's deliberations. The Committee expects this trend to continue as the worldwide network of tax treaties continues to grow and as the Commentaries gain even more widespread acceptance as an important interpretative reference.

30. Observations on the Commentaries have sometimes been inserted at the request of member countries that are unable to concur in the interpretation given in the Commentary on the Article concerned. These observations thus do not express any disagreement with the text of the Convention, but usefully indicate the way in which those countries will apply the provisions of the Article in question. Since the observations are related to the interpretations of the Articles given in the Commentaries, no observation is needed to indicate a country's wish to modify the wording of an alternative or additional provision that the Commentaries allow countries to include in their bilateral conventions.

Reservations of certain member countries on some provisions of the Convention

31. Although all member countries are in agreement with the aims and the main provisions of the Model Convention, nearly all have entered reservations on some provisions, which are recorded in the Commentaries on the Articles concerned. There has been no need for countries to make reservations indicating their intent to use the alternative or additional provisions that the Commentaries allow countries to include in their bilateral conventions or to modify the wording of a provision of the Model to confirm or incorporate an interpretation of that provision put forward in the Commentary. It is understood that insofar as a member country has entered reservations, the other member countries, in negotiating bilateral conventions with the former, will retain their freedom of action in accordance with the principle of reciprocity.

32. The Committee on Fiscal Affairs considers that these reservations should be viewed against the background of the very wide areas of agreement that has been achieved in drafting this Convention.

Relation with previous versions

33. When drafting the 1977 Model Convention, the Committee on Fiscal Affairs examined the problems of conflicts of interpretation that might arise as a result of changes in the Articles and Commentaries of the 1963 Draft Convention. At that time, the Committee considered that existing conventions should, as far as possible, be

interpreted in the spirit of the revised Commentaries, even though the provisions of these conventions did not yet include the more precise wording of the 1977 Model Convention. It was also indicated that member countries wishing to clarify their positions in this respect could do so by means of an exchange of letters between competent authorities in accordance with the mutual agreement procedure and that, even in the absence of such an exchange of letters, these authorities could use mutual agreement procedures to confirm this interpretation in particular cases.

34. The Committee believes that the changes to the Articles of the Model Convention and the Commentaries that have been made since 1977 should be similarly interpreted.

35. Needless to say, amendments to the Articles of the Model Convention and changes to the Commentaries that are a direct result of these amendments are not relevant to the interpretation or application of previously concluded conventions where the provisions of those conventions are different in substance from the amended Articles. However, other changes or additions to the Commentaries are normally applicable to the interpretation and application of conventions concluded before their adoption, because they reflect the consensus of the OECD member countries as to the proper interpretation of existing provisions and their application to specific situations.

36. Whilst the Committee considers that changes to the Commentaries should be relevant in interpreting and applying conventions concluded before the adoption of these changes, it disagrees with any form of *a contrario* interpretation that would necessarily infer from a change to an Article of the Model Convention or to the Commentaries that the previous wording resulted in consequences different from those of the modified wording. Many amendments are intended to simply clarify, not change, the meaning of the Articles or the Commentaries, and such *a contrario* interpretations would clearly be wrong in those cases.

36.1 Tax authorities in member countries follow the general principles enunciated in the preceding four paragraphs. Accordingly, the Committee on Fiscal Affairs considers that taxpayers may also find it useful to consult later versions of the Commentaries in interpreting earlier treaties.

Multilateral Convention

37. When preparing the 1963 Draft Convention and the 1977 Model Convention, the Committee on Fiscal Affairs considered whether the conclusion of a multilateral tax convention would be feasible and came to the conclusion that this would meet with great difficulties. It recognised, however, that it might be possible for certain groups of member countries to study the possibility of concluding such a convention among themselves on the basis of the Model Convention, subject to certain adaptations they might consider necessary to suit their particular purposes.

38. The Nordic Convention on Income and Capital entered into by Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, which was concluded in 1983 and replaced in 1987, 1989 and 1996,[1] provides a practical example of such a multilateral convention between a group of member countries and follows closely the provisions of the Model Convention.

1 The Faroe Islands is also a signatory of the 1989 and 1996 Conventions.

39. Also relevant is the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters, which was drawn up within the Council of Europe on the basis of a first draft prepared by the Committee on Fiscal Affairs. This Convention entered into force on 1 April 1995.

40. Despite these two conventions, there are no reasons to believe that the conclusion of a multilateral tax convention involving all member countries could now be considered practicable. The Committee therefore considers that bilateral conventions are still a more appropriate way to ensure the elimination of double taxation at the international level.

Tax avoidance and evasion; improper use of conventions

41. The Committee on Fiscal Affairs continues to examine both the improper use of tax conventions and international tax evasion. The problem is referred to in the Commentaries on several Articles. In particular, Article 26, as clarified in the Commentary, enables States to exchange information to combat these abuses.

Allgemeine Literatur

Aigner, D., Kapitalanlagefonds im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2001); *Aigner, D./Aigner, H.-J./Fellner/Fraberger/Heinrich/Konezny/Loukota, H./Sutter/Zehetner/Züger*, Erbschaftssteuern und Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2002); *Aigner, D./Kofler/Tumpel*, Zuzug und Wegzug von Kapitalgesellschaften im Steuerrecht (2004); *Aigner, H.-J.*, Hinzurechnungsbesteuerung und DBA-Recht (2004); *Aigner, H.-J./Loukota, W.* (Hrsg), Source Versus Residence in International Tax Law (2005); *Aigner, H.-J./Züger* (Hrsg), Permanent Establishments in International Tax Law (2003); *Bauer et al* (Hrsg), Unilaterale Maßnahmen zur Vermeidung der Doppelbesteuerung (2004); *Bendlinger*, Auslandsentsendungen in der Praxis des internationalen Steuer- und Sozialversicherungsrechts[2] (2011); *Bendlinger*, Die Betriebsstätte in der Praxis des internationalen Steuerrechts[2] (2012); *Bendlinger*, Steueroasen und Offshore-Strukturen (2013); *Bendlinger/Kanduth-Kristen/Kofler/Rosenberger*, Internationales Steuerrecht (2015); *Bendlinger/Walch*, Auslandsentsendung in der Praxis des internationalen Steuer- und Sozialversicherungsrechts (2006); *Bernegger/Rosar/Rosenberger* (Hrsg), Handbuch Verrechnungspreise[2] (2012); *Brandstetter*, „Taxes Covered": A Study of Article 2 of the OECD Model Tax Conventions (2011); *Brugger/Plansky* (Hrsg), Permanent Establishments in International and EU Tax Law (2011); *Burgstaller*, Mitarbeiter-Stock-Options im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2006); *Burgstaller/Haslinger* (Hrsg), Conflicts of Qualification in Tax Treaty Law (2007); *Daurer*, Die japanischen Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen im Lichte des OECD- und UN-Musterabkommens (2008); *Djanani*, Internationales Steuerrecht[2] (1998); *Dommes*, Pensionen im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2012); *Dziurdź*, Kurzfristige Arbeitnehmerüberlassung im Internationalen Steuerrecht (2013); *Dziurdź/Marchgraber* (Hrsg), Non-Discrimination in European Tax Treaty Law (2015); *Ecker/Ressler* (Hrsg), History of Tax Treaties (2011); *Ehrke-Rabel/Freudhofmeier/Linzner-Strasser/Toifl/Vrignaud*, Künstler und Sportler im nationalen und internationalen Steuerrecht[3] (2011); *Essers/Lalithkumar/Lang/Wassermeyer/West/Kemmeren*, Abusive Application of International Tax Agreements (2001); *Gassner/Gröhs/Lang* (Hrsg), Zukunftsaufgaben der Wirtschaftsprüfung, FS

Deloitte & Touche (1997); *Gassner/Hemetsberger-Koller/Lang/Sasseville/Vogel* (Hrsg), Die Zukunft des Internationalen Steuerrechts (1999); *Gassner/Lang* (Hrsg), Besteuerung und Bilanzierung international tätiger Unternehmen, FS 30 Jahre Steuerrecht an der Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (1998); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Aktuelle Entwicklungen im Internationalen Steuerrecht – Das neue Musterabkommen der OECD (1994); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Das neue Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen Österreich-USA (1997); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Das neue Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen Österreich-Deutschland (1999); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Der Entwurf eines österreichischen Außensteuergesetzes (2001); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Die Betriebsstätte im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (1998); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Die Methoden zur Vermeidung der Doppelbesteuerung (1995); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen und EU-Recht (1996); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Double Taxation Treaties and EC Law (1997); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Österreich – Der steuerrechtliche EU-Nachbar (1996); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Personengesellschaften im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2000); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Arbeitnehmer im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2003); *Gassner/Lang/Lechner/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Die beschränkte Steuerpflicht im Einkommen- und Körperschaftsteuerrecht (2004); *Gassner/Lang/Schuch./Staringer* (Hrsg), Die Verteilung der Besteuerungsrechte zwischen Ansässigkeits- und Quellenstaat im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2005); *Gassner/Lechner* (Hrsg), Österreichisches Steuerrecht und europäische Integration (1992); *Gröhs*, Die Gewinnbesteuerung der Personengesellschaften im internationalen Steuerrecht Österreichs (1986); *Gröhs/Jirousek/Lang/Loukota, H.* (Hrsg), Kurzkommentar zum neuen Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen Österreich – USA (1997); *Günther/Tüchler* (Hrsg), Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes (2013); *Hammer*, Ausländische Stiftungen und vergleichbare Strukturen im österreichischen Steuerrecht (2012); *Haslehner*, Das Betriebsstättendiskriminierungsverbot im Internationalen Steuerrecht (2009); *Heidenbauer/Stürzlinger* (Hrsg), The EU's External Dimension in Direct Tax Matters (2010); *Hirschler*, Rechtsformplanung im Konzern (2000); *Hofbauer*, Das Prinzip der Meistbegünstigung im grenzüberschreitenden Ertragsteuerrecht (2005); *Hofstätter/Plansky* (Hrsg), Dual Residence in Tax Treaty Law and EC Law (2009); *Hohenwarter*, Verlustverwertung im Konzern (2010); *Hohenwarter/Metzler* (Hrsg), Taxation of Employment Income in International Tax Law (2009); *Huemer*, Die unbeschränkte Steuerpflicht natürlicher Personen (1996); *IFA* (Hrsg), Non-Discrimination Rules in International Taxation, CDFI 78b (1993); *IFA* (Hrsg), Source and residence: new configuration of their principles, CDFI 90a (2005); *IFA* (Hrsg), Tax Treatment of Corporate Losses, CDFI 84a (1998); *IFA* (Hrsg), Trends in company/shareholder taxation: single or double taxation? CDFI 88a (2003); *Kalteis*, Die Besteuerung international tätiger Künstler und Künstlerbetriebe (1998); *Kemmeren/Smit/Essers/De Broe/Vanistendael/Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer/Storck* (Hrsg), Tax Treaty Case Law around the Globe 2012 (2013); *Kofler*, Die steuerliche Abschirmwirkung ausländischer Finanzierungsgesellschaften (2002); *Kofler*, Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen und Europäisches Gemeinschaftsrecht (2007); *Kofler*, Mutter-Tochter-RL (2011); *Krüglstein*, Der Künstlerdurchgriff im nationalen und internationalen Steuerrecht

(2009); *Lahodny-Karner*, Die neuen Verrechnungspreisrichtlinien der OECD (1996); *Lahodny-Karner*, Konzernverrechnungspreise im nationalen und internationalen Steuerrecht (1998); *Lang* (Hrsg), Avoidance of Double Non-Taxation (2003); *Lang* (Hrsg), Double Taxation Conventions and Social Security Conventions (2006); *Lang* (Hrsg), Recent Tax Treaty Development around the Globe (2009); *Lang* (Hrsg), Tax Treaty Interpretation (2001); *Lang*, Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen und innerstaatliches Recht (1992); *Lang*, Einführung in das Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen[2] (2002); *Lang*, Hybride Finanzierungen im internationalen Steuerrecht (1991); *Lang*, Introduction to the Law of Double Taxation Conventions[2] (2013); *Lang*, Neue Entwicklungen im Internationalen Steuerrecht. Wohin geht das österreichische Internationale Steuerrecht, 13. ÖJT Band III/2 (1999) 63; *Lang*, Recent Tax Treaty Developments Around the Globe (2009); *Lang*, The Application of the OECD Model Tax Convention to Partnerships – A Critical Analysis of the Report prepared by the OECD Committee on Fiscal Affairs (2000); *Lang/Braccioni/Garbarino/Schönstein*, European Union: Tax Treaties of the Central and Eastern European Countries (2008); *Lang/Daurer*, Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen Österreich-Slowenien (2015); *Lang/Jirousek* (Hrsg), Praxis des Internationalen Steuerrechts, FS Loukota (2005); *Lang/Loukota, H./Lüthi* (Hrsg), Die Weiterentwicklung des OECD-Musterabkommens (1996); *Lang/Loukota, H./Rädler/Schuch/Toifl/Urtz/Wassermeyer/Züger* (Hrsg), Multilateral Tax Treaties (1997); *Lang/Mössner/Waldburger* (Hrsg), Die Auslegung von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen in der Rechtsprechung der Höchstgerichte Deutschlands, der Schweiz und Österreichs (1998); *Lang/Owens/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer/Storck/Essers/Kemmeren/Smit* (Hrsg), Tax Treaty Case Law Around the Globe 2013 (2013); *Lang/Pistone/Rust/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) (2016); *Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Einkünftezurechnung in Internationalen Steuerecht (2012); *Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Source versus Residence. Problems Arising from the Allocation of Taxing Rights in Tax Treaty Law and Possible Alternatives (2008); *Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), The Impact of the OECD and UN Model Convention on Bilateral Tax Treaties (2012); *Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer/Storck* (Hrsg), Beneficial Ownership: Recent Trends (2013); *Lang/Pistone/Rust/Schuch/Staringer/Storck* (Hrsg), The OECD-Model-Convention and its Update 2014 (2015); *Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer/Storck* (Hrsg), Dependent Agents as Permanent Establishments (2014); *Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer/Storck/De Broe/Essers/Kemmeren/Vanistendael* (Hrsg), Tax Treaty Case Law Around the Globe 2011 (2011); *Lang/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer/Storck/Zagler* (Hrsg), Tax Treaties: Building Bridges between Law and Economics (2010); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Die Ansässigkeit im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2007); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Die Diskriminierungsverbote im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2006); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Die Grenzen der Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten im Internationalen Steuerrecht (2009); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Die österreichische DBA-Politik (2013); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Einkünftezurechnung im Internationalen Steuerrecht (2012); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Internationale Amtshilfe in Steuersachen (2011); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Quellensteuern (2010); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Soft Law in der Praxis (2005); *Lang/Schuch/Staringer* (Hrsg), Tax Treaty Law and

EC Law (2007); *Lang/Simader*, Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen Österreich-Kroatien (2013); *Lang/Rust/Owens/Pistone/Schuch/Staringer/Storck/Essers/Kemmeren/Smit* (Hrsg), Tax Treaty Case Law Around the Globe 2015 (2016); *Lechner*, Gewinnaufteilung zwischen in- und ausländischen Betriebsstätten (1982); *Lohr*, Der internationale Auskunftsverkehr im Steuerverfahren (1993); *Loukota, H.*, Internationale Steuerfälle (1989); *Loukota, H.*, Österreichs Außensteuerrecht (2002); *Loukota, H.*, Wohin geht das österreichische internationale Steuerrecht? 13. ÖJT III/1 (1997); *Loukota, W.*, EG-Grundfreiheiten und beschränkte Steuerpflicht (2006); *Loukota, W./Stefaner* (Hrsg), Taxation of Artistes and Sportsmen in International Tax Law (2007); *Macho/Steiner*, Case Studies Verrechnungspreise kompakt (2011); Macho/Steiner/Spensberger, Verrechnungspreise kompakt[2] (2011); *Metzler/Hohenwarter* (Hrsg), Taxation of Employment Income in International Tax Law (2009); *Nowotny*, Betriebsstättengewinnermittlung – Die Zuordnung von Wirtschaftsgütern im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2004); *Pamperl*, The scope of Article 16 and its role in the OECD Model Convention (Diss WU, 2014); *Philipp/Loukota, H./Jirousek*, Internationales Steuerrecht (Loseblatt); *Phillip*, Befreiungssystem mit Progressionsvorbehalt und Anrechnungsverfahren (1971); *Plansky*, Die Gewinnzurechnung zu Betriebsstätten im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2010); *Schaumburg*, Internationales Steuerrecht[3] (2011); *Schilcher*, Grenzen der Mitwirkungspflichten im Lichte des Gemeinschaftsrechts (2010); *Schilcher*, Subject-to-Tax-Klauseln in der österreichischen Abkommenspraxis (2004); *Schilcher/Weninger* (Hrsg), Fundamental Issues and Practical Problems in Tax Treaty Interpretation (2008); *Schindler/Baumann/Twardosz* (Hrsg), Double Tax Treaties in CEE/SEE (2011); *Schuch*, Die Zeit im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2002); *Schuch*, Verluste im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (1998); *Shubshizky* (Hrsg), Praxisleitfaden zum internationalen Personaleinsatz (2003); *Simader/Titz* (Hrsg), Limits to Tax Planning (2013); *Staringer*, Besteuerung doppelt ansässiger Kapitalgesellschaften (1999); *Stefaner/Züger* (Hrsg), Tax Treaty Policy and Development (2005); *Steiner, R.*, Dienstleistungserbringung und Mitarbeiterentsendung nach Deutschland (2010); *Strasser*, Die Auslegung von Quellenstaatsregelungen in Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2005); *Sutter/Wimpissinger* (Hrsg), Freistellungs- und Anrechnungsmethode in den Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2002); *Sutter/Zehetner* (Hrsg), Triangular Tax Cases (2004); *Thömmes/Lang/Schuch* (Hrsg), Investitions- und Steuerstandort Österreich (2005); *Toifl*, Personengesellschaften im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2003); *Toifl*, Wegzugsbesteuerung (1996); *Tumpel*, Harmonisierung der direkten Unternehmensbesteuerung in der EU (1994); *Urtz/Züger* (Hrsg), Personengesellschaften im internationalen Steuerrecht (2001); *Wassermeyer/Lang/Schuch* (Hrsg), Doppelbesteuerung. OECD-Musterabkommen, DBA Österreich-Deutschland, Kommentar[2] (2010); *Zehetner*, Kapitalertragsteuer im Internationalen Steuerrecht (2001); *Züger*, Schiedsverfahren für Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2001).

Übersicht

I. Funktion von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen
A. Grundlagen und Zielsetzung 1–8
B. Vertragsmuster und österreichische Abkommenspolitik...... 10–20
C. Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen im innerstaatlichen Recht

1. Abschluss und innerstaatliche Wirkung 30–32
2. Verteilung der Steuergüter und Schrankenwirkung 33–36
3. Verhältnis zum innerstaatlichen Recht 37–44
D. Aufbau und Systematik von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen 50–56
II. Auslegung von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen
A. Völkerrechtliche Auslegungsgrundsätze 60–67
B. Bedeutung des OECD-MA und des Kommentars 70–73
C. Bedeutung des innerstaatlichen Rechts 80–84
D. Verständigungsverfahren und Verwaltungspraxis 90–93
E. Exkurs: Qualifikations- und Zurechnungskonflikte
1. Qualifikationskonflikte 100–104
2. Zurechnungskonflikte... 105–112
III. Verhältnis zu anderen Rechtskreisen
A. Verhältnis zum nationalen Verfassungsrecht......................... 120–122
B. Verhältnis zum Unionsrecht.. 130–133

I. Funktion von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen

A. Grundlagen und Zielsetzung

Literatur

Achatz, Unterkapitalisierung und wirtschaftliche Doppelbesteuerung im Lichte des DBA- und Europarechts, in *Lang/Jirousek* (Hrsg), Praxis des Internationalen Steuerrechts, FS Loukota (2005) 1; *Bendlinger*, Internationale Steuerfälle systematisch gelöst und umgesetzt – Erfahrungen aus dem In- und Ausland, in *Urnik/Fritz-Schmied/Kanduth-Kristen* (Hrsg), Steuerwissenschaften und betriebliches Rechnungswesen, FS Kofler (2009) 29; *Gassner/Lang*, Double Non-Taxation of a Belgian Tax Law Professor Lecturing in Vienna? in *Vanistendael* (Hrsg), Liber amicorum honouring Luc Hinnekens (2002) 219; *Göschl/Kovar/Wahrlich*, Dreiecksverhältnisse im Recht der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen, in *Lang/Jirousek* (Hrsg), Praxis des Internationalen Steuerrechts, FS Loukota (2005) 111; *Lang*, 2008 OECD-Model: Conflicts of Qualification and Double Non-Taxation, BIT 2009, 204; *Lang*, Die Vermeidung der Doppelbesteuerung und der doppelten Nichtbesteuerung als DBA-Auslegungsmaxime? IStR 2002, 609; *Lang*, General Report, in IFA (Hrsg), Double Non Taxation, CDFI 89a (2004) 73; *Lang*, Rechtsquellen und Prinzipien des Internationalen Steuerrechts, in *Achatz* (Hrsg), Internationales Steuerrecht, DStJG 36 (2013) 7; *Lang*, Vermeidung der Doppelbesteuerung und der doppelten Nichtbesteuerung als Auslegungsmaxime für Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen? in *Haarmann* (Hrsg), Auslegung und Anwendung von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (2004) 83; *Loukota, H.*, Einführung in die Systematik der Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen, FJ 1978, 87, 106 und 139; *Loukota, H.*, Über das Verhältnis zwischen internationalem und nationalem Steuerrecht, FJ 1976, 105; *Loukota, H.*, Über die Durchführung von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen, FJ 1977, 54; *Staringer*, Triangular Cases, in *Gassner/Lang/Lechner* (Hrsg), Aktuelle Entwicklungen im Interna-

tionalen Steuerrecht (1994) 67; *Valta*, Das Internationale Steuerrecht zwischen Effizienz, Gerechtigkeit und Entwicklungshilfe (2014); *Vogel*, Zur Dogmatik der Verteilungsnormen in Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen, in *Lang/Jirousek* (Hrsg), Praxis des Internationalen Steuerrechts, FS Loukota (2005) 621; *Wassermeyer*, Dreiecksverhältnisse im Abkommensrecht, SWI 2000, 520; *Winner*, Die Auswirkungen von DBA auf internationale Direktinvestitionen, SWI 2005, 361.

1 Die drohende **Doppelbesteuerung ist ein Charakteristikum der grenzüberschreitenden wirtschaftlichen Betätigung** und kann durch eine doppelte Besteuerung von Einnahmen, aber auch durch Nichtberücksichtigung von Ausgaben entstehen. Es ist dabei geradezu ein typisches Ergebnis der grenzüberschreitenden Aktivität, dass der Steuerpflichtige dem Steuerzugriff mindestens zweier Staaten und damit einer drohenden Doppelbesteuerung ausgesetzt ist. Dies ist schon deshalb der Fall, weil idR der Ansässigkeitsstaat seine Angehörigen als „unbeschränkt Steuerpflichtige" mit ihrem **Welteinkommen** besteuert **(Universalitäts- bzw Welteinkommensprinzip)**, der Quellenstaat aber auf seinem Gebiet durchgeführte Aktivitäten eines Steuerausländers iRd „beschränkten Steuerpflicht" ebenfalls für besteuerungswürdig erachtet **(Territorialitäts- bzw Quellenprinzip)**. Von einer **echten bzw juristischen Doppelbesteuerung** spricht man dabei, wenn vergleichbare Steuern in zwei oder mehreren Staaten von demselben Steuerpflichtigen für denselben Zeitraum und für denselben Besteuerungsgegenstand erhoben werden (Einl Z 1 und Art 23 Z 1 OECD-MK; siehe auch VwGH 29.1.1998, 95/15/0043, ÖStZB 1998, 609; VwGH 28.9.2004, 2000/14/0172, ÖStZB 2005/219, 297). Im Rahmen juristischer Doppelbesteuerung wird typischerweise weiters zwischen **effektiver und virtueller Doppelbesteuerung** unterschieden: Effektive Doppelbesteuerung liegt vor, wenn ein und dasselbe Steuersubjekt tatsächlich von mehreren internationalen Abgabenhoheiten in Anspruch genommen wird; virtuelle Doppelbesteuerung liegt vor, wenn eine solche Inanspruchnahme möglich ist, ohne dass sie tatsächlich erfolgt. Das **allgemeine Völkerrecht** setzt der materiellen Besteuerung bei ausreichender Inlandsanknüpfung keine relevanten Schranken; es enthält **kein generelles Verbot der juristischen Doppelbesteuerung**.

2 So lassen sich dem allgemeinen Völkerrecht **nur vage Begrenzungen der materiellen Besteuerungshoheit** entnehmen: Das Völkerrecht erfordert zunächst für die Auferlegung von Abgaben gegen einen im Ausland lebenden Ausländer, die an einen Sachverhalt anknüpfen, der ganz oder teilweise im Ausland verwirklicht worden ist, hinreichend sachgerechte Anknüpfungsmomente für die Abgabenerhebung in dem Staat, der die Abgaben erhebt (BVerfG 22.3.1983, 2 BvR 457/78, BVerfGE 63, 343). Solcherart ist die Besteuerung ausländischer Wirtschaftsvorgänge und Vermögenswerte nach geltendem Völkerrecht jedenfalls dann zulässig, wenn die besteuerte Person zu dem besteuernden Staat eine **hinreichend enge Beziehung hat**, wie etwa durch ihren Wohnsitz, ihren gewöhnlichen Aufenthalt, ihre Staatsangehörigkeit, die Belegenheit von Vermögenswerten, die Verwirklichung eines

Abgabentatbestandes im Inland oder die Herbeiführung eines abgabenrechtlich erheblichen Erfolges im Inland (BVerfG 22.3.1983, 2 BvR 457/78, BVerfGE 63, 343; *Lehner* in *V/L*[6] Grundl Rz 11). Umgekehrt gibt es auch **kein völkerrechtliches „Quellenprinzip“ oder „materielles Territorialprinzip“**, das es verbieten würde, Rechtsfolgen des innerstaatlichen Rechts auch an von Steuerinländern verwirklichte ausländische Sachverhalte, zB durch Besteuerung ausländischer Einkünfte, anzuknüpfen (*Lehner* in *V/L*[6] Grundl Rz 11 f). Staaten dürfen nach der Judikatur des VwGH lediglich Sachverhalte, zu denen sie **keinerlei persönliche oder sachliche Beziehung** aufweisen, nach den allgemeinen Regeln des Völkerrechts nicht besteuern (VwGH 3.6.1993, 92/16/0174, ÖStZB 1994, 263; s a VwGH 24.3.1994, 94/16/0026, ÖStZB 1995, 119). Das allgemeine Völkerrecht enthält insb auch kein generelles Verbot der juristischen Doppelbesteuerung (BFH 14.2.1975, VI R 210/72, BFHE 115, 319, BStBl 1975 II 497). Es setzt dem Steuerrecht aber durchaus **Grenzen für die hoheitliche Durchsetzung von Besteuerungsansprüchen** im Ausland. So hat bereits die grundlegende *Lotus*-Entscheidung des Internationalen Gerichtshofs (IGH) klargestellt, dass ein Staat nach allgemeinem Völkerrecht grundsätzlich nicht verpflichtet ist, in seinem Hoheitsbereich die Vornahme oder Vollstreckung von Hoheitsakten eines anderen Staates durch dessen Organe zu dulden oder dafür – im Wege der Rechtshilfe – seine Hand zu reichen (StIGH 7.9.1927, *The Case of the S. S. „Lotus“*, PCIJ Series A, No 10 (1927) 18 f; s nachfolgend zB die Entscheidung des IGH im *Korfu-Kanal*-Fall, ICJ Reports 1949, 35; weiters BVerfG 22.3.1983, 2 BvR 457/78, BVerfGE 63, 343). Allerdings verbietet das Völkerrecht eine solche Duldung oder Mithilfe auch nicht; in der Tat bestehen eine Reihe internationaler Instrumente zur grenzüberschreitenden Amts- und Vollstreckungshilfe (zB Art 26, 27).

3 Die **Vermeidung einer solchen juristischen Doppelbesteuerung** ist typischer Gegenstand von **Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen (DBA)**. Der VfGH umschreibt daher die Bedeutung und Funktionsweise von Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen folgendermaßen (VfGH 23.6.2014, SV 2/2013-14, VfSlg 19.889/2014):

> „Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen sind – idR bilaterale – völkerrechtliche Verträge, in denen die Vertragspartner innerhalb des persönlichen und des sachlichen Anwendungsbereichs des Abkommens die Verteilung der Besteuerungsrechte zwischen den Vertragstaaten mit dem Ziel der Vermeidung der Doppelbesteuerung regeln. Zu den zentralen Bestimmungen jedes Doppelbesteuerungsabkommens zählen Regelungen, welche die Zuteilung der Besteuerungsrechte festlegen (Verteilungsnormen). Diese bestimmen für die jeweiligen im Abkommen angeführten Einkünfte, ob der jeweilige Vertragstaat völkerrechtlich berechtigt ist, einen innerstaatlich bestehenden Besteuerungsanspruch durchzusetzen, oder ob er nach diesem Vertrag verpflichtet ist, auf den innerstaatlich bestehenden Anspruch zu verzichten. [...] Für jene Fälle, in denen ein Doppelbesteuerungsabkommen in einer Verteilungsnorm dem Quellenstaat ein Besteuerungsrecht einräumt, bestimmen die Methodenartikel eines Doppelbesteuerungsabkommens, nach welcher Methode die