

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. The importance of information exchange in tax matters	1-3	3
II. Improving the legal framework for information exchange: New Article 26	4-8	3
III. Improving the Operational Aspects of Exchange of Information	9-14	5
IV. Conclusion	15-16	6
V. Annex		7

7. With the completion of the work on Article 26, t

- Optional language has been included in the Commentary for countries wishing to share information for non-tax purposes (i.e. to counteract money laundering or corruption). It provides that Contracting States may use the information for other purposes provided the information may be used for such purposes under the laws of both countries and the use is authorized by the competent authority of the supplying country.
- Language has been added to clarify a number of terms and concepts used in Article 26. The revised Commentary contains more detailed explanations on (i) the principle of reciprocity, (ii) trade, business and other secrets, (iii) the attorney-client and similar privileges and (iv) the term “public policy/ordre public.”

III. Improving the Operational Aspects of Exchange of Information

The New OECD Manual on the Implementation of Exchange of Information Provisions for Tax Purposes

9. The purpose of this Manual is to provide tax officials dealing with exchange of information for tax purposes with an overview of the operation of exchange of information provisions and some technical and practical guidance to improve the efficiency of such exchanges.

10. In designing the Manual the objective has been to be as practical as possible and as global as possible. Non OECD Economies and regional tax organisations were invited to comment on the earlier drafts of the Manual.

11. The Manual follows a modular approach as some modules may not be relevant to all countries depending on the type of exchange countries are engaged in and as it facilitates updates and additions of new modules. The present modules are the following:

- General module general and legal aspects of exchange of information.
- Module 1 Exchange of information on request.
- Module 2 Spontaneous exchange of information.
- Module 3 Automatic (or routine) exchange of information.
- Module 4 Simultaneous tax examinations.
- Module 5 Tax examinations abroad.
- Module 6 Country profiles regarding information exchange.
- Module 7 Information exchange instruments and models.
- Module 8 Industry-wide exchange of information.

12. CIAT is currently using the OECD Manual as a basis for developing its own manual on exchange which will be more tailored to the CIAT model agreement on exchange of information.

Improving the technical aspects of exchange

13. An increasing number of countries are engaged in automatic exchange of information. Information suitable for automatic exchange is typically bulk information comprising many individual cases of the same type, usually consisting of details of income arising from sources in the supplying state where such

information is available periodically under that state's own system and can be transmitted automatically on a routine basis. Autom

**ANNEX 1 : Article 26 and Commentary in the 2005 edition of the
OECD Model Tax Convention***Article 26*

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

1. The competent authorities of the Contracting States shall exchange such information as is foreseeably relevant for carrying out the provisions of this Convention or to the administration or enforcement of the domestic laws concerning taxes of every kind and description imposed on behalf of the Contracting States, or of their political subdivisions or local authorities, insofar as the taxation thereunder is not contrary to the Convention. The exchange of information is not restricted by Articles 1 and 2.

2. Any information received under paragraph 1 by a Contracting State shall be treated as secret in the same manner as information obtained under the domestic laws of that State and shall be disclosed only to persons or authorities (including

**COMMENTARY ON ARTICLE 26
CONCERNING THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION**

I. Preliminary remarks

1. There are good grounds for including in a convention for the avoidance of double taxation provisions concerning co-operation between the tax administrations of the two Contracting States. In the first place it appears to be desirable to give administrative assistance for the purpose of ascertaining facts in relation to which the rules of the convention are to be applied. Moreover, in view of the increasing internationalisation of economic relations, the Contracting States have a growing interest in the reciprocal supply of information on the basis of which domestic taxation laws have to be administered, even if there is no question of the application of any particular article of the Convention.

2. Therefore the present Article embodies the rules under which information may be exchanged to the widest possible extent, with a view to laying the proper basis for the implementation of the domestic tax laws of the Contracting States and for the application of specific provisions of the Convention. The text of the Article makes it clear that the exchange of information is not restricted by Articles 1 and 2, so that the information may include particulars about non-residents and may relate to the administration or enforcement of taxes not referred to in Article 2.

3. The matter of administrative assistance for the purpose of tax collection is dealt with in Article 27.

4. In 2002, the Committee on Fiscal Affairs undertook a comprehensive review of Article 26 to ensure that it reflects current country practices. That review also took into account recent developments such as the Model Agreement on Exchange of Information on Tax Matters¹ developed by the OECD Global Forum Working Group on Effective Exchange of Information and the ideal standard of access to bank information as described in the report "Improving Access to Bank Information for Tax Purposes".² As a result, several changes to both the text of the Article and the Commentary were made in 2005.

4.1 Many of the changes that were then made to the Article were not intended to alter its substance, but instead were made to remove doubts as to its proper interpretation. For instance, the change from "necessary" to "foreseeably relevant" and the insertion of the words "to the administration or enforcement" in paragraph 1 were made to achieve consistency with the Model Agreement on Exchange of Information on Tax Matters and were not intended to alter the effect of the provision. New paragraph 4 was added to incorporate into the text of the Article the general understanding previously expressed in the Commentary (cf. paragraph 19.6). New paragraph 5 was added to reflect current practices among the vast majority of OECD member countries (cf. paragraph 19.10). The insertion of the words "or the oversight of the above" into new paragraph 2, on the other hand, constitutes a reversal of the previous rule.

4.2 The Commentary also has been expanded considerably. This expansion in part reflects the addition of new paragraphs 4 and 5 to the Article. Other changes were made to the Commentary to take into account recent developments and current

1. Available on www.oecd.org/taxation.

2. OECD, Paris, 2000. Available on www.oecd.org/taxation.

country practices and more generally to remove doubts as to the proper interpretation of the Article.

II. Commentary on the provisions of the Article

Paragraph 1

5. The main rule concerning the exchange of information is contained in the first sentence of the paragraph. The competent authorities of the Contracting States shall exchange such information as is foreseeably relevant to secure the correct application of the provisions of the Convention or of the domestic laws of the Contracting States concerning taxes of every kind and description imposed in these States even if, in the latter case, a particular Article of the Convention need not be applied. The standard of “foreseeable relevance” is intended to provide for exchange of information in tax matters to the widest possible extent and, at the same time, to clarify that Contracting States are not at liberty to engage in “fishing expeditions” or to request information that is unlikely to be relevant to the tax affairs of a given taxpayer. Contracting States may agree to an alternative formulation of this standard that is consistent with the scope of the Article (e.g. by replacing, “foreseeably relevant” with “necessary” or “relevant”). The scope of exchange of information covers all tax matters without prejudice to the general rules and legal provisions governing the rights of defendants and witnesses in judicial proceedings. Exchange of information for criminal tax matters can also be based on bilateral or multilateral treaties on mutual legal assistance (to the extent they also apply to tax crimes). In order to keep the exchange of information within the framework of the Convention, a limitation to the exchange of information is set so that information should be given only insofar as the taxation under the domestic taxation laws concerned is not contrary to the Convention.

5.1 The information covered by paragraph 1 is not limited to taxpayer-specific information. The competent authorities may also exchange other sensitive information related to tax administration and compliance improvement, for example risk analysis techniques or tax avoidance or evasion schemes.

5.2 The possibilities of assistance provided by the Article do not limit, nor are they limited by, those contained in existing international agreements or other arrangements between the Contracting States which relate to co-operation in tax matters. Since the exchange of information concerning the application of custom duties has a legal basis in other international instruments, the provisions of these more specialised instruments will generally prevail and the exchange of information

- c) Similarly, information may be needed with a view to the proper allocation of taxable profits between associated companies in different States or the adjustment of the profits shown in the accounts of a permanent establishment in one State and in the accounts of the head office in the other State (Articles 7, 9, 23 A and 23 B).

exchanges of information under international tax agreements", the OECD Council Recommendation C(92)50, dated 23 July 1992, entitled "Recommendation of the Council concerning a standard magnetic format for automatic exchange of tax information", the OECD Council Recommendation on the use of Tax Identification Numbers in an international context C(97)29/FINAL dated 13 March 1997, the OECD Council Recommendation C(97)30/FINAL dated 10 July 1997 entitled "Recommendation of the Council of the OECD on the Use of the Revised Standard Magnetic Format for Automatic Exchange of Information" and the OECD Council Recommendation on the use of the OECD Model Memorandum of Understanding on Automatic Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes C(2001)28/FINAL);³

- c) spontaneously, for example in the case of a State having acquired through certain investigations, information which it supposes to be of interest to the other State.

9.1 These three forms of exchange (on request, automatic and spontaneous) may also be combined. It should also be stressed that the Article does not restrict the possibilities of exchanging information to these methods and that the Contracting States may use other techniques to obtain information which may be relevant to both Contracting States such as simultaneous examinations, tax examinations abroad and industry-wide exchange of information. These techniques are fully described in the publication "Tax Information Exchange between OECD Member Countries: A Survey of Current Practices"⁴ and can be summarised as follows:

- a simultaneous examination is an arrangement between two or more parties to examine simultaneously each in its own territory, the tax affairs of (a) taxpayer(s) in which they have a common or related interest, with a view of exchanging any relevant information which they so obtain (see the OECD Council Recommendation C(92)81, dated 23 July 1992, on an OECD Model agreement for the undertaking of simultaneous examinations);
- a tax examination abroad allows for the possibility to obtain information through the presence of representatives of the competent authority of the requesting Contracting State. To the extent allowed by its domestic law, a Contracting State may permit authorised representatives of the other Contracting State to enter the first Contracting State to interview individuals or examine a person's books and records — or to be present at such interviews or examinations carried out by the tax authorities of the first Contracting State — in accordance with procedures mutually agreed upon by the competent authorities. Such a request might arise, for example, where the taxpayer in a Contracting State is permitted to keep records in the other Contracting State. This type of assistance is granted on a reciprocal basis. Countries' laws and practices differ as to the scope of rights granted to foreign tax officials. For instance, there are States where a foreign tax official will be prevented from any active participation in an investigation or examination on the territory of a country; there are also States where such participation is only possible with the taxpayer's consent. The Joint Council of Europe/OECD Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters specifically addresses tax examinations abroad in its Article 9;

3. OECD Recommendations are available on www.oecd.org/taxation.

- an industry-wide exchange of information is the exchange of tax information especially concerning a whole economic sector (e.g. the oil or pharmaceutical industry, the banking sector, etc.) and not taxpayers in particular.

10. The manner in which the exchange of information agreed to in the Convention will finally be effected can be decided upon by the competent authorities of the Contracting States. For example, Contracting States may wish to use electronic or other communication and information technologies, including appropriate security systems, to improve the timeliness and quality of exchanges of information. Contracting States which are required, according to their law, to observe data protection laws, may wish to include provisions in their bilateral conventions concerning the protection of personal data exchanged. Data protection concerns the rights and fundamental freedoms of an individual, and in particular, the right to privacy, with regard to automatic processing of personal data. See, for example, the Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data of 28 January 1981.⁵

Paragraph 2

11. Reciprocal assistance between tax administrations is feasible only if each administration is assured that the other administration will treat with proper confidence the information which it will receive in the course of their co-operation. The confidentiality rules of paragraph 2 apply to all types of information received under paragraph 1, including both information provided in a request and information transmitted in response to a request. The maintenance of secrecy in the receiving Contracting State is a matter of domestic laws. It is therefore provided in paragraph 2 that information communicated under the provisions of the Convention shall be treated as secret in the receiving State in the same manner as information obtained under the domestic laws of that State. Sanctions for the violation of such secrecy in that State will be governed by the administrative and penal laws of that State.

12. The information obtained may be disclosed only to persons and authorities involved in the assessment or collection of, the enforcement or prosecution in respect of, the determination of appeals in relation to the taxes with respect to which information may be exchanged according to the first sentence of paragraph 1, or the oversight of the above. This means that the information may also be communicated to the taxpayer, his proxy or to the witnesses. This also means that information can be disclosed to governmental or judicial authorities charged with deciding whether such information should be released to the taxpayer, his proxy or to the witnesses.

The information ~~is~~ (t)-41.9318(t)-37.8567(i)-90.1514ormaem amamar xto the8.685 -12 Td [(t)-25.7084(o)-34.526(

other purposes under the laws of both States and the competent authority of the supplying State authorises such use.”

13. As stated in paragraph 12, the information obtained can be communicated to the persons and authorities mentioned and on the basis of the last sentence of paragraph 2 of the Article can be disclosed by them in court sessions held in public or in decisions which reveal the name of the taxpayer. Once information is used in public court proceedings or in court decisions and thus rendered public, it is clear that from that moment such information can be quoted from the court files or decisions for other purposes even as possible evidence. But this does not mean that the persons and authorities mentioned in paragraph 2 are allowed to provide on request additional information received. If either or both of the Contracting States object to the information being made public by courts in this way, or, once the information has been made public in this way, to the information being used for other purposes, because this is not the normal procedure under their domestic laws, they should state this expressly in their convention.

Paragraph 3

14. This paragraph contains certain limitations to the main rule in favour of the requested State. In the first place, the paragraph contains the clarification that a Contracting State is not bound to go beyond its own internal laws and administrative practice in putting information at the disposal of the other Contracting State. However, internal provisions concerning tax secrecy should not be interpreted as constituting an obstacle to the exchange of information under the present Article. As mentioned above, the authorities of the requesting State are obliged to observe secrecy with regard to information received under this Article.

14.1 Some countries' laws include procedures for notifying the person who provided the information and/or the taxpayer that is subject to the enquiry prior to the supply of information. Such notification procedures may be an important aspect of the rights provided under domestic law. Thee sr3777(o)-46.6743(n)-34.526(d)-46.6743()-41.5581(i)-25.7084(t)-nd

the result that the Contracting States exchange very little information or perhaps none at all. In such a case, the Contracting States may find it appropriate to broaden the scope of the exchange of information.

18.1 Unless otherwise agreed to by the Contracting States, it can be assumed that the requested information could be obtained by the requesting State in a similar situation if that State has not indicated to the contrary.

19. In addition to the limitations referred to above, subparagraph c) of paragraph 3 contains a reservation concerning the disclosure of certain secret information. Secrets mentioned in this subparagraph should not be taken in too wide a sense. Before invoking this provision, a Contracting State should carefully weigh if the interests of the taxpayer really justify its application. Otherwise it is clear that too wide an interpretation would in many cases render ineffective the exchange of information provided for in the Convention. The observations made in paragraph 17 above apply here as well. The requested State in protecting the interests of its taxpayers is given a certain discretion to refuse the requested information, but if it does supply the information deliberately the taxpayer cannot allege an infraction of the rules of secrecy.

19.1 In its deliberations regarding the application of secrecy rules, the Contracting State should also take into account the confidentiality rules of paragraph 2 of the Article. The domestic laws and practices of the requesting State together with the obligations imposed under paragraph 2, may ensure that the information cannot be used for the types of unauthorised purposes against which the trade or other secrecy rules are intended to protect. Thus, a Contracting State may decide to supply the information where it finds that there is no reasonable basis for assuming that a taxpayer involved may suffer any adverse consequences incompatible with information exchange.

19.2 In most cases of information exchange no issue of trade, business or other secret will arise. A trade or business secret is generally understood to mean facts and circumstances that are of considerable economic importance and that can be exploited practically and the unauthorised use of which may lead to serious damage (e.g. may lead to severe financial hardship). The determination, assessment or collection of taxes as such could not be considered to result in serious damage. Financial information, including books and records, does not by its nature constitute a trade, business or other secret. In certain limited cases, however, the disclosure of financial information might reveal a trade, business or other secret. For instance, a request for information on certain purchase records may raise such an issue if the disclosure of such information revealed the proprie

protection does not attach to documents or records delivered to an attorney, solicitor or other admitted legal representative in an attempt to protect such documents or records from disclosure required by law. Also, information on the identity of a person such as a director or beneficial owner of a company is typically not protected as a confidential communication. Whilst the scope of protection afforded to

these purposes. This principle is also stated in the report "Improving Access to Bank Information for Tax Purposes".⁶

19.7 According to paragraph 4, Contracting States must use their information gathering measures, even though invoked solely to provide information to the other Contracting State. The term "information gathering measures" means laws and administrative or judicial procedures that enable a Contracting State to obtain and provide the requested information.

19.8 The second sentence of paragraph 4 makes clear that the obligation contained in paragraph 4 is subject to the limitations of paragraph 3 but also provides that such limitations cannot be construed to form the basis for declining to supply information where a country's laws or practices include a domestic tax interest requirement. Thus, whilst a requested State cannot invoke paragraph 3 and argue that under its domestic laws or practices it only supplies information in which it has an interest for its own tax purposes, it may, for instance, decline to supply the information to the extent that the provision of the information would disclose a trade secret.

19.9 For many countries the combination of paragraph 4 and their domestic law provide a sufficient basis for using their information gathering measures to obtain the requested information even in the absence of a domestic tax interest in the information. Other countries, however, may wish to clarify expressly in the convention that Contracting States must ensure that their competent authorities have the necessary powers to do so. Contracting States wishing to clarify this point may replace paragraph 4 with the following text:

"4. In order to effectuate the exchange of information as provided in paragraph 1, each Contracting State shall take the necessary measures, including legislation, rule-making, or administrative arrangements, to ensure that its competent authority has sufficient powers under its domestic law to obtain information for the exchange of information regardless of whether that Contracting State may need such information for its own tax purposes."

Paragraph 5

19.10 Paragraph 1 imposes a positive obligation on a Contracting State to exchange all types of information. Paragraph 5 is intended to ensure that the limitations of paragraph 3 cannot be used to prevent the exchange of information held by banks, other financial institutions, nominees, agents and fiduciaries as well as ownership information. Whilst paragraph 5, which was added in 2005, represents a change in the structure of the Article, it should not be interpreted as suggesting that the previous version of the Article did not authorise the exchange of such information. The vast majority of OECD member countries already exchanged such information under the previous version of the Article and the addition of paragraph 5 merely reflects current practice.

19.11 Paragraph 5 stipulates that a Contracting State shall not decline to supply information to a treaty partner solely because the

Positions on the Commentary

3. [Deleted]

4. *Malaysia* wishes to indicate that with respect to paragraph 11 of the Commentary, it would be difficult for it, in view of its strict domestic laws and administrative practice as to the procedure to make public certain information obtained under the domestic laws, to provide information requested.
