This is a Technical Explanation of the Protocol signed at Washington on September 23, 2009 and the related Exchange of Notes (hereinafter the “Protocol” and “Exchange of Notes” respectively), amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on October 2, 1996 as amended by the Protocol also signed on October 2, 1996 (together, the "existing Convention").

Negotiations took into account the U.S. Department of the Treasury’s current tax treaty policy and the Treasury Department’s Model Income Tax Convention, published on November 15, 2006 (the "U.S. Model"). Negotiations also took into account the Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital, published by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (the "OECD Model"), and recent tax treaties concluded by both countries.

This Technical Explanation is an official guide to the Protocol and Exchange of Notes. It explains policies behind particular provisions, as well as understandings reached during the negotiations with respect to the interpretation and application of the Protocol and the Exchange of Notes.

References to the existing Convention are intended to put various provisions of the Protocol into context. The Technical Explanation does not, however, provide a complete comparison between the provisions of the existing Convention and the amendments made by the Protocol and Exchange of Notes. The Technical Explanation is not intended to provide a complete guide to the existing Convention as amended by the Protocol and Exchange of Notes. To the extent that the existing Convention has not been amended by the Protocol and Exchange of Notes, the technical explanation of the Convention signed at Washington on October 2, 1996 and the Protocol signed on also signed on October 2, 1996 remains the official explanation. References in this Technical Explanation to "he" or "his" should be read to mean "he or she" or "his or her." References to the “Code” are to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended.

The Exchange of Notes relates to the implementation of new paragraphs 6 and 7 of Article 25 (Mutual Agreement Procedure), which provide for binding arbitration of certain disputes between the competent authorities.
Article 1

Article 1 of the Protocol revises Article 10 (Dividends) of the existing Convention by restating paragraph 3. New paragraph 3 provides that dividends paid by a company resident in a Contracting State shall be exempt from tax in that State if the dividends are paid to and beneficially owned by a pension or other retirement arrangement which is a resident of the other Contracting State, or an individual retirement savings plan set up in and owned by a resident of the other Contracting State, and the competent authorities of the Contracting States agree that the pension or retirement arrangement, or the individual retirement savings plan, in a Contracting State generally corresponds to a pension or other retirement arrangement, or to an individual retirement savings plan, recognized for tax purposes in the other Contracting State.

The exemption from tax provided in new paragraph 3 shall not apply if the pension or retirement arrangement or the individual retirement savings plan receiving the dividend controls the company paying the dividend. Additionally, in order to qualify for the benefits of new paragraph 3, a pension or retirement arrangement or individual retirement savings plan must satisfy the requirements of paragraph 2 of Article 22 (Limitation on Benefits).

Article 2

Article 2 of the Protocol replaces paragraph 6 of Article 25 (Mutual Agreement Procedure) of the existing Convention with new paragraphs 6 and 7. New paragraphs 6 and 7 provide a mandatory binding arbitration proceeding. Paragraph 1 of the Exchange of Notes provides that binding arbitration will be used to determine the application of the Convention in respect of any case where the competent authorities have endeavored but are unable to reach an agreement under Article 25 regarding such application (the competent authorities may, however, agree that the particular case is not suitable for determination by arbitration. Paragraph 1 of the Exchange of Notes provides additional rules and procedures that apply to a case considered under the arbitration provisions.

New paragraph 6 provides that a case shall be resolved through arbitration when the competent authorities have endeavored but are unable to reach a complete agreement regarding a case and the following three conditions are satisfied. First, tax returns have been filed with at least one of the Contracting States with respect to the taxable years at issue in the case. Second, the case is not a case that the competent authorities agree before the date on which arbitration proceedings would otherwise have begun, is not suitable for determination by arbitration. Third, all concerned persons and their authorized representatives agree, according to the provisions of new subparagraph 7)d), not to disclose to any other person any information received during the course of the arbitration proceeding from either Contracting State or the arbitration board, other than the determination of the board (confidentiality agreement). The confidentiality agreement may also be executed by any concerned person that has the legal authority to bind any other concerned person on the matter. For example, a parent corporation with the legal authority to bind its subsidiary with respect to confidentiality may execute a
comprehensive confidentiality agreement on its own behalf and that of its subsidiary.

New paragraph 6 provides that an unresolved case shall not be submitted to arbitration if a decision on such case has already been rendered by a court or administrative tribunal of either Contracting State.

New paragraph 7 provides additional rules and definitions to be used in applying the arbitration provisions. Subparagraph 7)a) provides that the term “concerned person” means the person that brought the case to competent authority for consideration under Article 25 and includes all other persons, if any, whose tax liability to either Contracting State may be directly affected by a mutual agreement arising from that consideration. For example, a concerned person does not only include a U.S. corporation that brings a transfer pricing case with respect to a transaction entered into with its Swiss subsidiary for resolution to the U.S. competent authority, but also the Swiss subsidiary, which may have a correlative adjustment as a result of the resolution of the case.

Subparagraph 7)c) provides that an arbitration proceeding begins on the later of two dates: two years from the commencement date of that case (unless both competent authorities have previously agreed to a different date), or the earliest date upon which all concerned persons have entered into a confidentiality agreement and the agreements have been received by both competent authorities. The commencement date of the case is defined by subparagraph 7)b) as the earliest date on which the information necessary to undertake substantive consideration for a mutual agreement has been received by both competent authorities.

Subparagraph 1)c) of the Exchange of Notes provides that notwithstanding the initiation of an arbitration proceeding, the competent authorities may reach a mutual agreement to resolve the case and terminate the arbitration proceeding. Correspondingly, a concerned person may withdraw its request for the competent authorities to engage in the Mutual Agreement Procedure and thereby terminate the arbitration proceeding at any time.

Subparagraph 1)p) of the Exchange of Notes provides that each competent authority will confirm in writing to the other competent authority and to the concerned persons the date of its receipt of the information necessary to undertake substantive consideration for a mutual agreement. Such information will be submitted to the competent authorities under relevant internal rules and procedures of each of the Contracting States. The information will not be considered received until both competent authorities have received copies of all materials submitted to either Contracting State by concerned persons in connection with the mutual agreement procedure.

The Exchange of Notes provides several procedural rules once an arbitration proceeding under paragraph 6 of Article 25 has commenced, but the competent authorities may complete these rules as necessary. In addition, as provided in subparagraph 1)f) of the Exchange of Notes, the arbitration panel may adopt any procedures necessary for the conduct of its business, provided the procedures are not
inconsistent with any provision of Article 25 or of the Exchange of Notes.

Subparagraph 1)e) of the Exchange of Notes provides that each Contracting State has 90 days from the date on which the arbitration proceeding begins to send a written communication to the other Contracting State appointing one member of the arbitration panel. The members of the arbitration panel shall not be employees of the tax administration which appoints them. Within 60 days of the date the second of such communications is sent, these two board members will appoint a third member to serve as the chair of the panel. The competent authorities will develop a non-exclusive list of individuals familiar in international tax matters who may potentially serve as the chair of the panel, but in any case, the chair can not be a citizen or resident of either Contracting State. In the event that the two members appointed by the Contracting States fail to agree on the third member by the requisite date, these members will be dismissed and each Contracting State will appoint a new member of the panel within 30 days of the dismissal of the original members.

Subparagraph 1)g) of the Exchange of Notes establishes deadlines for submission of materials by the Contracting States to the arbitration panel. Each competent authority has 60 days from the date of appointment of the chair to submit a Proposed Resolution describing the proposed disposition of the specific monetary amounts of income, expense or taxation at issue in the case, and a supporting Position Paper. Copies of each State’s submissions are to be provided by the panel to the other Contracting State on the date on which the later of the submissions is submitted to the panel. Each of the Contracting States may submit a Reply Submission to the panel within 120 days of the appointment of the chair to address points raised in the other State’s Proposed Resolution or Position Paper. If one Contracting State fails to submit a Proposed Resolution within the requisite time, the Proposed Resolution of the other Contracting State is deemed to be the determination of the arbitration panel in the case and the arbitration proceeding will be terminated. Additional information may be supplied to the arbitration panel by a Contracting State only at the panel’s request. The panel will provide copies of any such requested information, along with the panel’s request, to the other Contracting State on the date on which the request or response is submitted. All communication from the Contracting States to the panel, and vice versa, is to be in writing between the chair of the panel and the designated competent authorities with the exception of communication regarding logistical matters.

Subparagraph 1)h) of the Exchange of Notes provides that the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State may submit a Position Paper to the panel for consideration by the panel. The Position Paper must be submitted within 90 days of the appointment of the chair, and the panel will provide copies of the Position Paper to the Contracting States on the date on which the later of the submissions of the Contracting States is submitted to the panel.

Subparagraph 1)ii) of the Exchange of Notes provides that the arbitration panel must deliver a determination in writing to the Contracting States within six months of the appointment of the chair. The determination must be one of the two Proposed
Resolutions submitted by the Contracting States. Subparagraph 1)b) of the Exchange of Notes provides that the determination may only provide a determination regarding the amount of income, expense or tax reportable to the Contracting States. The determination has no precedential value, and consequently the rationale behind a panel’s determination would not be beneficial and may not be provided by the panel.

Subparagraphs 1)j) and 1)k) of the Exchange of Notes provide that unless any concerned person does not accept the decision of the arbitration panel, the determination of the panel constitutes a resolution by mutual agreement under Article 25 and, consequently, is binding on both Contracting States. Within 30 days of receiving the determination from the competent authority to which the case was first presented, each concerned person must advise that competent authority whether the person accepts the determination. In addition, if the case is in litigation, each concerned person who is a party to the litigation must also advise, within the same time frame, the court of its acceptance of the arbitration determination, and withdraw from the litigation the issues resolved by the arbitration proceeding. If any concerned person fails to advise the competent authority and relevant court within the requisite time, such failure is considered a rejection of the determination. If a determination is rejected, the case cannot be the subject of a subsequent arbitration proceeding.

For purposes of the arbitration proceeding, the members of the arbitration panel and their staffs shall be considered “persons or authorities” to whom information may be disclosed under Article 26 (Exchange of Information). Subparagraph 1)n) of the Exchange of Notes provides that all materials prepared in the course of, or relating to the arbitration proceeding are considered information exchanged between the Contracting States. No information relating to the arbitration proceeding or the panel’s determination may be disclosed by members of the arbitration panel or their staffs or by either competent authority, except as permitted by the Convention and the domestic laws of the Contracting States. Members of the arbitration panel and their staffs must agree in statements sent to each of the Contracting States in confirmation of their appointment to the arbitration board to abide by and be subject to the confidentiality and nondisclosure provisions of Article 26 of the Convention and the applicable domestic laws of the Contracting States, with the most restrictive of the provisions applying.

Subparagraph 1)m) of the Exchange of Notes provides that the applicable domestic law of the Contracting States determines the treatment of any interest or penalties associated with a competent authority agreement achieved through arbitration.

Subparagraph 1)l) of the Exchange of Notes provides that any meetings of the arbitration panel shall be in facilities provided by the Contracting State whose competent authority initiated the mutual agreement proceedings in the case. Subparagraph 1)o) of the Exchange of Notes provides that fees and expenses are borne equally by the Contracting States, including the cost of translation services. In general, the fees of members of the arbitration panel will be set at the fixed amount of $2,000 per day or the equivalent amount in Swiss francs. The expenses of members of the panel will be set in accordance with the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)
Schedule of Fees for arbitrators (in effect on the date on which the arbitration board proceedings begin). The competent authorities may amend the set fees and expenses of members of the board. Meeting facilities, related resources, financial management, other logistical support, and general and administrative coordination of the arbitration proceeding will be provided, at its own cost, by the Contracting State whose competent authority initiated the mutual agreement proceedings. All other costs are to be borne by the Contracting State that incurs them.

Article 3

Article 3 of the Protocol replaces Article 26 (Exchange of Information) of the existing Convention. This Article provides for the exchange of information and administrative assistance between the competent authorities of the Contracting States.

Paragraph 1 of Article 26

The obligation to obtain and provide information to the other Contracting State is set out in new Paragraph 1. The information to be exchanged is that which may be relevant for carrying out the provisions of the Convention or the domestic laws of the United States or of Switzerland concerning taxes covered by the Convention, insofar as the taxation thereunder is not contrary to the Convention. This language incorporates the standard in 26 U.S.C. Section 7602 which authorizes the IRS to examine “any books, papers, records, or other data which may be relevant or material.” (emphasis added) In United States v. Arthur Young & Co., 465 U.S. 805, 814 (1984), the Supreme Court stated that the language “may be” reflects Congress’s express intention to allow the IRS to obtain “items of even potential relevance to an ongoing investigation, without reference to its admissibility.” (emphasis in original) However, the language “may be” would not support a request in which a Contracting State simply asked for information regarding all bank accounts maintained by residents of that Contracting State in the other Contracting State.

Exchange of information with respect to each State’s domestic law is authorized to the extent that taxation under domestic law is not contrary to the Convention. Thus, for example, information may be exchanged with respect to a covered tax, even if the transaction to which the information relates is a purely domestic transaction in the requesting State and, therefore, the exchange is not made to carry out the Convention. An example of such a case is provided in the OECD Commentary: a company resident in one Contracting State and a company resident in the other Contracting State transact business between themselves through a third-country resident company. Neither Contracting State has a treaty with the third State. To enforce their internal laws with respect to transactions of their residents with the third-country company (since there is no relevant treaty in force), the Contracting States may exchange information regarding the prices that their residents paid in their transactions with the third-country resident.

New paragraph 1 clarifies that information may be exchanged that relates to the administration or enforcement of the taxes covered by the Convention. Thus, the competent authorities may request and provide information for cases under examination
or criminal investigation, in collection, on appeals, or under prosecution.

Information exchange is not restricted by paragraph 1 of Article 1 (General Scope). Accordingly, information may be requested and provided under this Article with respect to persons who are not residents of either Contracting State. For example, if a third-country resident has a permanent establishment in Switzerland, and that permanent establishment engages in transactions with a U.S. enterprise, the United States could request information with respect to that permanent establishment, even though the third-country resident is not a resident of either Contracting State. Similarly, if a third-country resident maintains a bank account in Switzerland, and the Internal Revenue Service has reason to believe that funds in that account should have been reported for U.S. tax purposes but have not been so reported, information can be requested from Switzerland with respect to that person’s account, even though that person is not the taxpayer under examination.

The obligation to exchange information under paragraph 1 does not limit a Contracting State's ability to employ unilateral procedures otherwise available under its domestic law to obtain, or to require the disclosure of, information from a taxpayer or third party. Thus, the Protocol does not prevent or restrict the United States' information gathering authority or enforcement measures provided under its domestic law.

Although the term "United States" does not encompass U.S. possessions for most purposes of the Convention, Section 7651 of the Code authorizes the Internal Revenue Service to utilize the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to obtain information from the U.S. possessions pursuant to a proper request made under Article 26. If necessary to obtain requested information, the Internal Revenue Service could issue and enforce an administrative summons to the taxpayer, a tax authority (or a government agency in a U.S. possession), or a third party located in a U.S. possession.

Paragraph 2 of Article 26

New paragraph 2 provides assurances that any information exchanged will be treated as secret, subject to the same disclosure constraints as information obtained under the laws of the requesting State. Information received may be disclosed only to persons, including courts and administrative bodies, involved in the assessment, collection, or administration of, the enforcement or prosecution in respect of, or the determination of the of appeals in relation to, the taxes covered by the Convention. The information must be used by these persons in connection with the specified functions. Information may also be disclosed to legislative bodies, such as the tax-writing committees of Congress and the Government Accountability Office, engaged in the oversight of the preceding activities. Information received by these bodies must be for use in the performance of their role in overseeing the administration of U.S. tax laws. Information received may be disclosed in public court proceedings or in judicial decisions.

New paragraph 2 also provides that information received by a Contracting State may be used for other purposes when such information may be used for such other
purpose under the laws of both States, and the competent authority of the requested State has authorized such use. This provision is derived from the OECD Model Commentary, which explains that Contracting States may add this provision to broaden the purposes for which they may use information exchanged to allow other non-tax law enforcement agencies and judicial authorities on certain high priority matters (e.g., to combat money laundering, corruption, or terrorism financing). To ensure that the laws of both States would allow the information to be used for such other purpose, the Contracting States will only seek consent under this provision to the extent that the non-tax use is allowed under the provisions of the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty between the United States and Switzerland which entered into force on January 23, 1977 (or as it may be amended or replaced in the future).

**Paragraph 3 of Article 26**

New paragraph 3 provides that the obligations undertaken in paragraphs 1 and 2 to exchange information do not require a Contracting State to carry out administrative measures that are at variance with the laws or administrative practice of either State. Nor is a Contracting State required to supply information not obtainable under the laws or administrative practice of either State, or to disclose trade secrets or other information, the disclosure of which would be contrary to public policy.

Thus, a requesting State may be denied information from the other State if the information would be obtained pursuant to procedures or measures that are broader than those available in the requesting State. However, the statute of limitations of the Contracting State making the request for information should govern a request for information. Thus, the Contracting State of which the request is made should attempt to obtain the information even if its own statute of limitations has passed. In many cases, relevant information will still exist in the business records of the taxpayer or a third party, even though it is no longer required to be kept for domestic tax purposes.

While paragraph 3 states conditions under which a Contracting State is not obligated to comply with a request from the other Contracting State for information, the requested State is not precluded from providing such information, and may, at its discretion, do so subject to the limitations of its internal law.

**Paragraph 4 of Article 26**

New paragraph 4 provides that when information is requested by a Contracting State in accordance with this Article, the other Contracting State is obligated to obtain the requested information as if the tax in question were the tax of the requested State, even if that State has no direct tax interest in the case to which the request relates. In the absence of such a paragraph, some taxpayers have argued that paragraph 3(a) prevents a Contracting State from requesting information from a bank or fiduciary that the Contracting State does not need for its own tax purposes. This paragraph clarifies that paragraph 3 does not impose such a restriction and that a Contracting State is not limited to providing only the information that it already has in its own files.
Paragraph 5 of Article 26

New paragraph 5 provides that a Contracting State may not decline to provide information because that information is held by financial institutions, nominees or persons acting in an agency or fiduciary capacity. Thus, paragraph 5 would effectively prevent a Contracting State from relying on paragraph 3 to argue that its domestic bank secrecy laws (or similar legislation relating to disclosure of financial information by financial institutions or intermediaries) override its obligation to provide information under paragraph 1. This paragraph also requires the disclosure of information regarding the beneficial owner of an interest in a person, such as the identity of a beneficial owner of bearer shares. Paragraph 5 further provides that the requested State has the power to meet its obligations under Article 26, and paragraph 5 in particular, even though it may not have such powers for purposes of enforcing its own tax laws.

Paragraph 2 of the Exchange of Notes provides that the Contracting States understand that there may be instances when paragraph 3 of Article 26 may be invoked to decline a request to supply information that is held by a person described in paragraph 5 of the Article. Such refusal must be based, however, on reasons unrelated to that person's status as a bank, financial institution, agent, fiduciary or nominee, or the fact that the information relates to ownership interests. For example, a Contracting State may decline to provide information relating to confidential communications between attorneys and their clients that are protected from disclosure under that State's domestic law.

Treaty effective dates and termination in relation to exchange of information

Article 5 of the Protocol sets forth rules governing the effective dates of the provisions of Articles 3 and 4 of the Protocol. The competent authorities are obligated to exchange information described in new paragraph 5 of Article 26 if that information relates to any date beginning on or after September 23, 2009, the date on which the Protocol was signed notwithstanding the provisions of the existing Convention. In all other cases of application of new Article 26, the competent authorities are obligated to exchange information that relates to taxable periods beginning on or after January 1 of the year following the date of signature of the Protocol.

A tax administration may also seek information with respect to a year for which a treaty was in force after the treaty has been terminated. In such a case the ability of the other tax administration to act is limited. The treaty no longer provides authority for the tax administrations to exchange confidential information. They may only exchange information pursuant to domestic law or other international agreement or arrangement.

Article 4

Article 4 of the Protocol replaces paragraph 10 of the Protocol to the existing Convention. New Protocol paragraph 10 provides greater detail regarding how the provisions of revised Article 26 (Exchange of Information) will be applied.
New Protocol paragraph 10)a) lists the information that should be provided to the requested State by the requesting State when making a request for information under paragraph 26 of the Convention. Clause i) of paragraph 10)a) provides that a request must contain information sufficient to identify the person under examination or investigation. In a typical case, information sufficient to identify the person under examination or investigation would include a name, and to the extent known, an address, account number or similar identifying information. It is mutually understood that there can be circumstances in which there is information sufficient to identify the person under examination or investigation even though the requesting State cannot provide a name.

Clause ii) of paragraph 10)a) provides that a request for information must contain the period of time for which the information is requested. Clause iii) of paragraph 10)a) provides that a request for information must contain a statement of the information sought, including its nature and the form in which the requesting State wishes to receive the information from the requested State. Clause iv) of paragraph 10)a) provides that a request for information must contain a statement of the tax purpose for which the information is sought. Clause v) of paragraph 10)a) provides that the request must include the name and, to the extent known, the address of any person believed to be in possession of the requested information.

New Protocol paragraph 10)b) provides confirmation of the extent to which information is to be exchanged pursuant to new paragraph 1 of Article 26. The purposes of referring to information that may be relevant is to provide for exchange of information to the widest extent possible. This standard nevertheless does not allow the Contracting States to engage in so-called “fishing expeditions” or to request information that is unlikely to be relevant to the tax affairs of a given taxpayer. For example, the language “may be” would not support a request in which a Contracting State simply asked for information regarding all bank accounts maintained by residents of that Contracting State in the other Contracting State. New Protocol paragraph 10)b) further confirms that the provisions of new Protocol paragraph 10)a) are to be interpreted in order not to frustrate effective exchange of information.

New Protocol paragraph 10)c) provides that the requesting State may specify the form in which information is to be provided (e.g., authenticated copies of original documents (including books, papers, statements, records, accounts and writings)). The intention is to ensure that the information may be introduced as evidence in the judicial proceedings of the requesting State. The requested State should, if possible, provide the information in the form requested to the same extent that it can obtain information in that form under its own laws and administrative practices with respect to its own taxes.

New Protocol paragraph 10)d) confirms that Article 26 of the Convention does not restrict the possible methods for exchanging information, but also does not commit either Contracting State to exchange information on an automatic or spontaneous basis. The Contracting States expect to provide information to one another necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Convention.
New Protocol paragraph 10)e) provides clarification regarding the application of paragraph 3)a) of revised Article 26, which provides that in no case shall the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 be construed so as to impose on a Contracting State the obligation to carry out administrative measures at variance with the laws and administrative practice of that or the other Contracting State. The Contracting States understand that the administrative procedural rules regarding a taxpayer’s rights (such as the right to be notified or the right to an appeal) provided for in the requested State remain applicable before information is exchanged with the requesting State. Notification procedures should not, however, be applied in a manner that, in the particular circumstances of the request, would frustrate the efforts of the requesting State. The Contracting States further understand that such rules are intended to provide the taxpayer a fair procedure and are not to prevent or unduly delay the exchange of information process.

Article 5

Article 5 of the Protocol contains the rules for bringing the Protocol into force and giving effect to its provisions.

Paragraph 1

Paragraph 1 provides for the ratification of the Protocol by both Contracting States according to their constitutional and statutory requirements. Instruments of ratification shall be exchanged as soon as possible.

In the United States, the process leading to ratification and entry into force is as follows: Once a treaty has been signed by authorized representatives of the two Contracting States, the Department of State sends the treaty to the President who formally transmits it to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification, which requires approval by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. Prior to this vote, however, it generally has been the practice for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings on the treaty and make a recommendation regarding its approval to the full Senate. Both Government and private sector witnesses may testify at these hearings. After the Senate gives its advice and consent to ratification of the protocol or treaty, an instrument of ratification is drafted for the President's signature. The President's signature completes the process in the United States.

Paragraph 2

Paragraph 2 provides that the Convention will enter into force upon the exchange of instruments of ratification. The date on which a treaty enters into force is not necessarily the date on which its provisions take effect. Paragraph 2, therefore, also contains rules that determine when the provisions of the treaty will have effect.

Under paragraph 2(a), the Convention will have effect with respect to taxes withheld at source (principally dividends, interest and royalties) for amounts paid or
credited on or after the first day of January of the year following the entry into force of the Protocol. For example, if instruments of ratification are exchanged on October 25 of a given year, the withholding rates specified in paragraph 3 of Article 10 (Dividends) would be applicable to any dividends paid or credited on or after January 1 of the following year. If for some reason a withholding agent withholds at a higher rate than that provided by the Convention (perhaps because it was not able to re-program its computers before the payment is made), a beneficial owner of the income that is a resident of the other Contracting State may make a claim for refund pursuant to section 1464 of the Code.

Paragraph 2)b) provides rules for the effective dates of Articles 3 and 4 of the Protocol. Those Articles shall have application for requests made on or after the date of entry into force of the Protocol. Clause i) provides that information described in paragraph 5 of revised Article 26 (Exchange of Information) shall be exchanged upon request if such information relates to any date beginning on or after September 23, 2009, the date of signature of the Protocol. Clause ii) provides that in all other cases, information shall be exchanged pursuant to Articles 3 and 4 if the information relates to taxable periods beginning on or after January 1, 2010.

Paragraph 2)c) sets forth a specific effective date for purposes of the binding arbitration provisions of new paragraphs 6 and 7 of revised Article 25 (Mutual Agreement Procedure) (Article 2 of the Protocol). Paragraph 2)c) provides new paragraphs 6 and 7 of revised Article 25 is effective for cases i) that are under consideration by the competent authorities as of the date on which the Protocol enters into force, and ii) cases that come under such consideration after the Protocol enters into force. In addition, paragraph 2)c) provides that the commencement date for cases that are under consideration by the competent authorities as of the date on which the Protocol enters into force is the date the Protocol enters into force. As a result, cases that are open and unresolved as of the entry into force of the Protocol will go into binding arbitration on the later of two years after the entry into force of the Protocol (unless both competent authorities have previously agreed to a different date) and the earliest date upon which the agreement required by new paragraph 6)d) of revised Article 25 has been received by both competent authorities.