

Australia

Australia has met all aspects of the terms of reference (OECD, 2017^[3]) (ToR) for the calendar year 2019 (year in review) and no recommendations are made.

Australia can legally issue four types of rulings within the scope of the transparency framework.

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

- 202 past rulings;
- For the period 1 April 2016 - 31 December 2016: 15 future rulings;
- For the calendar year 2017: 13 future rulings,
- For the calendar year 2018: 10 future rulings, and
- For the year in review: 15 future rulings.

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

A. The information gathering process

89. Australia can legally issue the following four 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) permanent establishment rulings; and (iv) related party conduit rulings.

90. For Australia, 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.

91. In the prior years' peer review reports, it was determined that Australia'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 Australia's review and supervision mechanism was sufficient to meet the minimum standard. Australia's implementation remains unchanged, and therefore continues to meet the minimum standard.

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

B. The exchange of information

93. In the prior years' peer review reports, it was determined that Australia's process for the completion and exchange of templates were sufficient to meet the minimum standard. With respect to past rulings, a small amount of further exchanges were made due to new exchange relationships being available during the year in review and also due to delayed confirmation from recipient jurisdictions regarding the system and format in which to receive exchanges]. Australia's implementation in this regard remains unchanged and therefore continues to meet the minimum standard.

94. Australia has international agreements permitting spontaneous exchange of information, including being a party to the (i) *Multilateral Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters: Amended by the 2010 Protocol* (OECD/Council of Europe, 2011^[4]) ("the Convention") and (ii) bilateral agreements in force with 45 jurisdictions.²

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

Past rulings in the scope of the transparency framework	Number of exchanges transmitted by 31 December 2019	Delayed exchanges		
		Number of exchanges not transmitted by 31 December 2019	Reasons for the delays	Any other comments
	9	0	N/A	The exchanges include two delayed exchanges from the prior year report, and seven further exchanges due to new exchange relationships.
Future rulings in 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	Delayed exchanges		
		Number of exchanges transmitted later than three months of the information on rulings becoming available to	Reasons for the delays	Any other comments

	impediments have been lifted	the competent authority		
	67	0	N/A	N/A
Total	76	0		

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

96. Australia 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. Australia has met all of the ToR for the exchange of information process and no recommendations are made.

C. Statistics (ToR IV)

97. 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	2	<i>De minimis</i> rule applies
Cross-border unilateral advance pricing agreements (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	68	Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Hong Kong (China), India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States
Permanent establishment rulings	6	Belgium, Hong Kong (China), Japan, New Zealand, Singapore
Related party conduit rulings	0	N/A
Total	76	

D. Matters related to intellectual property regimes (ToR I.4.1.3)

98. Australia does not offer an intellectual property regime for which transparency requirements under the Action 5 Report (OECD, 2015^[1]) were imposed.

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 (2017), *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, <http://www.oecd.org/tax/beps/beps-action-5-harmful-tax-practices-peer-review-transparency-framework.pdf>. [3]
- 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://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264241190-en>. [1]
- OECD/Council of Europe (2011), *The Multilateral Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters: Amended by the 2010 Protocol*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264115606-en>. [4]

Notes

¹ With respect to the following preferential regimes: 1) Offshore banking unit regime and 2) Conduit foreign income regime.

² Parties to the Convention are available here: www.oecd.org/tax/exchange-of-tax-information/convention-on-mutual-administrative-assistance-in-tax-matters.htm. Australia also has bilateral agreements with Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China (People's Republic of), Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russia, Singapore, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States and Viet Nam.



From:

Harmful Tax Practices – 2019 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/afd1bf8c-en>

Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2020), "Australia", in *Harmful Tax Practices – 2019 Peer Review Reports on the Exchange of Information on Tax Rulings: Inclusive Framework on BEPS: Action 5*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9ceaa848-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>.