# How MAP may contribute to tax certainty a from a corporate tax perspective a

Kan Sato
Deputy Head, Corporate Tax Team
Mitsubishi Corporation

#### Introduction

- ✓ Most cases considered under the MAP involve doubletaxation, with the majority of cases relating to TP adjustments.
- ✓ However, MAP assistance is required for a broader scope including non-transfer pricing cases.
- ✓ Given uncertainties around the interpretation of some of the OECD guidelines, tax disputes are expected to increase, calling for more effective and efficient resolution procedures.
- ✓ There are some weakness in how the current resolution process has been defined which needs to be revisited.

#### Limitations of the current mechanism

- ✓ Action Plan 14 has not made alterations to one of the major problems of MAP. 'Endeavour without success' is not enough.
- ✓ The negotiation process between the competent authorities under MAP are generally a 'closed door event'
- ✓ Need for rephrased provisions in the model convention, mandatory arbitration as minimum.
- ✓ The suggested timeframe may still prove to be lengthy under circumstances where interest and penalties keep on accumulating during the course of the procedure.

### Relationship between domestic litigation and MAP

- ✓ Can MAP really be explored in tandem with the domestic channels for dispute resolution ?
- ✓ Is MAP a viable alternative? Opposing views about the effect of MAP on domestic litigation.
- ✓ Effective MAP could be especially difficult in countries
  where the courts have the final say
  - Most taxpayers are reluctant to relinquish their right to seek remedy through domestic litigation
  - Litigation usually outpaces MAP
- ✓ Need for measures to encourage dispute resolution via MAP
  - Suspension of filing deadline for domestic litigation when MAP is initiated

## Thank you