

## **Contemporary Tax Controversies: Lessons from Developed Nations**

**AGBO, Elias Igwebuiké**

Department of Accounting and Finance,  
Godfrey Okoye University, Ugwuomu-Nike  
Enugu, Nigeria.

[agboelias@gmail.com](mailto:agboelias@gmail.com);

08038972753

### **Abstract**

*One of the major challenges confronting tax jurisdictions all over the world is generating tax revenues that will at least be sufficient to take care of public sector expenditure requirements under an equitable, growth - friendly, fair and economically efficient tax system. A number of tax issues are currently being discussed globally in an effort to achieve that objective. Global taxes have also been proposed. This study intends to review those trending global tax matters with the aim of finding out what they are and how they are being addressed by developed countries. The materials for the study are obtained from peer-reviewed articles published in Research Gate, Goggle Scholar and Science Direct, among others, as well as publications by some public authorities and notable international organizations. It finds that the entire global tax system is far from being ideal. Several countries under the Globe are found putting a lot of strategies in place jointly and severally in an attempt to fix the global tax and international taxation challenges. Some international bodies like the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the European Union, World Health Organization, the G-20, and others are equally lending their support to make the dream a reality. This study concludes that while some of the global tax proposals appear inappropriate or inadequately designed, others deserve serious attention.*

**Keywords:** International Taxation, Tax Controversies, Reform, OECD, WHO, G-20.

### **Introduction**

Taxation is pivotal in every economy and has a direct effect upon the lives of every individual (Doyle, 2015). As a result of high-profile cases involving several firms including Apple, Starbucks, Amazon, Google and Facebook, public and media interest in tax has risen very high recently. Furthermore, the recent OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting project (BEPS) has put global tax policy strongly on the agenda in both the international and domestic tax for a ((Doyle, 2015). This has therefore made now an exciting time for anyone with an interest in tax.

Tax regimes in many countries in the universe seem to be all facing a number of problems together. Their major challenges range from failing to garner sufficient revenue to finance government spending to undue complexity, creation of outcomes that are unfair and explicitly retarding economic efficiency in their host countries, tax avoidance by multinational enterprises and high-income individuals, etc. A good tax system raises the revenues needed to finance government spending in a manner that is as simple, equitable, and growth-friendly as possible (see Krupkin and Gale, 2016). According to Harris (n.d.), a country's stability and prosperity depends significantly upon having a tax system that works. Harris asserts that a tax system must allow tax revenues to flow in, while being fair and easily understood by those who actually pay the taxes. Added to this, it has to be consistent with international treaties and the laws of other countries. He notes that tax systems are often created piecemeal, with rules being changed or added over time, an exercise that

can result in a disjointed system, dogged by loopholes and inconsistencies. For example, UK tax laws run to over 10,000 pages of legislation, and include at least five different ways of dealing with change of corporate control. In the same token, many Commonwealth countries have been left with out-dated colonial tax systems that were amended in a haphazard way, resulting in unnecessary complexity (Harris, 2012).

The global tax environment appears to be dynamic and challenging now, more than ever before. Virtually all the regions in the universe are making frantic efforts to address a number of tax issues. Some of those tax issues that are in the front- burner nationally and internationally include digital taxation and the desire for tax certainty, the outcome of the US tax reform, changes in the shape of tax competition worldwide, the shifts in the tax enforcement landscape, subjective anti-avoidance tests, continued spread of Value Added Tax and multilateral tax assurance processes. A number of countries, including Nigeria, are already carrying out comprehensive tax reforms with the intention of modifying their corporate tax laws, providing equitable and efficient methods for dealing with the low and medium – income earners and taxing the high- income earning individuals. At the same time, a number of global taxes have been proposed.

In virtually all the nations around the Globe, public debts appear to be continuously rising year- by- year. Public revenues also rise but at a much slower pace (see Washington, 2016; Auerback & Gale, 2016). Auerback and Gale (2016) contend that, if this imbalance between the rise in public debts and rise in public sector revenue is not addressed quickly, time may soon come when public debts as well as their related servicing costs may reach a level such that they crowd out future investments, stymie

growth and possibly reduce the fiscal flexibility or the ability of the individual country to respond to future recessions. They maintain that, since reducing routine public spending would be less feasible in the short term, a more feasible approach toward ensuring a balance between public expenditure and revenue is looking for ways to increase tax revenue by broadening and deepening the tax base. The cardinal aim of this study, therefore, is to highlight the trending tax issues and find out how they are being addressed globally, to enhance tax revenues in an equitable, growth – friendly and economically efficient manner.

This paper does not intend to discuss all the trending global tax proposals and tax matters. Its focus is limited to highlighting and discussing some of the major tax issues, namely dealing with the low and medium income earners and taxing the high income earners to raise long-term revenue , continued spread of value added tax ( VAT), anti-tax avoidance tests, Base Erosion Profit Shifting (BEPS) challenges, shifts in the tax enforcement landscape, increasing environmental taxes(carbon tax as a contribution to environmental safety and revenue generation), outcome of the United States tax reform, taxation and tax reforms in the developing nations, corporate tax rate, tax competition, digital taxation, and moves for tax certainty, It further highlights the global taxes currently proposed as well as the bottlenecks militating against their quick implementation.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the review of the related literature. Section 3 presents the methodology while Section 4 summarizes and concludes the study.

### **Review of the related literature**

Doyle (2015) carried out a study to provide the background context and the historical change of the Irish tax system with particular reference to the origin of the taxes that sustain the Irish economy presently. The historical perspective of the paper was to provide a better understanding of the current Irish tax system and explains why it evolved as it did to its current iteration. Krupkin and Gale (2016) carried out a study on the federal tax system of the United States of America. The authors find that the United State's tax system is far from ideal and that there are several areas that require some improvement. They suggest that the system be reformed in favor of enabling it to cater for government expenditures, treat tax payers fairly, and improve incentives for productive activity. The studies that investigated part of the topic of this paper cited in Krupkin and Gale (2016) include Auerback and Gale (2016), Gale (2012), Banemal et al, (2012), Graetz (2004), Harris (2013), Gale (2013), Marron, Toder and Austin(2015),Toder and Viard (2016), Anerback (2010), Bloomberg (2011), Gale and Harris (2011), Kearney and Turner (2013),Hiynes (2014),Ziliak (2014),and Gale and Samwick(2016), Sanger and Thomas (n. d.), among others.

After investigating the United States Tax system, Graetz (2004) proposed a Value Added Tax for the US and affirmed that he would use the revenues generated to reduce the income tax substantially. The author also promised to raise the tax exemption to about \$100,000, tax the income above that level at a flat rate of 25 % and halve the corporate tax rate.

Carnathan (2015) examined taxation challenges in developing countries using public expenditure and financial accountability assessment data. The study finds that tax reforms ortax system changes

need to be made mindful of the current capacity. The author discovers that optimal choice of tax regime may be different when administrative capacity is low. The increasing globalization of economic activity increases the complexity that developing countries need to manage in building and maintaining their revenue systems. Finally, the author equally observes that any proposals to change the revenue system in a developing country requires recognizing that, like developed countries, tax reforms are highly political.

### **Materials and Method**

This study obtained its materials from journals, conference papers, seminar papers, etc. An exploratory research design was employed for carrying out the study. The latter's attention was center on the relevant literatures.

### **Recent Developments in International Tax Theory and Practice**

#### **Efficient Methods of dealing with the Low- and medium-Income Earners and taxing the High-income Earners**

According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2012), tax and transfer systems play a significant role in reducing the overall over all income inequality among tax payers. It claims that up to 75 % of the average reduction in inequality achieved across the OECD is due to transfers. However, the redistributive impact of cash transfers varies widely across countries, reflecting both the size and progressivity of these transfers. For instance, in some countries, such as Australia and the United Kingdom, cash transfers are small in size but highly targeted on those in need. In some others (*e.g.* France or Germany), large transfers redistribute income mainly over the life-cycle rather than across

individuals, and they have progressivity that is often low (OECD, 2012). Among the various types of taxes, the personal income tax (PIT) tends to be progressive, while social security contributions, consumption taxes and real estate taxes tend to be regressive. OECD (2012) claims that progressivity could be strengthened by cutting back tax expenditures that benefit mainly high-income groups (e.g. tax relief on mortgage interest). In addition, removing other tax reliefs – such as reduced taxation of capital gains from the sale of a principal or secondary residence, stock options and carried interest – would increase equity and allow a growth-enhancing cut in marginal labor income tax rates. It would also reduce tax avoidance instruments for top-income earners (OECD, 2012).

#### **Continued Spread of Value Added Tax**

For some time in the past, indirect taxes have been popular with policy-makers.

In the future, technology is likely to further boost their popularity — digitalization and automation will make the taxation of consumption more important, and has also positively impacted the administration of these taxes. According to Sanger and Hanson (2018) Switzerland reduced her federal VAT rates in 2018, from 8% to 7.7%. Eight of 38 jurisdictions (or 21%) forecast VAT base expansion in 2018 (versus 18% in 2017) - with 3 forecasting base contraction. With regard to indirect taxes impacting digital (the OECD, within BEPS Action 1 recommended that countries should apply VAT to digital transactions), four of the 13 jurisdictions (Argentina, Singapore, Turkey and the United Kingdom) forecast a higher burden from indirect tax-focused digital tax measures.

James (2011) asserts that Value Added Tax (VAT) which was originated in the early 20<sup>th</sup>

century, has been adopted by more than 140 countries and accounts for approximately 20 percent of worldwide tax revenue. The author claims that it is only income tax that provides a stronger example of 20th-century tax policy convergence. James quoted Sijbren Cnossen as writing thus concerning VAT: -“*The nearly universal introduction of the value added tax should be considered the most important event in the evolution of tax structure in the last half of the twentieth century.*” United States is the only developed nation without a federal VAT, in spite of a growing belief among U.S. tax policy commentators that the introduction of a VAT is either inevitable, or at least a possibility in light of overwhelming federal government debt and spending commitment.

The origins of the VAT are yet to be settled, as some attribute its origin to the German businessman Wilhelm Von Siemens in 1918, while others credit the American economist Thomas S. Adam for that. Von Siemens’s VAT concept was seen as a technical innovation which came with a key improvement to the turnover tax. VAT permitted the recovery of taxes paid on business inputs and therefore avoided the problems that arise with a turnover tax (Onodugo and Anowor, 2013). The innovation was clearly important, but it did not mean the revolutionary overthrow of the fiscal order. For Adam, the VAT is an alternative to the business income tax. Germany, along with much of Western Europe, embraced VAT as a superior technical modification to sales taxes already in place, and as an adjunct to the income tax.

The VAT was first introduced at a national level in France in 1954. Its original coverage was limited, and France did not move to a full VAT that reached the broader retail sector until 1968. The first full VAT in Europe was enacted in Denmark in 1967, VAT adoption

progressed in two major phases. The first occurred mostly in Western Europe and Latin America during the 1960s and 1970s.

Many people contend that the VAT spread globally because it is the consumption tax best suited to the revenue needs of states in an increasingly globalized economy. Even those who recognize the role of key regional and international institutions in promoting VAT often attribute the motives behind the promotion to the merits of the policy instrument itself (James, 2011). As a result, the rise of the VAT is attributable to its position as the best method of taxing general consumption, its neutral treatment of exports, and its revenue-raising capacity—which may be a matter of concern for those opposed to enhancing government’s ability to provide public goods and services. These factors may explain VAT’s global rise and its appeal to policymakers. Also offer a useful political strategy for promoting the adoption of VAT in the few places where it doesn’t exist. The introduction of national broad-based consumption taxation in developed countries such as Australia, Canada, and Japan did not succeed without prolonged resistance. Each site of resistance adopts a VAT that departs in varying degrees from the ideal policy prescriptions. In Australia and elsewhere this was evidenced by the exclusion of food and some essential services from the VAT base to reduce objections to the VAT’s regressive characteristic. In Japan it was reflected in the adoption of a low-rate, subtraction method VAT.

### **Anti – Tax Avoidance Test**

Tax avoidance is one of the major tax issues that have challenged many tax jurisdictions world-wide and measures are being taken to surmount it. One of those strategies for overcoming tax- avoidance is the adoption of the General Anti-avoidance Rule (GAAR). According to Waerzeggers and Hillier

(2016), have adopted a general anti-avoidance rule (GAAR) while others are considering the introduction of one or are otherwise seeking to fine-tune their existing rule. Countries with a GAAR include the UK, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Belgium, Canada, China, Singapore, Italy, South Africa, Kenya and Australia. The introduction of this test had also continues to be topical in many other jurisdictions such as India and Poland. Waerzeggers and Hillier (2016) assert that Australia has also recently amended its GAAR with the aim of addressing specific base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) concerns.

Waerzeggers and Hillier (2016) state the ultimate purpose of a GAAR as stamping out unacceptable tax avoidance practices. A GAAR is a provision of last resort which is capable of being invoked by a tax authority to strike down unacceptable tax avoidance practices that would otherwise comply with the terms and statutory interpretation of the ordinary tax law. A GAAR is typically designed to strike down those otherwise lawful practices that are found to be carried out in a manner which undermines the intention of the tax law such as where a taxpayer has misused or abused that law. This is typically achieved by giving the tax authority the power to cancel a particular tax benefit or assess a different (increased) tax liability against the taxpayer in circumstances where the course of action taken by a taxpayer is so artificial or contrived that it is only explicable by the urge to obtain a relevant tax benefit. All the same, the stated objective of stamping out unacceptable tax avoidance is capable of making the legal design of a GAAR complex, simply because the phrase “tax avoidance” means different things to different people. Whatever the form a GAAR may take, the suggestion by the authors is that it should give effect to a policy that seeks to strike down outright, artificial or

contrived tax-driven arrangements. However, the GAAR should be designed and applied so as not to frustrate or impede ordinary commercial transactions in respect of which taxpayers can legitimately take advantage of opportunities available to them when structuring or carrying out those transactions. When trying to introduce a GAAR close attention should be paid to the legal design and the available administrative capacity and infrastructure. The country's infrastructure to settle tax disputes should also be put into consideration as the broad powers that a GAAR confers on the tax authority requires adequate taxpayer safeguards. For these reasons, the implementation of a GAAR, especially in developing countries, needs to be carefully managed. According to Waerzeggers and Hillier (2016), before the provision of a GAAR can be invoked by the tax authority, the following conditions must be satisfied: -

(i) There must be a 'scheme'. Scheme includes any course of action, agreement, arrangement, understanding, promise, plan, proposal, or undertaking, whether express or implied and whether or not enforceable. It is possible either that the whole of a transaction or dealing may be identified as the relevant "scheme"; or that merely some component of the transaction (or combination of components) may be identified as the "scheme."

It is often important that the tax authority is given sufficient flexibility as to how the "scheme" is identified and defined because, if the whole of an arrangement consists of a series of transactions or steps, the tax authority should be permitted to select some aspect of that overall arrangement where the particular aspect selected, of itself, makes sense as a "scheme" which is motivated by tax considerations.

(ii) There must be a "tax benefit" in connection with the scheme. A "tax benefit" is defined under the sample GAAR as:

*"tax benefit" means: (a) a reduction in a liability to pay tax, including on account of a deduction, credit, offset or rebate; (b) a postponement of a liability to pay tax; (c) any other advantage arising because of a delay in payment of tax; or (d) anything that causes: (i) an amount of gross revenue to be exempt income or otherwise not subject to tax; or (ii) an amount that would otherwise be subject to tax not to be taxed (Waerzeggers and Hillier, 2016).*

DTax benefit is in different forms, such as a deduction, relief, rebate, credit, offset or refund, as well as a reduction in either a tax liability, amount of income or a tax base, including an increase in a tax loss. Consequently, the GAAR has to be tailored to the individual circumstances of any particular tax system to ensure it has a wide enough scope. However, as a general principle, a tax benefit in connection with a scheme ought not extend to incentives or concessions specifically provided for in the tax law. Normally, this would be the case for benefits such as the ability to make an available tax election, claim accelerated tax depreciation on the purchase of certain encouraged assets, or the claiming of a specific tax deduction for a bad debt, which a taxpayer takes advantage of in such a manner that is consistent with the policy intent of the relevant tax incentive or concession.

(iii) For the scheme to be caught by the GAAR it must be shown that the taxpayer's only or dominant intention was to obtain the identified tax benefit. According to the authors, the actual purpose must be found as having regard to the substance of the scheme. This could involve an examination of the following matters in order to make a

determination in relation to the substance of the scheme so as to make a finding of purpose:(a) The way in which the scheme was carried out;(b) Whether any artificiality or contrivance is evident in relation to that scheme;(c) Whether there is a divergence between the form and substance of the scheme; and(d) The result achieved by the scheme (e.g. reduction in income or increase in deductions) as compared to the result under a relevant counterfactual.

Waerzeggers and Hillier (2016) advise that any GAAR must operate in a world where tax laws influence the shape of nearly every commercial transaction or dealing. A taxpayer should therefore not be required to take a course of action which always results in the highest level of taxation where there are ordinary commercial reasons for the actual course taken. For example, a GAAR should not operate to impede a taxpayer's legitimate financing choice between debt (where returns are ordinarily deductible) and equity (where returns are typically non-deductible) particularly where the nature of the financing instrument chosen also has key (nontax) legal, commercial and accounting benefits and consequences. Any such tax limitation would be the role of a specific integrity provision to give effect to a specific policy formulation such as a rule against thin capitalization. Accordingly, the form of the transaction may be tax driven, yet the scheme giving rise to the transaction maybe one to which the GAAR does not apply. Finally, the balance between legitimate tax planning and a scheme that would be caught by a GAAR is often delicate (Waerzeggers & Hillier, 2016). According to Pwc (2016), General anti-avoidance rules (GARRS) have continued to place a pivotal role in tax production around the globe as a safeguard intended to thunder the incidents of tax avoidance. Though differing in a number of respects, the tax laws of several nations have adopted generally

similar principles in order to empower their revenue authorities to deny tax payers the benefits sought for arrangement to seen to be having tax related intentions which are not permissible.

However, some of the types of GAAR have existed for a considerable length of time, there is uncertainty with regard to the scope of the GAAR's application, interaction with specific anti-avoidance rates (SAARs) and its application in the context of a treaty. This uncertainty creates significant difficulties for the taxpayers that are in need of assurance on the appropriateness of their filing positions. It also creates a substantial risk with regard to the potential for future adjustments and the related penalties in the event of later problems.

According to Pwc (2016), Agbarakwe and Anowor (2018) with the advent of the OECD's Base Erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) the project and the increased Governments urge to reduce the erosion of their domestic tax base, GAARS are expected to play greater role in enforcing compliance in the future

Pwc (2016) noted in their Tax Insight dated October 4, 2016 that the OECD has effectively advocated the need for expanding, the prevalence and application of legislative GAAR's to address tax avoidance behaviors in the context of a treaty. According to Pwc (2016), this overture of the OECD promoted the EU to call for member states of uniformity adopt a minimum standard domestic GAAR as part of a raft of proposals aimed at tax avoidance

#### **Anti-EU -Tax Avoidance Directive**

According to European Commission (2016), Anti - tax avoidance Directive (ATAD) aims at implementing the recommendations made under the OECD's BEPS at the EU level. It

lays down anti-tax avoidance rules in the following areas: (i) Interest limitation rules (ii) Controlled foreign company rules (iii) Hybrid mismatches (iv) General anti-base rules (GAARS) and (v) Exit taxation. Exit taxation rule is to prevent companies from avoiding tax when re-locating assets. Controlled foreign company (CFC) rule is aimed at deterring profit shifting to a low/no tax country. Switch over rule is put in place to prevent double non-taxation of certain income. The Interest limitation rule is made to discourage artificial debt arrangements designed to minimize taxes. The General anti-abuse rule is aimed at counteracting aggressive tax planning when other rules do not apply. The rules should be applied from 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2019. Nigeria is a member of the Eu countries that co-operate to implement the anti-tax avoidance directive.

### **Base Erosion Profit Shifting**

Base erosion and profit shifting (or BEPS) is defined as the corporate tax planning strategies used by multinational enterprises which artificially "shift" profits from higher-tax locations, to lower-tax locations, thereby "eroding" the tax-base of the higher-tax locations. These structures are also known as BEPS tools or BEPS schemes. It refers to tax planning strategies which exploit gaps and mismatches in tax rules to artificially shift profits to low or no-tax locations where there is little or no economic activity. Although some of the schemes used are illegal, most are not. It is viewed that this undermines the fairness and integrity of tax systems as businesses that operate across borders can use BEPS to gain a competitive advantage over enterprises that operate at a domestic level. Moreover, when taxpayers see multinational corporations legally avoiding income tax, it undermines voluntary compliance by all taxpayers. Some of the strategies include (i) exploiting mismatches in tax rules, (ii) using intellectual property

accounting (the capital allowances intangible assets IP-based BEPS tools) and (iii) using loan interest from intergroup loans or more recently, using securitization. Owing to the exploitation of gaps and mismatches between different countries' tax systems by the multinational enterprises (MNEs), the domestic tax base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) affects all countries especially developing countries that have higher reliance on corporate income. Developing countries suffer from BEPS disproportionately (OECD, 2018). A steering committee was set up after the establishment of the BEPS Inclusive Framework by the OECD in June, 2016.

The members of the steering committee include Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt., France, Georgia, Germany, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal, Singapore, Southland, United Kingdom and United States. Countries consider it reasonable to join the committee because multinational businesses operate internationally. Consequently, governments need to act together to tackle BEPS and restore trust in domestic and international tax systems, BEPS cost countries between \$100-240 billion USD in lost revenue annually which is equivalent to 4 – 10% of the global corporate income tax revenue. With over 60 countries working together in the OECD/G20 BEPS project, they jointly delivered 15 Actions to tackle tax avoidance, improve the coherence of international tax rules, and ensure a more transparent tax environment. Each member country pays an annual membership due of 20,000 EUR (OECD, 2018).

### **Shifts in the Tax Enforcement Landscape**

Over the past years, understanding the causes and facilitators of taxpayer compliance and noncompliance has been the object of a lot of analysis in tax administration research. These

research efforts have been made in the hope of discovering a better strategy for fostering tax compliance and minimize the tax gap. In this ever-expanding area of research, reasonable advances have been made in modeling the taxpaying decision-making process and exploring the relationship between the taxpayer and the tax authority and how this relationship evokes compliance. Leviner (2009) is one of the major studies carried out on tax enforcement landscape.

According to the Federal treasury (2005) in Leviner (2009), the operation of the US Government is heavily dependent on income taxes; in 2005, about 43 percent of Federal tax revenue in the United States came from individual income taxes and another 13 percent from corporate income taxes. This amounted to \$927 billion and \$278 billion, respectively and, compared with Fiscal Year 2004, an increase of 14.6 percent in individual income taxes and 46.9 percent in corporate income taxes. Leviner (2009), claims, however, that every year, the Government collected billions of dollars less in tax money than it believes is owed. This difference between taxes owed and taxes collected--otherwise known as the "tax gap" was substantial and nearly tripled over the past 2 decades. Estimates released in February 2006 indicate that the U.S. tax gap for the 2001 tax year stood at approximately \$345 billion dollars,<sup>6</sup> corresponding to a noncompliance rate of 16.3 percent of taxes owed.<sup>7</sup> Both of these numbers fall at the high end of the range of estimates provided by the IRS in the spring of 2005(Leviner,2009). This tax gap arises principally owing to non-compliance by tax payers.

According to Leviner (2009), non-compliance with the tax law may occur in various ways, including taxpayers' failure to accurately report their tax bases, to correctly assess tax liability, to timely file tax returns,

or to promptly pay taxes due. The author claims that more than 80 percent of the tax gap comes from underreporting of taxes--mostly of income tax, meaning that many taxpayers either provide a partial report of their tax bases or completely fail to acknowledge an existing liability. Noncompliance may not be exclusively intentional and can stem from a wide range of causes, including lack of knowledge, confusion, [or] poor record keeping.

Leviner categorized the actions that challenge the integrity of the tax system into three. On either end of the spectrum are tax evasion and tax avoidance, while a third group, aggressive tax planning, is somewhere in between. According to the author, the IRS has taken a number of steps to bolster enforcement and ease the tax gap. Unfortunately, despite those increases in enforcement and revenue, the difference between taxes owed and taxes collected remained considerable. Leviner (2009) suggests the expansion of the traditional tax compliance analysis to include responsive elements of regulation, as illustrated in the Australian approach to tax enforcement. The author is optimistic that such shift in the tax enforcement approach will lead to a more credible, effective, and forward-looking model of tax compliance and enforcement as opposed to the alternative 'big-stick' models. The author comes up with some conclusions: -

- (i) The research in compliance is far from conclusive. It appears to support the economic model to the extent that taxpayers are generally sensitive to the expected payoffs of compliant and noncompliant behavior.
- (ii) Understanding the reasons for and influences on taxpaying behaviors has a direct effect on the design of

enforcement policies and their potential to improve compliance.

- (iii) The Australian compliance model offers a framework that incorporates a balanced and broad approach in the enforcement of taxes. Her compliance model makes a case for the superiority of an enforcement strategy that is gradual and proportional in its capacity.
- (iv) With growing interest around the world in tax administration that focuses on “customer” service and on embracing a dynamic approach to the study and enforcement of compliance, the Australian compliance model is capable of generating different conclusions regarding tax enforcement than what we have been evident.
- (v) By relying on a method that emphasizes the process of enforcement (“managing relationships”) rather than on any one defined regulatory or enforcement mechanism, the Australian model presents challenges in its practical application; a considerable amount of resources (including time and effort) is required to develop the range of regulatory and enforcement measures required for different industries, to test the effectiveness of each measure, and also fit the various measures into the model as a whole.
- (vi) The main advantage of the Australian model may be its ability to offer tax administrators and researchers a broad road map for tax enforcement that incorporates a set of checks and balances on punitive deterrence.

### **Carbon Tax–Contribution to Environmental Safety and Revenue Generation**

As the concentration of greenhouse gases in the earth’s atmosphere increases, heat is trapped. This leads to an overall warming of the globe and other related changes to the climate. The most important of the greenhouse gases is carbon dioxide which is emitted primarily through burning fossil fuels. Other types of greenhouse gases like methane are equally important. A tax on such emissions would be a cost-effective avenue for minimizing such emissions.

Marron et al, (2015) consider emissions as regularly coming from businesses, consumers and governments in the form of carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons and other greenhouse gases. Among all the types of emission, carbon dioxide is considered the most prevalent. These are released to the atmosphere by burning fossil fuels, making cement, raising cattle, clearing land and other activities. The emissions into the atmosphere trap heat, warm the universe, make sea levels to rise, shift rainfall patterns, boost storm intensity and increase the risk of sudden climate changes. Rising carbon dioxide concentrations are said to be also changing the chemical balance of the oceans, harming coral reefs and other marine life. Given the information above, it is evident that greenhouse gas emissions create a lot of potential economic and environmental threats including increased the damage of property from storms, human health hazards, reduced agricultural productivity, and the deterioration of the ecosystem.

The problem with attempting to reduce climate change (or global warming) is that emissions come from millions of sources and activities. Consequently, setting emission limits on individual sources, putting in place

specific technologies, or establishing other direct rules will not only be difficult but also unnecessarily costly. Thus, market-based approaches which place a price on emissions are attractive for combating climate change.

Marron, Toder and Austin (2015), contend that carbon taxation is strong in the US. The authors claim that a well-designed carbon tax is capable of efficiently reducing the emissions that cause climate change, encourage innovation in cleaner technology and annihilate other pollutants. The revenue accruable is capable of financing tax reductions, spending priorities, or deficit reduction. Such policies can offset the tax distributional and economic burdens. It will equally improve the environment and the well-being of the citizenry (Marron et al, 2015). Marron et al, (2015) suggest that, for the purpose of efficiency and fairness, a tax should apply broadly as much as possible to all greenhouse emissions, regardless of the source. For instance, electric power plants, automobiles, home heating systems, factories, farms, and ranches should all face the same carbon price. However, the authors note that taxing carbon dioxide when monitoring emissions is difficult.

### **Outcome of the United State Tax Reform**

One of the outcomes of the US tax reform is the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) of 2017. This marks the first major overhaul of the federal income tax after more than 30 years. The company tax rate was permanently reduced from a maximum of 35% to 21% with effect from January 1, 2018. It eliminates the corporate alternative minimum tax. The US taxation of multi-national business was moved from a world-wide to a quasi-territorial regime as is the case with most of its major international trading partners. The five/the deemed repatriation tax rates for the transitional transition to a territorial tax system on US shareholders of

foreign subsidiaries at 15.50% in respect for previously untaxed cash earnings or other specified assets, and 8% for what remains. Further, the act provides that the dividends received from foreign companies by at least 10% of US shareholder will be completely deductible. It includes a number of new international tax provisions such as would make the tax competitive in global markets, while retaining the anti-deferral regime. It includes a new regime that subjects to the US tax global intangible low taxes income.

New interest expense imitations have been imposed by the act. However, bonus depreciation would be increased from 40% to 100% to qualified property, placed in service after September 27, 2017 and before 2023. Experiencing was raised to \$1 million for qualified property placed in service in tax years commencing after 2017. The deduction for interest expense has been changed to 30% "adjusted taxable income" plus business interest income special elections are available and business. For the initial four years after the enactment of the TCJA, to adjusted taxable income (ATI) would be computed without subtracting depreciation, amortization or depletion in addition to interest and taxes.

Consequently, from 2022, ATI would be decreased by depreciation, thereby making the computation of 30% of net interest expenses to exceed the earnings before interest and taxes (EBIT). The Act provides that for most corporate net operating losses (NOL) arising in the tax years commencing after 2017 the NOL deduction is limited to 80% of the taxable income and the carry back provisions are repealed. The Act allows indefinite carry forward for most corporations. At the heart of the matter is a growing sentiment in Europe that the consensus position developed within BEPS Action 1 that there is "*no such thing as a*

*separate digital economy, but that companies are now participating in the digitalized economy”* is not sustainable. The EC is alleged to be acting quickly, detailing a number of both short- and long-term proposals, which in turn has increased the pressure on the OECD to move faster.

According to Sanger and Hanson (2018), 2018 is characterized by marked by a number of countries carrying out comprehensive tax reform. Among others, those countries engaged in tax reforms recently include Argentina, Belgium, Poland, South Korea, Turkey and the United States. Many of the reform programs are, naturally, BEPS (including ATAD) focused. Poland’s January 2018 tax reform package, for example, included new thin capitalization rules that also covered third-party financing, the disallowance of interest on debt-pushdown strategies, the majority of royalties and service fees now becoming nondeductible and finally, new controlled foreign company rules. In the same dimension, Argentina’s 2018 reform is heavily BEPS-focused. Other countries are carrying out more root-and-branch reform of their regimes. Switzerland, as noted, awaits decisions on whether its Tax Proposal 7 will move forward, while Portugal and Taiwan are also preparing to enact comprehensive reforms designed to reduce inequality. these approaches are dwarfed by the long-awaited US tax reform.

### **Taxation and tax reforms in the developing nations**

A lot of low-income countries are in a fix with regard to taxation (Ejeldad and Rakner, 2003). For those countries it is obvious and urgent that they require more revenues which will empower them to provide and maintain the most basic services. However, the truth is that those in possession of political and economic power are few and are resistant to pay taxes. At the same time, according to Fieldstad and Rakner (2003) those people

without political power are many; they have initially nothing to tax and equally resist paying taxes. The challenge for taxation in developing countries, therefore, is to mobilize domestic revenues from willing citizens in poor and significantly open economies. Elected governments in poor countries are compelled to make hard choices about taxation. Such decisions have immense effects on the future of democratization and on public service provision and have implications for the politics and sustainability of aid.

### **US Corporate Tax Rate**

The fall in the US corporate tax rate - to a Federal/State combined average of around 26% — is by far the biggest percentage faller (a fall of more than a third), and actually puts the US rate at lower than current OECD and G7 averages. The US is joined in significant rate reductions by Argentina, Colombia, and Luxembourg. We also see small reductions in Canada and Japan due to local changes. In contrast, we saw three increases in tax rate, driven by federal level changes, being Portugal (29.5% to 31.5%), Taiwan (17% to 20%) and Turkey (20% to 22%), with India’s increase being driven by changes in the educational surcharge. Reviewing the “broad-base” component of the trend, we seem to have reached a potential limit, with eleven jurisdictions (27%) forecasting a lower overall CIT burden in 2018 (2017: 20%), while seven (17%) forecast a higher overall CIT burden in 2018 (22% in 2017). So, potentially more countries are focusing again on remaining competitive. This desire for tax competitiveness is more apparent within the incentives category. The leading incidence of tax change (i.e., changes that result in either a higher or lower tax burden in 2018, which we track across 13 business tax measures), is attributable to R&D incentives in 2018. All comparisons are based upon like-for-like statistics tax.

### **Tax Competition**

According to Sanger and Hanson (2018), tax competition is essentially driven by public authorities desiring to attract economic activity to their jurisdictions. Tax competition is central in much of the changes occurring today in many tax jurisdictions.

Sanger and Hanson (2018) assert that 14 of 41 jurisdictions in the Globe (or 34%) are forecasting new or more generous R&D incentives in 2018 (2017: 22%). This is also a consistent theme with 9 of the 14 which enhanced their R&D incentives also doing so in 2017. For instance, Austria, Denmark, Hong Kong and New Zealand have or are arranging to introduce completely new R&D incentives among these 14. Other business incentives — which includes depreciation, amortization and capital allowances - also continue to receive high levels of attention. Six jurisdictions (China, Denmark, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy and Singapore) are enhancing both R&D and other business incentives in 2018 (see Sanger and Hanson, 2018).

### **Digital Taxation**

The taxation of digitized business appears to be receiving far more attention now than was the case in 2013, when the BEPS Action Plan (incorporating Action 1 on digital) was being developed. Consequently, fifteen of 41 tax jurisdictions (37%) are already forecasting higher tax burdens as a result of digitally focused changes in 2018. According to Sanger and Hanson (2018), the scope of change is wide, encompassing direct tax changes (Greece, Italy, and United Kingdom), indirect tax changes (Argentina, Singapore, and Turkey), re-definitions of Permanent Establishment (PE) (Italy, India) and anti-avoidance measures (New Zealand) targeting companies that may be data-intensive and/or of low physical presence in a jurisdiction.

### **Moves for tax certainty**

With BEPS measures being introduced by a large number of countries, the OECD is said to be hopeful that the world is moving in a direction where coherence and links between domestic tax systems promote fair taxation and trade.

It is expected that, once implemented, the measures will prevent double non-taxation. The OECD has recognized that such uncertainty potentially may create hurdles to investment and thus trade and economic growth and for those reasons working with the International Monetary Fund, it launched a tax certainty project. One of the concrete outcomes of this project has been the launch of a pilot of the International Compliance and Assurance Programme (ICAP) in January 2018. ICAP is a voluntary program that will use CbC reports, and other taxpayer-provided information, to allow MNE groups and tax administrations to engage in an open and transparent discussion on tax risks, if agreement can be reached that the issues are low risk, to provide outcome letters that state this. There are eight jurisdictions participating in the pilot: Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States

### **Proposed Global Taxes**

Even though there are important similarities between international taxation and global taxes, they are not the same as the former is only concerned with the interaction of national tax systems (Bird, 2015). Bird (2015) considers global taxes as those taxes which are imposed not by any one country but by a group of countries on a regional or worldwide basis. Many proposals for global taxes have the goal of providing a more automatic and reliable source of financing for the development of poorer countries.

Bird (2015) advises that whether the intention is to make international taxation work smoothly or to put a global tax in place,

all countries involved should be ready to give up a certain degree of fiscal sovereignty. The author claims that what exists presently are separate and different national tax systems that incorporate characteristics intended to deal with cross boarder flows and are often, not always, limited through a complex set of treaties. “ *As of now there is World Tax Authority, no World Tax Code and no one is in charge. Consequently, the absence of any effective global governance system is a major obstacle for any global tax proposal*” (Bird, 2015:6).

Bird (2015) asserts that many varieties of global tax were proposed over the years and some of them have continued to be put forward in the discussion of innovative development mechanism. Past studies including Yager and Brannon (1978), Cline (1979), Mendez (1992, 1997, 2001), Shome (1995), Frankman (1996), Paul and Wahlberg (2002), Wahlberg (2002), Wahlberge (2005), Alworth and Arachi (2012) and Herman (2012) all give testimony to such varieties of global tax proposals over the years.

Some global taxes are regarded as worldwide, while others have a amore regional focus. Some possess a broad base while others are narrow – based. Some of them can only be administered by a global or regional body buy others can be administered at the country level preferably in a coordinated manner. The proceeds of some global taxes are designed to be kept by those who collect them but for others, the proceeds would be allocated by some redistributive formula. While some global taxes may take the form of surcharges on national taxes, others are viewed as the possible basis of a new regional or world tax system and some are linked to specific expenditure programs and other process are kept aside for particular purposes.

Bird (2015) claims that while some like Alworth and Arachi (2012) think that tax issues played a role in the recent financial

crises, a common theme in the ensuring discussion has been that new taxes (like global taxes) on the financial sector might both reduce the fiscal problems currently affecting many countries and reduce the probability of future financial crisis.

United Nations (2012) cited in Bird (2015) suggests possible sources of global taxes, namely

- (i) royalties on natural resource extraction beyond 100 – mile exclusive economic zones,
- (ii) taxes on use of fossil fuels and other emission sources,
- (iii) a billionaire’s tax of 1 percent of individual wealth holdings in excess of \$1 billion,
- (iv) an air passenger levy on airline tickets, with proceeds earmarked for auspices of the World Health Organization (WHO) to supply drugs to treat malaria, tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS in developing countries,
- (v) a currency transaction tax collected through a central clearing house, and
- (vi) a financial transaction taxes.

A catalogue of the proposed global taxes as highlighted in Bird (2015) is in table 1 in the appendix. The types of taxes include taxes on the financial sector, environmental taxes and other global taxes whose detailed proposed taxes are in tables 2, 3 and 4 respectively all in the appendix. Other global tax proposals include

1. Arms trade tax. This global tax has been proposed as a way of moving the world closer to peace. It is sometimes called a weapons tax or a gun tax. It is a tax to be

imposed on arms sales and possibly on individual gun purchases.

2. Tobacco tax. This tax which is related to smoking is the most prominent health – related global tax proposal.

3. Wealth tax. A global wealth tax is aimed at taxing the rich usually with the intention of channeling the revenue to the poor in some manner. Such a levy could be based on the aggregate value of all household assets, including owner-occupied housing, cash, bank deposits, money funds and savings in insurance and pension plans, investment in real estate and unincorporated businesses, corporate stock financial recycles and personal trusts. An alternative to this is the so-called billionaires tax of (say) 1 percent on individual wealth holdings of \$1 billion or more. According to Bird (2015), national wealth taxes, which are usually imposed at a low flat rate is already in existence in a number of countries and recently have been receiving some support from economic studies.

4. Resources tax This kind of tax is regarded as a target of those concerned with the seeming basic inequity of the distribution of the wealth generated by such resources between those who own them and those who exploit them.

5. Cyberspace tax

Cordell and Ide (1997) cited in Bird (2015) issued a call to improve a special tax on the use of cyberspace which they branded the ‘new wealth of nations. WHO (2009) equally suggested a global internet tax as a way of taxing the new digital economy. The acceptance of these suggestions is gaining currency. However, not many of the proponents of this new idea seem to

understand much about how the present tax system works or why it works that way (Bird, 2015).

Tobin Tax According to IMF (2010) cited in Bird (2015), the best bank tax is a flat tax imposed on the balance sheets of financial institutions. It is preferable that the rates vary with the assessed riskiness of the financial institutions portfolio. The financial transactions tax is usually referred to as Tobin tax. However, Bird (2015) suggests, that the term Tobin tax is more accurately used for a tax limited only to international currency transactions which is also sometimes called a currency transaction tax or the Robin Hood Tax.

### **The Obstacles on the way of Implementing Global Taxation Proposals and International taxation and the way forward**

According to Bird (2015), It is possible and easy to establish potentially large global tax bases on which even a low tax rate might potentially produce a lot of revenue. However, this does not imply that such taxes are necessarily acceptable, feasible, or desirable at the global level until nation states, in the interest of their own survival and the continued well-being of their citizens, become desirous of forgoing substantial sovereignty in favor of an effective world governance structure. The author emphasizes that, pleasurable as it may be to think of global tax proposals and make impressive calculations of their revenue potential and even though it may be a good idea to discuss and explore such proposals because of the important global public goods like stability and even survival that may be obtained there from, it may in the end only be achievable as

and when countries begin to act as well as think globally.

Like the world itself, taxes are never perfect but are always in need of constant revision and interpretation. Even the most technically perfect legal designs or technological solutions (e.g. to increase tax transparency or to foster international tax cooperation) cannot and will not ever achieve perfection.

Rubagumya, P. T. highlights the challenges in international taxation especially developing countries like Nigeria as follows:

(i) Treaty abuse: Most treaties in developing countries are abused as a result of the inadequacy of the beneficial ownership anti-provision and as a result of the manner the provisions in those treaties are structured whereby the vice of treaty shopping prevails.

(ii) Lack of information about worldwide activities and operations of multinational entities and finding comparable data for transfer pricing matters

(iii) The MNEs create cash boxes in preferential tax regime jurisdictions and erode the tax base of developing countries through the payment of royalties and interest without substantial presence and value creation in such jurisdictions.

(iv) Limited financing for capacity building. Other challenges as pointed out in Jianfan (2015) include

(i) Globalization which has brought increased capital flows, both foreign direct investment and portfolio investments.

(ii) Digital Economy. The current international tax rules were developed in an age that rely on accompany having a physical presence in a country before a tax liability can

arise. Atypical problem in relation to the digital economy is that of defining where the value lies in a digital business and how to address the issues created by the intangible assets that exist in this industry.

(iii) Inclusive growth which is a problem faced universally (Singh, n.d.; Yang & Metallo, 2018).

### **Tax Policy issues in developing countries**

We have taxes because taxation is the only practical means of raising the revenue to finance government spending on the goods and services that most of us demand (Zee & Tanzi, 2001).

According to Zee and Tanzi (2001), developing countries face serious challenges as they strive they attempt to establish efficient tax systems:

(i) Majority of the workers in those countries are usually employed in agriculture or in small, informal enterprises. Consequently, modern means of raising revenue, such as income taxes and consumer taxes, play an insignificant role in these economies, and the possibility that the government will achieve high tax levels is virtually ruled out.

(ii) It is difficult to create an efficient tax administration in developing countries because of the dearth of a well-educated and well-trained staff, more so when money is unavailable to pay good wages to tax officials and to computerize the operation and when taxpayers do not have much competence to keep accounts.

(iii) Arising from the informal structure of the economy in many developing countries and because of financial limitations, statistical and tax offices have problems with generating reliable statistics.

(iv) It is usual for Income to be unevenly distributed in developing countries. Partly for this reason, many developing countries are yet to fully exploit personal income and property taxes. Also, their tax systems seldom achieve satisfactory progressivity.

### **Level of Tax Revenue**

The question on where to set the ideal level of tax revenue for developing countries can be answered only when answers are obtained regarding the desirable level of public spending for a developing country at a given level of national income and whether the government should spend one-tenth of national income, one third or half of it (Zee & Tanzi, 2001). These authors assert that since the vast literature on optimal tax theory provides little practical guidance on how to integrate the optimal level of tax revenue with the optimal level of government expenditure, it is not feasible to determine the optimal tax level which is conceptually equivalent to determining the optimal level of government spending. However, Zee and Tanzi (2001) suggest an alternative, statistically based approach to assessing whether the overall tax level in a developing country is appropriate. It comprises comparing the tax level in a specific country to the average tax burden of a representative group of both developing and industrial countries, taking into account some of these countries' similarities and dissimilarities.

According to Zee and Tanzi (2001), the data as at 2003 indicated that the tax level in major industrialized countries (members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development or OECD) was about double the tax level in a representative sample of developing countries (38 percent of GDP when compared with 18 percent).

### **Composition of Tax Revenue**

Zee and Tanzi (2001) report that data from industrial and developing countries indicate that the ratio of income to consumption taxes in industrial countries has continued to remain more than double the ratio in developing countries. According to the authors, the data also disclose a huge difference in the ratio of corporate income tax to personal income tax.

### **Selecting the Right Tax System**

Zee and Tanzi (2001) opine that the design of the tax system in developing countries where market forces are increasingly important in allocating resources ought to be as neutral as possible. The intention is to minimize interference in the allocation process. The system is also expected to have simple and transparent administrative procedures to facilitate finding out if it is not being enforced as designed.

### **Tax Policy Challenges Facing Developing Countries**

#### **(i) Low tax level**

Developing countries that intend to become fully integrated in the world economy are probably must require a higher tax level. This will empower them to pursue a government role nearer to that of industrial countries, which, on average, enjoy twice the tax revenue. They will need to reduce sharply their reliance on foreign trade taxes sharply, especially in raising more revenue from personal income tax. However, they should do so without at the same time creating economic disincentives. To meet these challenges, policymakers in these countries ought to get their policy priorities right and possess the political will to implement the necessary reforms. Also, tax administrations have to be strengthened to accompany the needed policy changes.

#### **(ii) Trade barriers**

With trade barriers increasing and capital becoming more mobile, the formulation of sound tax policy presents significant challenges for developing countries. The need to replace foreign trade taxes with domestic taxes will be accompanied by growing concerns about profit diversion by foreign investors, which weak provisions against tax abuse in the tax laws as well as inadequate technical training of tax auditors in many developing countries are currently unable to deter. A concerted effort to

eliminate these deficiencies is therefore of the utmost urgency.

(iii) Tax competition

This is another policy challenge in a world of liberalized capital movement. Zee and Tanzi (2001) suggest that, to allow their emerging markets to be properly rooted, developing countries should refrain from reliance on poorly targeted tax incentives as the main tool for investment promotion.

**Personal income taxes**

Personal income taxes have been contributing very little to total tax revenue in several developing countries. Taxing this type of income is a serious challenge for developing countries.

**Summary and Conclusion**

The entire global tax system is beset with a lot of issues. Apart from the tax jurisdictions world-wide being unable to raise sufficient revenue to finance their public sector spending, they are complex, create outcomes that are unfair, and retard economic efficiency. This paper discussed several global tax issues and expert opinions on the optimal ways to fix them. The tax issues discussed include creating a value-added tax, increasing environmental taxes, reforming the corporate tax, treating low- and middle-income earners equitably and efficiently, and ensuring appropriate taxation of high-income households. The paper also discussed the recent developments in the Globe with regard to shifts in the tax enforcement landscape, anti-avoidance tax rules, the continued spread of VAT to more tax jurisdictions world-wide, multilateral tax assurance tests, and tax reforms aimed at modifying the corporation tax laws, among others. It went further to highlight some of the proposed global taxes and indicate the extent to which Nigeria has participated in the global efforts to curb tax revenue loss arising from base

erosion and profit shifting menace facing ill tax jurisdictions worldwide.

With regard to global taxes, Bird (2015) opines that those who seek an automatic (and expanding) way to finance aid to developing countries are no more likely to find general acceptance of explicitly redistributive global taxation now than they were half a century ago when attention began to be paid to global taxation. It may well be that there are indeed instances in which a harmonized global tax approach may be both sensible and feasible – perhaps in particular with respect to controlling carbon emissions and, less clearly, perhaps also with respect to reducing international financial instability.

It is argued that the best and most sustainable approach to both international and global tax problems does not lie so much in cleverly innovative tax design as it does in developing and improving the process through which such problems are defined and resolved. One essential condition for a sustainable solution is greater inclusivity. This means hearing from more of those affected in a significant way while reaching those decisions.

Many of the proposals for global taxation discussed earlier have suffered from the problem of too often appearing to represent only the interests of the poorer emerging countries to the detriment of the interests of those who are expected to bear most of the burden. In the contrary, a major failing of the current international tax system has been the extent to which it has been seen to reflect primarily the interests of the major developed countries. Involving an increasingly large and more representative group of countries and interests, gradually extending this process and making it more inclusive remains the most promising way available to develop common goals, definitions, concepts, assessments and evaluations of the very

broad ranges of activities and interests affected by tax decisions.

As suggested by Sen (1999), global controversies relating to justice and fairness need not be dealt with globally instead of leaving them to be dealt with by nation states only. What is needed is some forum between these extremes in which such issues can be discussed and, perhaps, resolved. Further, since the very rich will hardly desire to see outsiders taxing their wealth, there is little political support, or indeed economic rationale, for such ideas as global wealth taxes (Bird, 2015).

#### References.

Auerbach, A. J. & Gale, W. G. (2012). Once more unto the breach: The deteriorating fiscal

Auerbach, A. J. (2010). A Modern Corporate tax. Hamilton Project. Brookings.

Agbarakwe, H. U. & Anowor, O. F. (2018). Government Intervention and Economic Development: Lessons from Songhai Development Initiative Farm in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Research*, 4(1), 13-21.

Bird, R. M. (2015). Global Taxes and International Taxation: Mirage or Reality. *Working Paper*

Carnathan, M (2015). Taxation Challenges in Developing Countries. *Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies*, vol.2, no.1, pp.169-182.

Cline, W. (1979) 'Resource Transfers to the Developing Countries: Issues and Trends', in W. Cline (ed), *Policy Alternatives for a New International Economic Order*, New York: Praeger Publishers:333-353

Cordell, A. and Ide, T. (1997) *The New Wealth of Nations: Taxing Cyberspace*, Toronto: Between the Lines

Doyle, E. (2015). Contemporary Issues in Tax Research.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282021169\\_Contemporary\\_Issues\\_in\\_Tax\\_Research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282021169_Contemporary_Issues_in_Tax_Research)

Ejeldsland, O. & Rakner, L. (2003). Taxation and Tax Reforms in Developing countries: Illustrations from SUB-Saharan Africa. Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI Report R 2003^), P. 34

Frankman, M. J. (1996) International taxation: The Trajectory of an Idea from Lorimer to Brandt, *World Development* 24(5): 807-820

Gale, W. G. & Samwick, A. A. (2016). Effects of Income Tax changes on Economic Growth. Brookings.

Gale, W. G. & Harris, B. (2011). Don't Fall for Corporate Repatriation. Brookings, June 27. [www.brookings.edu/opinions/dont-fall-for-corporate-repatriation/](http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/dont-fall-for-corporate-repatriation/).

Gale, W. G. (2013). The Tax favored by Most Economists, Brookings. March 12. [www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/03/12-taxing-carbon-gale](http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/03/12-taxing-carbon-gale).

Gale, W. G. (2012). Why Higher Taxes will have to be part of the Medium- and Long-term Fiscal Solution. Tax Vox (blog). Tax Policy Center, January 23. <http://taxvox.taxpolicycenter.org/2012/01/23/why-higher-taxes-will-have-to-be-part-of-the-medium-and-long-term-fiscal-solution/>.

Graetz, M. (2004). 100 Million Unnecessary Returns: A fresh start for the U.S. tax system, *Yale Law Journal*, 112 : 263–313

Harris, P. (2015). Tax Solution for Developing Countries. University of Cambridge. July 30.

Hoynes, H. (2014). Building on the Success of the Earned Income Tax Credit. Brookings, June 1

- Islam, A. (2001) Issues in Tax Reform. Asia Pacific Development Journal, Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 1 – 12.
- James, K. (2011). Exploring the Origins and Global Rise of VAT. *TAX Analysts*.
- Jianfan, W. (2015). Challenges of International Taxation for Developing Countries. The sixth IMF\_ Japan High- Level Tax Conference for Asian Countries. Tokyo. April 9.
- Krupkin, A. & Gal, W. G. (2015) Major Tax Issues in 2017 pp 1 – 17. March 12.
- Marron, D., Toder, E. & Austin, L. (2015). Taxing Carbon: What, why, and how. Tax Policy Center, June 24. [www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/taxing-carbon-what-why-and-how](http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/taxing-carbon-what-why-and-how).
- Melissa S. Kearney, M. S. & Turner, L. J. (2013). Giving Secondary Earners a Tax Break: A proposal to help low- and middle-income families. *Discussion Paper 2013-07* Hamilton Project, Brookings. [www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads\\_and\\_links/THP\\_Kearney\\_DiscPaper\\_Final.pdf](http://www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads_and_links/THP_Kearney_DiscPaper_Final.pdf).
- Mendez, R. (1992) *International Public Finance: A New Perspective on Global Relations*, Oxford University Press
- Mendez, R. (1997) ‘Financing the United Nations and the International Public Sector’, *Global Governance*, 3: 283-310
- Mendez, R. (2001) ‘The Case for Global Taxes: An Overview’, paper presented to United Nations ad hoc Expert Group Meeting on Innovations in Mobilizing Global Resources for Development, New York, available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.197.6984&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Michalos, A. (1997) *Good Taxes: The Case for Taxing Foreign Currency Exchange and Other Financial Transactions*, Toronto: Dundurn Press
- OECD (2012). Reducing income inequality while boosting economic growth: Can it be done? Economic Policy Reforms 2012. Part 11 Chapter 5.
- OECD (2018). Bas Erosion and Profit Shifting Inclusive Framework outlook. Washington: Brookings.
- Onodugo, V. A. and Anowor, F. O. (2013). An Evaluation of the Contribution of Value Added Tax (Vat) To Resource Mobilization in Nigeria, *European Journal of Business and Management*. 5 (6): 35-40
- Onodugo, V. A., Anowor, O. F., & Ofoegbu, G. N. (2018). The effectiveness of monetary policy in tackling inflation in emerging economy. *Opción (Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela)*, 34(14), 314 – 355.
- Paul, J. and Wahlberg, K. (2002) *Global Taxes for Global Priorities*, Global Policy Forum, WEED and the Heinrich Böll Foundation, available at <http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/216/46027.html>
- Pwc (2016). Recent Global Developments in General anti -avoidance Rules. Tax controversy and Dispute Resolution. Retrieved from [www.pwc.com](http://www.pwc.com). October 14.
- Pwc (2018). Multilateral Instrument for coming into force to change many Tax treaties from 1 January, 2019. Tax Policy Bulletin, pp. 1-13.
- Rubayumya, C. T. (2015). Emerging Issues in International taxation – Challenges and way forward. Uganda Revenue Authority. pp 1-20.
- Sanger, C. & Hanson, R. (2018). The Outlook for Global Policy in 2018. EY Contacts.

- Sen, A. (1999). 'Global Justice, Beyond International Equity', in I. Kaul, I. Grumberg and M. Stern, (eds) *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, New York. Oxford University Press: 116-115.
- Shome, P. (1995) *Global Taxes*, Working Paper No. 5, New Delhi: National Institute of Public Finance and Policy
- Shome, P. and Stotsky, J. (1995) *Financial Transactions Taxes*, IMF Working Paper WP/95/77, Washington DC: IMF
- Singh, B. M. (n. d.) Emerging Issues in International taxation. International Tax Conference, Mumbai, New Delhi.
- Tobin, J. (1974) *The New Economics: One Decade Older*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Tobin, J. (1978) A Proposal for International Monetary Reform', *Eastern Economic Journal* 4(3-4): 153-159
- Toder, E. & Rosenberg, J. (2010). Effects of imposing a Value-added Tax to replace Payroll Taxes or Corporate Taxes. Washington: The Tax Policy Center.
- Toder, E. & Viard, A. (2016). A Proposal to reform the Taxation of Corporate Income. Washington, D.C.: Tax Policy Center.
- Waerzeggers, G. & Hillier, C. (2016). Introducing a General anti – avoidance rule (GAAR). Tax Law IMF Technical Note, pp. 1-12.
- Wahlberg, K. (2005) *Progress on Global Taxes?* Global Policy Forum, available at <http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/216/46020.html> 54
- William G. Gale, W.G. & Harris, B. H. (2013). Proposal 10: Creating an American value-added tax Washington: The Hamilton Project.
- [www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2010/12/pdf/auerbachpaper.pdf](http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2010/12/pdf/auerbachpaper.pdf).
- Yang, J. G.S. & Metllo, V. N. A. (2018). The emerging international taxation problems. *International Journal of Financial Studies*. 1-10.
- Zee, H. & Tanzi, V. (2001). Tax Policy for Developing Countries. *International Monetary Fund*. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/issues/issues27/>
- Ziliak, J. P. (2014). Supporting low-income workers through refundable child-care credits. Brookings.