

Israel

Israel has met all aspects of the terms of reference (OECD, 2021^[1]) (ToR) for the calendar year 2022 (year in review), and no recommendations are made.

Israel can legally issue five types of rulings within the scope of the transparency framework.

In practice, Israel issued rulings within the scope of the transparency framework as follows:

Type of ruling	Number of rulings
Past rulings	79
Future rulings in the period 1 April 2016 – 31 December 2016	5
Future rulings in the calendar year 2017	3
Future rulings in the calendar year 2018	15
Future rulings in the calendar year 2019	30
Future rulings in the calendar year 2020	15
Future rulings in the calendar year 2021	47
Future rulings in the year in review	24

Peer input was received from one jurisdiction in respect of the exchanges of information on rulings received from Israel. The input was positive, noting that overall information was complete, in a correct format and received in a timely manner.

Information gathering process (ToR I.A)

623. Israel can legally issue the following five types of rulings within the scope of the transparency framework: (i) preferential regimes;¹ (ii) cross-border unilateral APAs and any other cross-border unilateral tax rulings (such as an advance tax ruling) covering transfer pricing or the application of transfer pricing principles; (iii) rulings providing for unilateral downward adjustments; (iv) permanent establishment rulings; and (v) related party conduit rulings.

624. For Israel, past rulings are any tax rulings within scope that are issued either: (i) on or after 1 January 2014 but before 1 April 2016; or (ii) on or after 1 January 2010 but before 1 January 2014, provided they were still in effect as at 1 January 2014. Future rulings are any tax rulings within scope that are issued on or after 1 April 2016.

625. In the prior year peer review report, it was determined that Israel's undertakings to identify past and future rulings and all potential exchange jurisdictions were sufficient to meet the minimum standard. In addition, it was determined that Israel's review and supervision mechanism was sufficient to meet the minimum standard. Israel's implementation remains unchanged, and therefore continues to meet the minimum standard.

626. Israel has met all of the ToR for the information gathering process and no recommendations are made.

Exchange of information (ToR II.B)

627. Israel has the necessary domestic legal basis to exchange information spontaneously. Israel notes that there are no legal or practical impediments that prevent the spontaneous exchange of information on rulings as contemplated in the Action 5 minimum standard.

628. Israel has international agreements permitting spontaneous exchange of information, including being a party to (i) the *Multilateral Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters: Amended by the 2010 Protocol* (OECD/Council of Europe, 2011^[2]) ("the Convention") and (ii) bilateral agreements in force with jurisdictions.²

629. For the year in review, the timeliness of exchanges is as follows:

Future rulings within the scope of the transparency framework	Number of exchanges transmitted within three months of the information becoming available to the competent authority or immediately after legal impediments have been lifted	Delayed exchanges		
		Number of exchanges transmitted later than three months of the information on rulings becoming available to the competent authority	Reasons for the delays	Any other comments
	95	0	N/A	N/A

Follow-up requests received for exchange of the ruling	Number	Average time to provide response	Number of requests not answered
	0	N/A	N/A

630. In the prior year's peer review report, it was determined that Israel's process for the completion and exchange of templates were sufficient to meet the minimum standard. With respect to past rulings, no further action was required. Israel's implementation in this regard remains unchanged and therefore continues to meet the minimum standard. Israel has the necessary legal basis for spontaneous exchange

of information, a process for completing the templates in a timely way and has completed all exchanges. Israel has met all of the ToR for the exchange of information process and no recommendations are made.

Statistics (ToR IV.D)

631. The statistics for the year in review are as follows:

Category of ruling	Number of exchanges	Jurisdictions exchanged with
Ruling related to a preferential regime	95	Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China (People's Republic of), Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Korea, Lithuania, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay
Cross-border unilateral APAs and any other cross-border unilateral tax rulings (such as an advance tax ruling) covering transfer pricing or the application of transfer pricing principles	0	N/A
Cross-border rulings providing for a unilateral downward adjustment to the taxpayer's taxable profits that is not directly reflected in the taxpayer's financial / commercial accounts	0	N/A
Permanent establishment rulings	0	N/A
Related party conduit rulings	0	N/A
IP regimes: total exchanges on taxpayers benefitting from the third category of IP assets, new entrants benefitting from grandfathered IP regimes; and taxpayers making use of the option to treat the nexus ratio as a rebuttable presumption	0	N/A
Total	97	

Matters related to intellectual property regimes (ToR I.A.1.3)

632. In the prior years' peer review reports, it was determined that Israel's information gathering and exchange of information processes for matters related to intellectual property regimes³ were sufficient to meet the minimum standard. Israel's implementation in this regard remains unchanged and therefore continues to meet the minimum standard.

Summary of recommendations on implementation of the transparency framework

Aspect of implementation of the transparency framework that should be improved	Recommendation for improvement
	No recommendations are made.

References

- OECD (2021), *BEPS Action 5 on Harmful Tax Practices - Terms of Reference and Methodology for the Conduct of the Peer Reviews of the Action 5 Transparency Framework*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://www.oecd.org/tax/beps/beps-action-5-harmful-tax-practices-peer-review-transparency-framework.pdf>. [1]
- OECD (2015), *Countering Harmful Tax Practices More Effectively, Taking into Account Transparency and Substance, Action 5 - 2015 Final Report*, OECD/G20 Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Project, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264241190-en>. [3]
- OECD/Council of Europe (2011), *The Multilateral Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters: Amended by the 2010 Protocol*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264115606-en>. [2]

Notes

¹ With respect to the following preferential regimes: Preferred company regime and Preferred technological enterprise regime.

² Participating jurisdictions to the Convention are available here: www.oecd.org/tax/exchange-of-tax-information/convention-on-mutual-administrative-assistance-in-tax-matters.htm. Israel also has bilateral agreements with Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China (People's Republic of), Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Singapore, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.



From:

Harmful Tax Practices – 2022 Peer Review Reports on the Exchange of Information on Tax Rulings Inclusive Framework on BEPS: Action 5

Access the complete publication at:

<https://doi.org/10.1787/22bbeacc-en>

Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2023), “Israel”, in *Harmful Tax Practices – 2022 Peer Review Reports on the Exchange of Information on Tax Rulings: Inclusive Framework on BEPS: Action 5*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/10c68308-en>

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>.