

Portability, IORPs and the PEPP

Prof.dr. Hans van Meerten

Chair EU Pension Law



3 false statements about the PEPP

- 1) IORPs are not financial undertakings
- 2) PEPP is contrary to prohibition of secondary business activities
- 3) PEPP will not work without harmonized tax regime



1) IORPs are not financial undertakings and should not be treated as such

Not true: many IORPs are financial undertakings: Dutch PPI for example

Why exclude IORPs?

Second best: exclude I ORPs that are not cross border AND are financial undertakings?

See amendments Paul Tang on IORP II



2) PEPP is contrary to prohibition of secondary business activities

PEPP is NO 3th pillar pensionscheme but sui generis product

Article 7 IORP: Pension funds should confine themselves to providing retirement benefits and related activities.

PEPP fits perfectly in this definition



3) PEPP will not work without harmonized tax regime

First time Portability is properly adressed

National obstacles which make it impossble to transfer

Contrary to free movement of workers?

Compartiment approach will minimize effects of different tax regimes

Portability without Portability



We need PEPP to overcome EU pension gap

This will also hit well developed pension sectors like the Netherlands

More on the PEPP:

Van Meerten/Hooghiemstra

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2993991