

Introduction

Dutch taxpayers are affected by tax law in various ways. The most direct forms are taxation, tax collection and, in extreme situations, punishment of violations of tax legislation. There are, however, also indirect forms: taxpayers are confronted with tax law through control and supervision and through the influence of tax legislation. In all these forms of confrontation with tax law and the Tax and Customs administration (hereafter also called the tax authorities), there is a need for and entitlement to protection of taxpayers' rights.

The position of Dutch taxpayers is protected by various laws. The Constitution provides an important basis for this legal protection. Section 104 of the Constitution provides that tax may only be levied pursuant to the law. Substantive tax law has been laid down in various laws, such as the Income Tax Act [*Wet op de Inkomstenbelasting 2001*], the Corporation Tax Act [*Wet op de Vennootschapsbelasting 1969*] and a multitude of implementing regulations.

Procedural tax law follows from the General Administrative Law Act [*Algemene wet bestuursrecht*, hereinafter referred to as "Awb".] The Awb codifies rules that apply to administrative law in general. The Awb includes many provisions that pertain to the protection of taxpayers' rights. Tax law forms part of this administrative law.¹ The General State Taxes Act [*Algemene wet inzake rijksbelastingen*, hereinafter referred to as "AWR"] contains a large number of additional provisions. The AWR sets out the manner in which tax can be levied and provides the taxpayers with the means to object to the infringement of their rights.

Taxpayers' rights also follow from policy rules, such as the Administrative Fines (Tax and Customs Administration) Decree [*Besluit Bestuurlijke Boetes Belastingdienst*], which contains instructions to the tax authorities concerning the imposition of fines, and procedural rules of the district court, the court of appeal and the Supreme Court of the Netherlands (hereafter also called Supreme Court) on the implementation of tax proceedings. Taxpayers can invoke such policy as if they were rules at law.

Besides this, in case law various principles of proper administration are developed, which the tax authorities have to apply and which principles the taxpayer may invoke. These are for instance the principle of legitimate expectations, the fair play principle, the principle of equality, the principle of due care and the principle of legal certainty. A few of these principles are already incorporated in the Awb.

Finally, taxpayers can invoke the rights derived from human rights conventions if a fine has been imposed on them. Above this a tax payer may refer to the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union and the Charter of the European Union, in a case in which the law of the European Union is applied or if one of the four freedoms of the European Union is at stake.

A last remark to make is that the communication between the tax payers and the tax authorities and judicial bodies is developing in a way that more and more will be digital. At this moment the communication about tax declarations is mostly digital. In the (near) future all communication with the tax authorities and the courts will be digital.²

Dutch law therefore offers taxpayers in the Netherlands a strong foundation for safeguarding their rights.

This report will discuss the following subjects more in detail:

- Preliminary consultation and horizontal monitoring
- Taxpayers' privacy, in particular the (informal) right of non-disclosure and the closed hearing
- Practical legal protection during audits
- Limitation of delay during the course of the proceedings
- The closed system of legal remedies
- The cancelled (prior) notification for international exchange of information.

¹ See also E. Blummenstein, *Cahiers de droit fiscal international* Vol. II. Basel 1939, p. 90-91.

² Wetsvoorstel Elektronisch Verkeer en Project KEI.

We believe that these subjects can be qualified as best practices in the protection of Dutch taxpayers' rights.

Subject 1: preliminary consultation and horizontal monitoring

If, in the application of tax laws, it is difficult to interpret sections of the law and to assess tax obligations, taxpayers may initiate consultations with a tax inspector.³ This possibility has existed in the Netherlands for a long time and is open to everyone, also for foreigners who intend to take up residence in the Netherlands. Sometimes, this possibility to consult is already anticipated during the drafting of legislation, because the State Secretary for Finance indicates that consultation with a tax inspector is possible if and where necessary. An example is the implementation of the statutory obligation to retain the records kept. For less essential parts of the records, the legislature indicated that it is possible to make agreements with the tax authorities.⁴ Moreover, in case of complicated tax issues, it is not unusual for a tax adviser to request a tax inspector to give his view on the tax obligations, for example in case of an intended establishment or reorganisation of a company.

There are a few subjects and situations, in which a preliminary consultation at request of the tax payer will take place in a coordinated and nationally organised way. This is for instance the case with rulings, ATR's (advance tax rulings) and APA's (advance price agreements).

If sufficient special circumstances of the relevant case have been put forward, the tax inspector will be bound by the position he has taken. To a certain extent, the doctrine of legitimate expectations gives taxpayers certainty on the tax treatment of the intended establishment or reorganisation. However, the tax inspector is only bound by the position he has taken if all relevant information has been provided⁵. Should, at a later stage, it become clear that important information has been withheld for whatever reason, the tax inspector can still deviate from the tax return filed. The taxpayer is responsible for providing relevant information, the tax inspector is responsible for taking a position in accordance with the law, regulations and policy. This form of consultation is called preliminary consultation. A distinguishing feature is the shared responsibility to correctly assess the tax obligations in the relevant case. In exceptional cases, such as exploration of the tax boundaries, the tax inspector will not take a position. This exception has been laid down in published policy.⁶

The initiative for preliminary consultation can be taken by any taxpayer; there is no obligation to hold preliminary consultations. A request for preliminary consultation has no prescribed form and no fee is charged for it. For some taxes⁷, it is also possible to request a consultation in the tax return. In the tax return program, taxpayers can request the tax inspector for a position on a specific position taken in the tax return.

With respect to the phase prior to filing the tax return, it is therefore possible to submit to the tax inspector any issues regarding the interpretation and application of tax law in individual cases. This "preliminary consultation" may also relate to facts that have not yet taken place. In practice, this possibility of preliminary consultation, which has existed for a long time, prevents many disputes on the interpretation and application of tax rules.

In combination with a strengthening of companies' internal procedures aimed at compliance with tax regulations, this practice has developed into a new supervision method, the so-called "horizontal monitoring" (hereinafter: HM). Companies that want and are able to set up their administrative organisation and internal control (AO/IC) such as to allow for the detection of possible tax issues are

³ Tax Administrative Law Decree; paragraph 3.

⁴ Tax Administrative Law Decree; paragraph 14, sections 5, 6 and 7.

⁵ Supreme Court 26 September 1979, ECLI:NL:HR:1979:AM4918; Supreme Court 5 October 2007, ECLI:NL:HR:2007:BB4736; Supreme Court 14 August 2009, ECLI:NL:HR:2009:BB5128 and Supreme Court 21 December 2012; ECLI:NL:HR:2012:BY6916.

⁶ Tax Administrative Law Decree; paragraph 4.

⁷ Income tax and corporation tax.

offered the possibility to conclude an HM agreement with the tax authorities. In brief, it is agreed that companies put forward possible tax risks during preliminary consultations and strengthen their administrative control and organisation (tax control framework; TCF). So horizontal monitoring is roughly based on two principles: strengthening the internal administrative organisation in the area of taxation (the TCF) and the agreement to hold preliminary consultations with the tax inspector on all relevant issues.

The Dutch tax authorities offer the possibility of horizontal monitoring not only to large businesses, but also to small and medium-sized businesses. In this variety, preliminary consultations within the context of horizontal monitoring are generally held through a Tax Service Provider. Where the Tax Service Provider has already performed an audit at his client, the tax authorities will rely on this audit by adjusting its own monitoring to this.

When setting up its monitoring, the tax authorities take account of the internal and external measures of administrative organisation and internal control (TCF) taken by taxpayers. This "form of cooperation" between a tax inspector and a company provides as much certainty as possible with respect to developments regarding possible tax issues, regarding their own positions and mutual responsibilities. If a difference of opinion continues to exist after the preliminary consultation, this will constitute a situation of "agree to disagree", and, through the usual legal channels, the court is requested to give its decision.

However, practice shows that the number of conflicts is considerably reduced due to the constructive approach and the preliminary consultation. There has been no evaluation on this subject yet, but it is assumed that tax declarations are accepted by the tax authorities, because the communication about tax issues are being dealt with before the tax declaration is submitted.

Subject 2: taxpayers' privacy

Theme 1: (informal) right of non-disclosure

Broad obligations to provide information to the tax authorities apply in the Netherlands to (potential) taxpayers⁸ and parties obliged to keep records⁹, such as businesses and employers. Parties obliged to keep records are also obliged to provide information for the purpose of taxes levied on third parties.¹⁰ Only those holding a spiritual office, notaries, (tax) attorneys, doctors and pharmacists may - at law and otherwise - rely on the circumstance that they are obliged to observe secrecy based on their position, office or profession.¹¹ They have a so-called "right of non-disclosure". If a tax inspector demands that a doctor or (tax) attorney provides information about a third party, this doctor or attorney may refuse this by invoking section 53a of the AWR. This also applies before a court if he or she as a witness is asked questions about the taxpayer.

In the Netherlands, the profession of a tax adviser is not protected by law. In principle, anyone may call themselves tax adviser. However, several professional organisations have been set up for tax consultancies in order to guarantee the 'honour and dignity' of the profession for their members. Nevertheless, due to the absence of statutory regulations of the profession, these members have no statutory right of non-disclosure. In principle, a tax adviser is therefore obliged to provide data and information upon request for the purpose of the taxation of his client, the taxpayer. In itself, the contractual and/or disciplinary obligation of tax advisers to observe confidentiality does not form a legitimate reason to refuse to comply with the tax inspector's request.

On the other hand, the legislature takes into consideration that taxpayers should be given the opportunity to consult their tax adviser in confidence. That is why the Tax and Customs Administration

⁸ Section 47 of the AWR.

⁹ Section 52 of the AWR.

¹⁰ Section 53 of the AWR.

¹¹ Section 53a of the AWR.

was instructed not to demand of tax advisers to give access to advices given to their clients and to the correspondence with them.¹² This regulation had been laid down in policy rules for a long time¹³ and was acknowledged by the Supreme Court.

This legally enforceable limitation of a tax inspector's authority is also called the *pseudo or informal right of non-disclosure*.

In 2005, the Supreme Court delivered an important judgment on the scope of the informal right of non-disclosure, which is still guiding for tax legal practice.¹⁴ In these proceedings, our highest tax court decided on the question whether a due diligence report should be produced for inspection. The court answered this question in the negative. The principle of fair play - which is part of the general principles of proper administration - opposes the fact that a tax inspector uses his authority to gain insight into reports and other documents of third parties insofar as their purpose is to shed light on the tax position of taxpayers or to advise them on this. This limitation therefore also applies to tax advice and to parts of tax advice that contain information of a factual or descriptive nature for that purpose. The remaining parts (not relating to this purpose) must - upon request - be provided, for which purpose it may be necessary to split or adjust the document."

Case law on the informal right of non-disclosure has not been crystallised, but is in full swing. For instance, it was ruled in a judgment by the Civil-Law Division of the Supreme Court on the (derivative) right of an administrative office or a trust office to refuse to give evidence that the tax authorities should be given the opportunity to test the plausibility of the statement that the relevant information relates to communication between this taxpayer and a holder of confidential information.¹⁵

The doctrine of the informal right of non-disclosure therefore offers taxpayers significant protection of their privacy with respect to confidential tax advice, even though there is no statutory basis for this.

Theme 2: closed hearing

Section 121 of the Netherlands Constitution, as well as many sections in international conventions, provides that court hearings are held in public and that court judgments are delivered in public. This basic principle also applies to general administrative law.¹⁶ This main rule does, however, not apply to tax cases. Section 27c of the AWR¹⁷ provides that, except in cases in which an appeal is submitted against a fine, the examination in court be held behind closed doors. The court may, however, determine that the examination be held in public, if this does not harm the interests of the parties. In a closed hearing, a taxpayer will experience fewer barriers for arguing his 'case' than if he has to take into account the fact that all information provided by him becomes public. Therefore, a closed hearing also contributes to the protection of the taxpayer's privacy.

There are many opposing interests regarding the question as to whether or not court hearings should be held in public.¹⁸ An argument in favour of public hearings is that the parties have the reassurance that their cases are not settled in a 'backroom atmosphere'. On the other hand, it is the same parties who have no need for openness whatsoever in connection with their privacy. What is more, full openness will be a reason for many to refrain from instituting proceedings in connection with their privacy. However, public interest is also involved in openness, even more so if the community is a direct or indirect party to the proceedings such as in criminal law, but, in principle, also in tax law.

¹² Parliamentary Papers II, 1958/59, 4080, no. 7, p. 13.

¹³ Statement by the State Secretary for Finance, no. 10 DGM4 dated 5 January 1994, V-N 1994, page 456, point 3. This policy rule has been withdrawn, as it was superseded by case law.

¹⁴ Supreme Court, 23 September 2005, BNB 2006/21, ECLI:NL:HR:2005:AU3140.

¹⁵ Supreme Court, 27 April 2012, Dutch Law Reports (NJ) 2012/408, ECLI:NL:HR:2012:BV3426.

¹⁶ Sections 8:62 and 8:78 of the Awb.

¹⁷ Entry into force on 1 September 1999, before that included in section 11a of the Administrative Justice (Taxation Appeals) Act.

¹⁸ Prof. mr. E. Aardema, *Heffing naar behoren*, Erasmus University Rotterdam 1995, p. 27.

Many years ago, the Dutch legislature consciously opted for having tax cases be settled, in principle, behind closed doors due to the protection of personal privacy. Dutch taxpayers are traditionally reluctant in providing their financial data. This fits in with the fact that the legislature imposed a far-reaching obligation on tax inspector to observe confidentiality with respect to a taxpayer's tax file.¹⁹ This file, must, however, form the point of departure for any tax proceedings.

The deviating regulations on the closed nature of tax cases was not a subject of discussion for many years. During an evaluation of tax legislation in 2005, it was argued by all parties involved that no amendment was required. The courts were reluctant to public hearings. The public and the media paid no attention to tax cases.

This changed in the next few years. More and more people were in favour of making tax cases public. This would not only benefit taxpayers' tax ethics, but also tax transparency.

This notion caused the legislature to decide to prepare a draft bill in early 2011: "Tax Cases (Public Access) Bill". In summary, the then government believed that, as a rule, the interest of public access to (tax) proceedings should prevail over the interest of privacy. The fact that this consideration is now different than in the past may - apart from the other outcome of the comparisons made - partly be explained by an increasing social demand for transparency and, in addition, a different appreciation of privacy in general.

The draft bill was then offered for internet consultation purposes on the website www.internetconsultatie.nl/openbaarheid for a period of six weeks, from mid-April 2011 to the end of May 2011. An internet consultation gives everyone the opportunity to respond to a draft bill. In case of the above draft bill, 41 interested parties took advantage of this possibility.

On 25 April 2014, the State Secretary for Finance informed the Second Chamber of the Dutch parliament of the outstanding tax motions and commitments. One of the topics was the state of affairs concerning the draft "Tax Cases (Public Access)" Bill and the report containing the results of the internet consultation was made available. The State Secretary stated that he will not submit the bill to the House of Representatives. The internet consultation showed that 71 percent of respondents preferred a closed hearing, 27 percent preferred a public hearing and 2 percent gave a less unambiguous response. As respondents, tax advisers and attorneys generally preferred a closed hearing, since a public hearing would constitute a high or too high a barrier for taxpayers to apply to the court. Preferences varied among private individuals and companies. The received responses to the above draft bill as well as the attention in the media and in trade journals have been included in the final assessment on submitting the bill.

Here, the State Secretary considered that the judicial system had already adjusted the policy on publication of judgments, as a result of which the names of legal persons under public law are now no longer in anonymous form in judgments on tax cases²⁰. The tax authorities also make an effort to ensure that important judgments are published, thereby satisfying the feeling that the tax authorities has better access to information. Therefore, the bill was cancelled.

It should be noted here that judgments are pronounced in public, although, as a rule, there is hardly any interest in this. All judicial authorities then make a selection of the relevant judgments, which are placed on the internet in a public database in anonymous form,²¹ thereby sufficiently guaranteeing the external openness of the judicial system.

All in all, we believe that the closed nature of tax cases guarantees taxpayers' privacy. Moreover, the said procedure provides a good example of how Dutch taxpayers and legal protectors can exert practical influence on the legislative process.

Subject 3: practical legal protection during audits

¹⁹ Section 67 of the AWR.

²⁰ Removing the reason for the political discussion as a result of the Parliamentary questions, namely the indignation on an unknown municipality.

²¹ www.rechtspraak.nl

Theme 1: terms for additional tax assessments in relation to reasonable progress

The Dutch tax law does not know terms for performing audits, but there are fixed maximum terms for imposing tax assessments. If these terms are expired, the possibilities for an audit over these years will also be limited.

If the tax inspector after the regular term of three years for imposing a tax assessment of taxes such as income tax, company income tax or inheritance tax finds out a new fact or believes that the tax payer is of bad faith when he filed his tax declaration, the tax can still be assessed with an additional tax assessment. The term for this is five years. If the amount of taxes is related to equity outside the Netherlands, the term is twelve years (section 16, paragraph 4 of the AWR).

A few years ago the making of tax assessments on the basis of section 16, paragraph 4, of the AWR was limited due to the introduction of the criteria “reasonable progress”. The Supreme Court decided on 26 February 2010²² that the tax inspector should act with “reasonable progress” with the tax assessment regarding foreign equity. In this judgment the Supreme Court decided that the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 11 June 2009²³ should be explained that a longer term than five years is acceptable if that term is necessary to gather the information that is needed to define the tax amount and to prepare and impose tax assessment with reasonable progress on the basis of the information that is available for the tax inspector.

On the basis of this decision of the Supreme Court in a lot of cases in which the term of twelve years is applicable is discussed whether the tax inspector acted with reasonable progress. In these cases all the facts and circumstances are considered. It is discussed which actions the tax inspector takes between the moment on which the tax payer gave information to the tax payer and the moment that the tax assessment is imposed. The Supreme Court decided in a judgment of 12 April 2013²⁴ that a duration of time of seven months after the announcement of the tax assessment and the actual making of the tax assessment is that long that it needs a further explanation of the tax inspector. From the case law may be concluded that the tax inspector is not allowed to ‘sit still’. The application of the criteria ‘reasonable progress’ is however not fully clear in the case law.²⁵

Against all these additional tax assessments it is possible to make objections and to file an appeal. In these procedures not only the application of the term, but also the criteria such as the new fact or bad faith may be disputed and will be decided by the judge. The application of the criteria ‘reasonable progress’ is therefore also a better protection of tax payer’s rights.

Theme 2: information decisions

Under Dutch law, (potential) taxpayers must provide the tax authorities with data and information or allow them to inspect books, documents and other data carriers when requested²⁶. Moreover, those obliged to keep records must keep and store their records such that they clearly show the data that are important for taxation.²⁷ Those obliged to keep reports must, when requested, also provide information and allow inspection of data for the purpose of taxes levied on third parties.²⁸ Taxpayers

²² Supreme Court 26 February 2010, BNB 2010/199 and 200.

²³ Court of Justice EU 11 June 2009, C-155/08 and C-157/08 (X/Passenheim-van Schoot).

²⁴ Supreme Court 12 April 2013, ECLI:NL:HR:2013:BZ6799.

²⁵ It is being discussed whether a tax payer may state, if the extended term of twelve years is not applicable, that the tax inspector should act with reasonable progress as well. If the tax inspector receives information within the term of five years (for instance after a year after the first tax assessment) then he would be allowed to sit still for four years and could make the additional tax assessment shortly before the end of the term of five years. However if he receives the information after five years he is not allowed to sit still due to the criteria of reasonable progress. It could be defended that the tax inspector always has to act with reasonable progress, based on the general principles of proper behavior.

²⁶ Section 47 of the AWR.

²⁷ Section 52 of the AWR.

²⁸ Section 53 of the AWR.

who run a business, have an independent profession or employ staff are obliged to keep records; furthermore, all entities are obliged to keep records.²⁹

Apart from the condition that only information needs to be provided which could be important for taxation purposes, the tax authorities are, when requesting information, bound by the general principles of proper administration. For instance, the request may not be disproportionately onerous to the taxpayer or party obliged to keep records, or the request may not constitute a fishing expedition, and the above-mentioned informal right of non-disclosure must be respected.

Under normal circumstances, the burden of proof lies with the tax authorities in case of corrections to the tax return which increase the taxable amount and with the taxpayer in case of corrections which reduce the taxable amount (such as deductible items). Making a plausible case will be sufficient in this respect. Taxpayers who fail to provide information or to allow inspection for the purpose of their own taxation may - unless it concerns the proof of a deductible item - be confronted with a reversal and increase of the burden of proof. In such a situation, taxpayers must prove that the tax assessment imposed by the tax authorities is incorrect and cannot merely make a plausible case, but have to produce conclusive proof.

If a taxpayer refuses to cooperate, because he believes that the tax authorities have exceeded their authority to obtain information, there were, until recently, no legal remedies available. This entailed that a taxpayer who believed that the request for information was wrong either had to take the risk of a reversal and increase of the burden of proof, or had to provide the information anyway in order to avoid this risk, because the reversal and increase of the burden of proof automatically took effect if the taxpayer had wrongly refused to provide information. The tax court always assessed in retrospect, within the context of the court proceedings against the tax assessment, whether the refusal was wrong or not.

This lack in legal protection has been filled since 1 July 2011. Since this date, tax inspectors must, before they impose a tax assessment with corrections, issue an information decision, if they want to ensure that the burden of proof is reversed and increased during the objection phase. If they do not issue an information decision, the regular rules on the allocation of the burden of proof will apply.

Taxpayers are given the opportunity to submit an objection against the information decision.³⁰ This notice of objection is assessed by another tax official than the official who made the request for information. If the objection is not met, the taxpayer may, before the burden of proof is reversed and increased, submit the case to the court. If the court rules that the tax authorities' request for information is incorrect, the taxpayer need not provide the information. If the court rules that the request for information is correct, the taxpayer is given a certain amount of time to comply with the request for information, thereby avoiding a reversal and increase of the burden of proof. Only if, in the opinion of the court, there is a manifestly unreasonable use of procedural law will the court not be obliged to give the taxpayer a new period in order to comply with the request for information.

Theme 3: judicial guarantee in case of obligations to provide information

The Tax and Customs Administration has authorities to request information from taxpayers and businesses for the purpose of their taxation. Apart from the duty to impose tax assessments, the tax authorities also have the power to impose fines. The exercise of the power to obtain information for taxation purposes could create a field of tension with respect to the (implementation of the) right to prohibition of self-incrimination (*nemo tenetur* principle). This field of tension becomes most tangible if the tax authorities initiates civil proceedings with the aim of obtaining information under the threat of a penalty payment. The judgment of the Supreme Court on how to deal with this possible tension is detailed below.

²⁹ Section 52 of the AWR.

³⁰ Section 52a of the AWR.

A taxpayer or party obliged to keep records who fails to provide information may, in exceptional cases, also be summoned by the tax authorities to appear before the civil court.³¹ This was the case, for example, in the situation in which the tax authorities became aware of the fact that a number of taxpayers held a bank account in a country with banking secrecy which they did not state in their tax return. Those taxpayers who kept refusing to provide information about this bank account were summoned to appear in preliminary relief proceedings. In such proceedings, the tax authorities demand that the refusing taxpayer or party obliged to keep records be ordered to provide the information requested, subject to a penalty. The civil court will decide on this demand and on the amount of the penalty. If the civil court imposes a penalty payment in its judgment, the taxpayer can submit an appeal and an appeal in cassation.

The Dutch tax authorities cannot only impose assessments, but also have the statutory power to impose fines, amongst other things because a tax return (whether or not intentionally) was filed incorrectly. Information which could be important for taxation and which, as explained above, must be provided by a taxpayer, could also be important for the purpose of imposing the fine. However, taxpayers who are confronted with the tax authorities' intention to impose a fine have the right to remain silent, which includes the right to refuse to cooperate in one's own conviction. The latter concerns the so-called *nemo tenetur* principle, which follows from section 6 of the ECHR.³²

The question is how the obligation to provide information for taxation purposes and the right to remain silent which applies as soon as a taxpayer reasonably expects that a fine will be imposed on him, relate to each other. The Supreme Court gave a judgment concerning this question in 2013.³³ The Supreme Court ruled that the circumstance that the information requested for taxation purposes may also be important for the fine does not mean that the taxpayer's obligation to provide information is cancelled.³⁴ Under certain circumstances, however, the national authorities may guarantee that the information obtained is only used for the purpose of taxation. As long as the Netherlands have no statutory regulations covering this, the court will have to provide for this guarantee.³⁵ This guarantee requirement only applies if two conditions are met. Firstly, coercion must have been applied in order to obtain the information. One can speak of coercion, for example, if a taxpayer, as explained above, is forced by the civil court to provide information, subject to a penalty payment. Secondly, the information requested should concern information that is dependent of the will of the suspect (in this case: the taxpayer).³⁶ The Supreme Court based this condition on the decision by the ECHR in the *Saunders* judgment, that the *nemo tenetur* principle does not include material that is independent of the will of the suspect.³⁷ In the *Saunders* judgement is mentioned that documents acquired pursuant to a warrant, breath, blood and urine samples and bodily tissue for the purpose of DNA testing should be considered to be independent of the will of the suspect.

The question, however, is what is to be understood by material independent of the will. Although in the underlying case, the material consisted of existing documents, it was not possible to inspect these documents without the taxpayer's cooperation. Prior to the judgment, the Advocate General concluded that ECHR case law showed that these documents constituted material dependent of the will, because the taxpayer's cooperation was necessary in order to inspect these documents.³⁸ However, the Supreme Court did not follow the Advocate General's conclusion in this regard and considered the documents to be material independent of the will, without stating what is to be understood by material dependent of the will.³⁹

³¹ The Tax and Customs Administration may use private-law (civil) authorities in order to fulfil its public duties, if the relevant public-law regulations do not provide for this, unless such use interferes with the public-law regulations in an unacceptable manner; Supreme Court 26 January 1990; ECLI:NL:HR:1990:AC0965 (*State/Windmill*). Explicitly for demands for information under section 52a(4) of the AWR.

³² ECHR 25 February 1993 (*Funke vs. France*).

³³ Supreme Court, 12 July 2013; ECLI:NL:HR:2013:BZ3640.

³⁴ Ground 3.5.

³⁵ Ground 3.7.

³⁶ Ground 3.6.

³⁷ ECHR 17 December 1996 (*Saunders vs. United Kingdom*).

³⁸ Opinion of Advocate-General Wattel, 1 March 2013; ECLI:NL:PHR:2013:BZ3640.

³⁹ Ground 3.10.

Subject 4: limitation of delay in the process of legal protection

The right to a fair trial also includes the right to a decision within a reasonable period. Over the past period, the legislature has introduced a number of successful measures that prevent or compensate for any undue delay.

Firstly, tax law originally had its own regulations for the period within which the tax inspector had to decide on a notice of objection. These separate regulations were cancelled a few years ago. Instead, the regulations provided for by general administrative law were followed as far as the decision-making periods were concerned. These regulations provide that a tax inspector has to reach a decision within a period of around 6-10 weeks. Moreover, a possibility was created to challenge any omission to reach a decision. In such a situation, it is assumed by means of fiction that the notice of objection was rejected, creating the possibility to apply to the court. (Theme 1).

Secondly, two regulations were included in 2009 in order to stimulate the tax inspector, by means of a penalty, to reach a decision. (Theme 2).

Finally, the doctrine of immaterial damages was developed in case law, based on which the court may grant compensation for supposed immaterial damage in case of any undue delay. This compensation may be owed by the tax inspector or by the State. (Theme 3).

Because the measures to speed up tax proceedings have fairly recently been introduced, the effectivity of the measures has not scientifically been researched. However, the impression of the reporters is that the measures are effective. The tax authorities have implemented measures to prevent incurring the penalty payment.

These three themes are detailed and summarised below.

Theme 1: decision-making periods

Until 1 January 2008, tax law had its own period for reaching decisions on objections.⁴⁰ The period initially was one year, to be extended by one year with the approval of the Minister of Finance.⁴¹ This decision-making period was cancelled on 1 January 2008 when the Tax Law Enforcement (Further Measures) Act and the Miscellaneous Tax Measures Act 2008 (Wet versterking fiscale handhaving en de Wet overige fiscale maatregelen 2008) entered into force. Instead, the regulations provided for by general administrative law were followed as far as the decision-making periods were concerned. Section 7:10 of the Awb provides that a tax inspector must reach a decision within six weeks counting from the day after the day on which the period for submitting a notice of objection has expired.⁴² So in fact, the tax inspector has a period varying from 6 weeks if the notice of objection was submitted on the last day of the period, to almost 12 weeks if the notice of objection was submitted on the first day.⁴³ The tax inspector may postpone the decision-making period by a maximum of 6 weeks. A further postponement of the decision is only possible if this is necessary for compliance with a statutory provision or if the person submitting the notice of objection agree(s) to this. In case of a postponement or agreement to a longer decision-making period, the tax inspector will notify the tax payer in writing.

In its annual reports, the Tax and Customs Administration reports on the extent to which it has, in practice, successfully processed objections within the decision-making period.

⁴⁰ Tax Law Enforcement (Further Measures) Act, Bulletin of Acts and Decrees 2007, 376 and Miscellaneous Tax Measures Act 2008, Bulletin of Acts and Decrees 2008, 563.

⁴¹ Section 25(1) and (2) of the old AWR.

⁴² Section 7:10 in conjunction with section 6:7 of the Awb.

⁴³ If the notice of objection does not meet the requirements set, for example there is no substantiation, the period will be suspended from the moment the tax inspector gives the person submitting the notice of objection the opportunity to correct the omission; section 7:10(2) of the Awb.

It is possible to appeal against a decision on the notice of objection to the court.⁴⁴ A decision is considered to be equal to a written refusal of the tax inspector to reach a decision.⁴⁵ So an acting tax inspector is involved both in case of a written refusal and in case of a decision. If, however, the tax inspector fails to respond (in time), it is also possible to appeal against the omission to reach a decision in time⁴⁶. This possibility gives an interested party an indirect means to stimulate the tax inspector to make progress. The submission of such appeal is not bound by a certain period (unless it is unreasonably late....). Prior to the appeal, the interested party must give the tax inspector written notice of default. The appeal can be submitted within two weeks after the notice of default. The regulations on the appeal phase in the Awb have a separate part containing provisions on the omission to act in time.

Theme 2: penalty payment to be imposed on the tax authorities

The above-described possibility to appeal against the omission to reach a decision does not yet provide a targeted means to induce the tax inspector to actually decide. The “Penalty Payments (Failure to Give Timely Decisions) Act”⁴⁷ (Wet dwangsom en beroep bij niet tijdig beslissen) introduces two regulations in order to supplement legal protection in this regard, namely (i) a penalty payment to be paid by the tax authorities and (ii) a special court procedure. These regulations are briefly discussed below:

(i) The Awb provides for a penalty payment in case of an omission to reach a decision in time.⁴⁸ If the tax inspector failed to reach a timely decision on a notice of objection⁴⁹ and the interested party gave the tax inspector written notice of default, the regulation provides for the incurrence of a penalty payment if the tax inspector failed to reach a decision within two weeks after receipt of the notice of default. The tax authorities will incur a penalty payment for each day the tax inspector is in default. The maximum term of the penalty payment is 42 days. The penalty payment amounts to €20 per day for the first two weeks, €30 per day for the next two weeks and €40 per day for the other days. The maximum penalty payment is therefore €1260. The tax inspector determines the total amount of the penalty payment owed by means of a decision. It is possible to submit an appeal against this decision to the court.

(ii) If the tax inspector failed to make a decision in time and the interested party has given him written notice of default, it is possible to initiate accelerated court proceedings against the omission to reach a decision. In principle, the court will handle the appeal without a hearing and within 8 weeks on the basis of this regulation. If the appeal is justified, the court will decide that the tax inspector has to reach a decision within two weeks. The court will impose a new penalty payment to be incurred by the tax authorities if he does not decide within the period stated.⁵⁰

Theme 3: immaterial damages due to undue delay

The Awb contains a few articles about a compensation of damages (section 8:73 of the Awb), compensation of the court registry fee (section 8:74 of the Awb) and a compensation of procedural costs (section 8:75 of the Awb).

To start with these last articles to give an impression on the compensation possibilities. In the past a tax payer was compensated with a substantial part of the procedural costs. With the entry into force of the Legal Costs (Administrative Law) Decree (“*Besluit Proceskosten Bestuursrecht*”) these costs were based on flat rates. This leads in practice to the situation that only a small amount of the procedural costs of a tax payer are compensated if he engaged a tax advisor or a tax attorney at law. In some cases there are advisors who start class actions and this might lead to a more substantial compensation per case. The court registry fee was and is compensated to the tax payer if he ‘wins’ the

⁴⁴ Section 8(1) of the Awb.

⁴⁵ Section 6:2(a) of the Awb.

⁴⁶ Section 62(b) of the Awb.

⁴⁷ Act of 28 August 2009, Bulletin of Acts and Decrees 2009, 383.

⁴⁸ Part 4.1.3.2 of the Awb.

⁴⁹ Section 4:17 of the Awb; The regulation is open to more late decisions.

⁵⁰ Section 8:55(2) of the Awb. In principle, there is no maximum penalty.

procedure, although there is much discussion going on in the Dutch Parliament to raise the fees to substantial amounts which might lead to a limitation of the access to judicial bodies. Insofar, these are not really best practices for protection of tax payers rights.

This is different for the compensation of damages. In the past a request for or the compensation of damages was rarely seen. This has been changed since 2011 and gives the tax authorities and the judicial bodies a stimulus to deal with tax cases within a reasonable time.

On 10 June 2011, the Supreme Court rendered three judgments⁵¹ on the granting of immaterial damages in case of tax disputes⁵² in connection with the long duration of the handling of objections and appeals.

In these judgments, the Supreme Court ruled that legal certainty is a generally accepted legal principle, which is partly based on section 6 of the ECHR.⁵³ This principle of legal certainty likewise applies within the national legal system and likewise separately from section 6 of the ECHR. Its aim is to guarantee that tax disputes are settled within a reasonable period. With analogous application of section 8:73 of the Awb, the tax authorities may be ordered to compensate for this damage. The delay due to the court handling may result in the State being ordered to compensate for immaterial damage.

If this reasonable period is exceeded, tension and frustration are assumed to arise, which constitutes a ground for compensation of immaterial damage. Here, the Supreme Court is guided by existing case law on section 6 of the ECHR.⁵⁴

The duration of the reasonable period is set at two years, counting from the moment when the tax inspector receives the notice of objection until the moment when the court delivers a judgment.⁵⁵

The immaterial damages in case this period is exceeded have been set by the court at a fixed amount of € 500 per six months, rounded up.⁵⁶

Subject 5: closed or open system

This subject can be explained in various ways and offers from more points of view advantages for the tax payer. A few themes will be discussed. First the closed system of legal decisions which can be appealed. Secondly we will elaborate that it is despite of the first theme possible to ask the tax inspector to decide ex officio that an irrevocable decision can be diminished.

Theme 1: the closed system of legal protection

Dutch general administrative law has an open system of legal remedies (objection and appeal) for taxpayers.⁵⁷ This means that, in principle, legal remedies are available for any interested party against any decision or any written decision by an administrative body on a public-law act. Legal remedies are

⁵¹ Supreme Court 10 June 2011; ECLI:NL:HR:B05046; Supreme Court 10 June 2011; ECLI:NL:HR:B05080 and Supreme Court 10 June 2011; ECLI:NL:HR:B05087.

⁵² In case of proceedings regarding a fine, established case law shows that, under certain circumstances, unreasonably long proceedings imply a mitigation due to undue delay. Supreme Court 22 April 2005, ECLI:NL:HR:2005:AT4468.

⁵³ Section 6 of the ECHR does not pertain to pure tax disputes. See e.g. ECHR 12 July 2001 (Ferrazini vs. Italy).

⁵⁴ E.g. the judgment of 29 March 2006 (Riccardi Pizzati vs. Italy).

⁵⁵ As a rule, a division of the period in tax matters implies that the objection phase has lasted unreasonably long if its duration exceeds six months. The appeal phase has lasted unreasonably long if it takes more than 18 months.

⁵⁶ Here, no distinction is made between natural and legal persons.

⁵⁷ Section 8:1 in conjunction with section 7:1 of the Awb

only not available against a number of decisions specifically referred to in the law.⁵⁸ So it is possible to submit an objection or appeal against a decision, unless the law dictates otherwise.

Although Dutch tax law forms part of administrative law, it has a closed system of legal remedies. This means that legal remedies are available only against specific decisions referred to in the law and for specific interested parties referred to in the law. So it is not possible to submit an objection or appeal against a decision, unless the law dictates otherwise.

Before we elaborate this theme further we must notice that the closed system of legal protection might not be confused with the possibilities of the tax payer to defend himself on the basis of a civil procedure if the closed system of legal protection in tax law does not provide a legal remedy. Or with the option for the tax inspector to force a tax payer to provide information during a civil law suit with a penalty payment⁵⁹. Lastly it should be noticed that the tax collector has an open system with regards to the collection of taxes (administrative and civil options are in principle allowed for the tax collector to use).

Under tax law, it is possible to submit an objection and appeal against the following decisions⁶⁰:

- tax assessments (provisional assessments, final assessments and additional assessments);
- refund decisions and
- decisions open to objection, or decisions against which legal remedies are available under tax law (for example a decision on the formation of a tax group).

Moreover, the payment or self-assessment of a tax amount is considered equal to a decision that is open to objection. The same applies to the withholding of a tax on behalf of a taxpayer. This pertains to, for example, the situation in which an employer deducted and paid wage tax on behalf of an employee. Due to the fact that this withholding and payment is considered equal to a decision that is open to objection, a taxpayer may submit to the tax inspector an objection against the withholding or payment of wage tax by his employer.

Over the past few years, the decisions against which legal remedies are available have been extended.

For instance, regarding tax assessments, the possibility to submit an objection against provisional assessments has been laid down in the law. This possibility was changed though a few years ago.⁶¹ There are no direct legal remedies available anymore against these assessments. Instead, provisional income tax or corporation tax assessments can be reviewed at the request of the interested party. If this request is wholly or partly rejected, then this is done by means of a decision that is open to objection.

Moreover, regarding decisions that are open to objection, legal remedies have for example been made available against a decision on an ex officio reduction in income tax.⁶² If a notice of objection was filed outside the statutory period, the tax inspector will always proceed to an ex officio examination of this objection. A few years ago, the decision made by the tax inspector following this ex officio examination has become a decision that is open to objection through a statutory provision.

⁵⁸ Section 8:3 to section 8:5 of the Awb

⁵⁹ This is also possible for information that is relevant for multiple tax payers, for instance Court of Appeal 's-Hertogenbosch 19 August 2014, ECLI:NL:GHSHE:2014:2803 . In this case the tax authorities requested the transactions regarding parking of SMSParking. SMSParking is an organization in the Netherlands which offers payment of parking taxes via sms, internet or smartphone. The request of the tax authorities was not limited to certain tax payers nor was it limited to certain taxes. The Court of Appeal decided that this request for information was not a violation of the privacy of tax payers.

⁶⁰ Section 26 of the AWR

⁶¹ Section 9.5 of the Income Tax Act and section 27 of the Corporation Tax Act respectively

⁶² Section 9.6 of the Income Tax Act

Moreover, legal remedies have been made available against an information decision.⁶³ If, for example, a taxpayer refuses to provide information, the burden lying with the tax inspector to prove the tax corrections may be shifted to this taxpayer. In that case, the taxpayer must prove that the tax corrections were made incorrectly. In order to shift the burden of proof, the tax inspector must, before imposing the tax assessment with the tax corrections, issue an information decision. Legal remedies are available against this information decision.

Under Dutch tax law, the circle of interested parties who can submit an objection and appeal is also limited. Legal remedies against the aforementioned decisions are available for the following interested parties⁶⁴:

- the interested party on whom the tax assessment was imposed;
- the interested party who paid the tax amount on the basis of self-assessment or in respect of whom the tax amount was deducted;
- the interested party to whom the decision open to objection is addressed and
- the interested party whose income components or assets are included in the object of taxation to which the tax assessment or decision open to objection relates.

The last-mentioned interested parties have been included in the law following a judgment of the tax division of the Supreme Court.⁶⁵

The above-mentioned closed system was formed through history and has grown since then. The decisions that are open to objection and appeal and the circle of interested parties who can submit an objection and appeal have expanded over the years, as explained above. The legislature has taken the initiative for this. Sometimes, the legislature is incited to do so as a result of case law in which a legal remedy deficiency has been detected and may already have been repaired. A disadvantage of this course of affairs is that a legal remedy deficiency may arise and that it may take some time before this legal remedy deficiency is actually lifted by the legislature or case law.

However, the State Secretary for Finance stated that he wants to keep the closed system as a basic principle under Dutch tax law, as it functions properly.⁶⁶

An advantage of the closed system is that the number of objection and appeal procedures can remain limited. This applies to tax inspectors, the judiciary and taxpayers.

Another advantage of the closed system is its clarity. The current closed system only has a limited number of decisions against which an interested party has to submit an objection in order to secure his rights. The relevant decisions are clear to both the tax inspector and the taxpayer. Moreover, tax law has specific provisions based on which the objection and appeal submitted against a tax assessment are deemed to also be submitted against the fine and interest decisions referred to in the notice of assessment.⁶⁷ The tax division of the Supreme Court has expanded this regulation to include decisions determining a loss for the year to which the tax assessment relates.⁶⁸

In the closed system, an interested party can, in most cases, also express his complaints against decisions that are not open to objection and appeal. These complaints can be put forward in the objection against a decision that is open to objection and appeal, insofar as this decision is based on the decisions that are not open to objection and appeal.

⁶³ Section 52a of the AWR

⁶⁴ Section 26a of the AWR.

⁶⁵ Supreme Court , 27 September 1989; ECLI:NL:HR:1989:ZC4110.

⁶⁶ Parliamentary Papers II, 2006/07, 30322, no. 13, p. 2.

⁶⁷ Section 24a(2) and (3) and section 27h(2) of the AWR

⁶⁸ Supreme Court , 16 December 2005; ECLI:NL:HR:2005:AU8171.

In the open system, on the other hand, both tax inspectors and interested parties always have to ask themselves whether a decision is a decision that is open to objection and appeal.

The uncertainty about this is borne by the interested parties. An objection can be submitted against any decision that is open to objection and appeal only once. If a decision appears to be a decision against which legal remedies were available and the interested party did not submit an objection during the period for submitting an objection, the relevant decision will have become final. In that case, the decision will have obtained legal effect.

In the open system, a taxpayer therefore runs the risk, for each decision possibly open to objection, of forfeiting his rights by not submitting an objection.

The adverse effects of this need not be limited to this one decision. If the decision that has obtained legal force forms the basis for another decision, the objection submitted against the other decision may only be effective if it is not based on the decision that has already obtained legal force. The reverse also applies. If a decision against which an objection has been submitted forms the basis for another decision against which no objection has been submitted, the objection against the first decision may no longer be effective.

A practical example will clarify this. This example forms an exception to the existing closed system. In an open system, the problems put forward in this example would be the rule rather than the exception. Certain companies may apply for a tax group for corporation tax purposes. With a tax group, these companies can file a tax return as a single taxpayer. The formation of a tax group is allowed by means of a decision that is open to objection and appeal.

It is conceivable that the tax inspector decides not to allow the formation of a tax group. This will constitute a decision that is open to objection and appeal, against which the interested companies can submit an objection. Assume that the interested parties submitted an objection against the decision of the tax inspector not to allow the formation, but filed tax returns as individual taxpayers pending this objection. If the tax inspector imposed the tax assessments in accordance with these tax returns and the interested parties failed to submit an objection against these assessments, the assessments will have obtained legal force. In that case, a continuation of the objection against the tax group will no longer be effective for those years relating to the assessments that have obtained legal force. By not submitting an objection against the most recent decisions, the assessments, the taxpayers will therefore have forfeited their rights also as regards the formation of a tax group.

Theme 2: official or ex officio reduction

Theme 1 explained that the Netherlands uses a closed system regarding legal protection. The closed system clarifies the decisions that can be challenged. If the period for submitting an objection or appeal has expired, the decision will obtain formal legal force. If a decision has formal legal force, it will no longer be possible to challenge it under administrative law and the civil court will consider the contents and the making of the decision to be lawful.

A particularity in the Dutch tax system is that even if a decision has formal legal force, it is possible to submit a request for an ex officio reduction. This is done as a rule in case of an untimely objection against a decision. In this case one could think of the situation, that a tax payer finds, when he has been on a world trip, a tax assessment of which the term to object has expired. There are also a lot of tax payers who forget to deduct costs in their tax declaration, such as the deduction of mortgage interest or medical expenses. The Tax and Customs Administration will, in that case, still assess the contents of the decision.⁶⁹ The official reduction has a statutory basis.⁷⁰ A decision on a request for an

⁶⁹ See Decree on Official Reductions or Refunds, 16 December 2010, DGB2010/6799M, Bulletin of Acts and Decrees 2010, 20999. No account is taken of case law or policy published at a later point in time; paragraph 5 of the Decree on Official Reductions or Refunds.

official reduction of an income tax assessment or decision is open to objection and appeal and can therefore be submitted to the court for assessment. The possibility of an official reduction or refund mitigates the consequences of formal legal force.

Subject 6: notification of international exchange of information

The point of departure of Dutch taxation is the duty of confidentiality as codified in section 67 of the AWR. This section forbids anyone who performs any work within the context of taxation to disclose information about taxpayers any further than necessary for the implementation of tax law or for the collection of taxes.⁷¹ In principle, international exchange of information without express statutory legitimacy is therefore not allowed.

That is why on 24 May 1986, the International Assistance (Levying of Taxes) Act was introduced (hereinafter: WIB).⁷² The WIB contains a statutory basis for the international exchange of information and administrative assistance in the levying of taxes. During the parliamentary debate, it was stated that by having proper information available in all countries, it is prevented on the one hand that tax is levied on gains resulting from international transactions neither abroad nor in the Netherlands and, on the other hand, double taxation is prevented.⁷³ Having adequate information available is a condition for taxation that is as correct as possible.

Under the WIB, it is possible to provide information falling under the duty of tax secrecy to the tax authorities of another state, under certain conditions. Taxes levied by central governments as well as local governments fall under the WIB. Turnover tax, excise duties and import and export duties, however, do not fall under the WIB. These levies fall under the direct scope of European regulations.⁷⁴

The information provision must be based on an international or interregional regulation, which is applicable to the relationship between the Netherlands and the state requesting or providing information. In the exchange of information, a distinction can be drawn between various forms of exchange. Information can be exchanged at the request of a foreign authority. Information can also be exchanged automatically, which constitutes a regular provision of information to a foreign authority on certain groups of persons. Finally, information can be exchanged to foreign countries spontaneously. The procedural rules included in the WIB apply to all procedures.

These procedural rules were amended with effect from 1 January 2014. Until 31 December 2013, the procedure was as follows. Before the information was provided to the foreign authorities spontaneously or upon request, the party the information came from was informed of the decision to provide the information. Subsequently, it was possible to submit an objection against this to the Tax and Customs Administration, after which an appeal could be submitted to the judiciary. After this notification, the information was not provided to the foreign authorities for ten days. Under section 6:16 of the Awb, lodging an objection and appeal has no suspensive effect in the Netherlands. During the above-mentioned ten-day period, however, it was possible to request preliminary relief from the court under section 8:81 of the Awb. By means of this preliminary relief, it was possible to suspend the exchange of information until the time when a decision was made on the objection and appeal.

If information was exchanged automatically, no individual notification was given as it concerned large groups of persons. However, a general notification was published in the form of a message in the Government Gazette.

Parliamentary history shows that the above notification was prescribed with a view to protection of the interests of the persons concerned.⁷⁵ However, the legislature considered these arguments to be not

⁷⁰ Section 65 of the AWR.

⁷¹ Section 67 of the Collection of State Taxes Act includes a comparable confidentiality provision with respect to work within the context of the Collection of State Taxes Act.

⁷² Bulletin of Acts and Decrees 1986, 249.

⁷³ Parliamentary Papers II 1984/85, 18 852, no 3, p. 7.

⁷⁴ See, for example, Regulation (EEC) 218/92.

⁷⁵ Parliamentary Papers 1984/85, 18 852, no. 3.

or no longer valid in order to maintain the notification procedure. Moreover, some pressure was exerted on an international level as well for the purpose of a revision of the Dutch procedure for the international exchange of information. In 2011, the Netherlands received a peer review⁷⁶ from the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information on Tax Matters (hereinafter: Global Forum) which reports to the G20. In line with the recommendations of the peer review and the new EU assistance directive, the above-described procedural rules were reconsidered by the Netherlands.

The notification procedure was eventually cancelled with effect from 1 January 2014.⁷⁷ Here, the Netherlands emphasised that there are sufficient guarantees in all countries with which information is exchanged, which ensures confidentiality of the data exchanged.⁷⁸ Moreover, the EU Assistance Directive and the information exchange section - based on the OECD Model Tax Convention - in the Dutch bilateral and multilateral conventions pertaining to information exchange assume the same level of data protection by the affiliated parties. The regulations and practices of all 120 countries affiliated with the Global Forum are or will be tested in the Global Forum peer review process for compliance with this level. The most important exchange partners of the Netherlands are affiliated with the Global Forum. Due to the purpose of the relevant guidelines and conventions, the data provided may only be used for the levy of taxes and, where necessary, any other detailed government purposes, such as determining and collecting social security contributions, or in court proceedings due to a violation of tax law. Finally, legal remedies are available for taxpayers against the relevant (foreign) assessment for which the relevant information has been used.

However, this does not alter the fact that Dutch interested parties whose data have been provided to foreign countries for the purpose of taxation of other parties no longer have a guarantee which ensures confidentiality of the information abroad and prevents data from being provided or used unlawfully or copied or shown incorrectly. That is why tax literature urges that the 'prior notification' should be reintroduced.

FINAL VERSION 19 October 2014

Marc van Elk, strategic advisor procedural tax law Large Businesses at the Netherlands Tax Administration

Marion Kors, specialist procedural tax law at the Netherlands Tax Administration and doctoral candidate procedural tax law

Hans Hertoghs, of counsel at Hertoghs advocaten-belastingkundigen (www.hertoghsadvocaten.nl)

Anke Feenstra, partner/attorney at law at Hertoghs advocaten-belastingkundigen (www.hertoghsadvocaten.nl)

⁷⁶ Peer review Global Forum 26 October 2011.

⁷⁷ Bulletin of Acts and Decrees 2013, 566.

⁷⁸ Parliamentary Papers II 2013/14, 33 753, no 3, p. 10.