Georgia

A. Progress in the implementation of the minimum standard

Georgia has 56 tax agreements in force, as reported in its response to the Peer Review questionnaire.

Georgia signed the MLI in 2017, listing 34 tax agreements.

Georgia is implementing the minimum standard through the inclusion of the preamble statement and the PPT.⁵⁹

The agreements that will be modified by the MLI will come into compliance with the minimum standard once the provisions of the MLI take effect.

Georgia has indicated in the response to the Peer Review questionnaire that bilateral negotiations would be used for its agreement with Poland.

B. Implementation issues

No jurisdiction has raised any concerns about their agreements with Georgia.

Summary of the jurisdiction response - Georgia

| | Treaty partners | Compliance with the standard | If compliant, the alternative implemented | Signature of a complying instrument | The alternative implemented through the complying instrument (if not the MLI) | Comments |
|----|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|----------|
| 1 | Armenia | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 2 | Austria | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 3 | Azerbaijan* | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 4 | Bahrain | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 5 | Belarus* | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 6 | Belgium | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 7 | Bulgaria | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 8 | China (People's Republic of) | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 9 | Croatia | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 10 | Cyprus* | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 11 | Czech Republic | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 12 | Denmark | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 13 | Egypt | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 14 | Estonia | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 15 | Finland | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 16 | France | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 17 | Germany | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 18 | Greece | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 19 | Hungary | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 20 | Iceland | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 21 | India | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |

| 22 | Iran* | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
|----|-------------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 23 | Ireland | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 24 | Israel | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 25 | Italy | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 26 | Japan | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 27 | Kazakhstan | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 28 | Korea | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 29 | Kuwait* | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 30 | Latvia | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 31 | Liechtenstein | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 32 | Lithuania | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 33 | Luxembourg | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 34 | Malta | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 35 | Moldova* | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 36 | Netherlands | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 37 | Norway | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 38 | Poland | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 39 | Portugal | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 40 | Qatar | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 41 | Romania | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 42 | San Marino | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 43 | Saudi Arabia | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 44 | Serbia | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 45 | Singapore | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 46 | Slovak Republic | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 47 | Slovenia | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 48 | Spain | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 49 | Sweden | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 50 | Switzerland | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 51 | Turkey | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 52 | Turkmenistan* | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 53 | Ukraine | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 54 | United Arab Emirates | No | N/A | No | N/A | |
| 55 | United Kingdom | No | N/A | Yes | N/A | |
| 56 | Uzbekistan* | No | N/A | No | N/A | |



From:

Prevention of Treaty Abuse – Second Peer Review Report on Treaty Shopping

Inclusive Framework on BEPS: Action 6

Access the complete publication at:

https://doi.org/10.1787/d656738d-en

Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2020), "Georgia", in *Prevention of Treaty Abuse – Second Peer Review Report on Treaty Shopping: Inclusive Framework on BEPS: Action 6*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/a5c2e6bd-en

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area. Extracts from publications may be subject to additional disclaimers, which are set out in the complete version of the publication, available at the link provided.

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions.

