

# NEWSLETTER



Institute of Public Finance, HR-10000 Zagreb, Katančičeva 5 Croatia

P.O.Box 320, Phone: (385 1) 4819 363; Fax: 4819 365; e-mail: office@ijf.hr; www.ijf.hr

No. 16, January 2005

Vjekoslav Bratić

## How much do tax authorities cost us?

The authorities responsible for collecting tax and customs revenues in Croatia spend an extra 2.2 lipas per kuna of collected revenues. That is the conclusion of research conducted by the Institute of Public Finance.

As we know, all work involves cost. Consequently, the collection of tax and customs revenues involves costs, too. In Croatia, this task is performed by Tax and Customs Administrations<sup>1</sup>. For many years now, the Institute of Public Finance has carried out an analysis of the revenue collection costs borne by these departments<sup>2</sup>. These costs are known as *costs of tax authorities* or *administrative costs of taxation and customs clearance*<sup>3</sup>. The costs of tax and customs authorities are largely financed from the State Budget and, to a smaller extent, from the authorities' own funds.

According to the budgetary classification, costs of tax authorities comprise operating costs (costs of employees, inventory spent, energy, DP equipment etc.), financial and other costs, as well as capital assets procurement costs.

The purpose of the research carried out by the Institute of Public Finance was to quantify the total costs of tax authorities in Croatia in the period 1997-2001, to determine the main characteristics of these costs and to provide recommendations for tax policy. What are the results of the research?

Table 1 Costs of tax authorities as shares of Budget revenue and GDP (in million kuna)

	1997.	1998.	1999.	2000.	2001.
Budget revenue	33.846	43.808	46.357	44.636	53.504
GDP at current prices	123.812	137.604	142.700	157.511	169.800
Tax revenues (excluding contributions)	33.846	33.846	33.846	33.846	33.846
Total costs of tax authorities	33.846	33.846	33.846	33.846	33.846
Costs of tax authorities as a share of					
Budget revenue	2,0	1,8	2,0	1,9	1,5
GDP	0,5	0,6	0,7	0,6	0,5
Tax revenues	2,15	1,96	2,46	2,16	2,05

Source: Monthly Statistical Review of the Ministry of Finance 76/02.

Taken from Bratić i Pitarević (2002).

<sup>1</sup> Tax and customs revenues were also collected by the Financial Police (FP) until its abolishment in May 2001.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. *Financijska teorija i praksa* 24 (2), 2000, pp 169-188 and 28 (3), 2004, pp 271-399; available at: [www.ijf.hr/financijska\\_praksa/2000/2.htm](http://www.ijf.hr/financijska_praksa/2000/2.htm) and [www.ijf.hr/financijska\\_praksa/2004/3.htm](http://www.ijf.hr/financijska_praksa/2004/3.htm).

<sup>3</sup> Besides the costs of tax authorities, there are also costs born by taxpayers. They are further discussed in other publications of the Institute for Public Finance.

The Institute of Public Finance deals with economic research and analysis related to various forms of public finances such as the budget, taxation and customs duties. Its orientation is thus to the various economic, legal and institutional topics that are important for the sound long-term economic development of the Republic of Croatia. So that the public should be able to have a better insight into certain issues, the Institute of Public Finance is launching its Newsletter, in which it will from time to time publish informed and independent analysis of economic questions. The views expressed in the articles published in the Newsletter will reflect the opinions of the authors, which do not necessarily coincide with those of the Institute as institution. Full text of Newsletter is also available on Institute's Web site: <http://www.ijf.hr/newsletter>.

By the estimate of the Institute of Public Finance, the costs of tax authorities in Croatia in the period 1997-2001 averaged 0.6% of GDP. The share of these costs in tax revenues<sup>4</sup>, which was an indicator of the tax administration efficiency, was about 2.2%. What did this actually show? It showed that the authorities responsible for tax and customs revenue collection, i.e. Tax Administration and Customs Administration spent an extra 2.2 lipas per kuna of collected revenues.

The research also demonstrated that all major determinants of the costs of tax authorities (their total level, share in GDP and in Budget revenue) decreased during the last three observed years (1999-2001). The share of the costs of tax authorities in total Budget revenue, which was 1.6% on average, fell from 2% in 1997 to 1.5% in 2001.

(CA) with around 38% and Financial Police (FP) with around 11%.

The total number of employees in tax and customs authorities increased in the period 1999-2001. Employment in these authorities averaged 7,400 during the observed period. The largest number of employees in tax and customs authorities (7,700) was recorded in 2000. The largest department was the Tax Administration with an average number of 3,700 employees. The second largest was the Customs Administration (2,800 employees on average) while the smallest department, until its abolition, was the Financial Police with 660 employees.

We can conclude that there is no good tax or customs policy without efficient tax and customs administrations. The costs of tax authorities are directly influenced by professional skills, motivation, diligence and possible corruption of the Tax and Cu-

*Table 2 Total costs of tax authorities (in million kuna and in %)*

	1997.	%	1998.	%	1999.	%	2000.	%	2001.	%
<b>Tax Administration</b>	390,8	55,0	467,6	57,5	517,9	54,9	498,3	57,7	430,7	52,6
<b>Financial Police*</b>	77,7	11,1	92,6	11,4	120,8	12,8	88,8	10,3	79,9	9,8
<b>Administration</b>	240,8	33,9	253,6	31,1	304,3	32,3	276,8	32,0	308,2	37,6
<b>Total</b>	709,3	100,0	813,8	100,0	943,0	100,0	863,9	100,0	818,8	100,0

\* For Financial Police, the costs covered by own funds throughout the observed period are not shown.

As shown in Table 2, the total absolute costs of tax authorities rose in the first part of the observed period and boomed during 1999. After that, they decreased over the three observed years from HRK 943 million in 1999 to HRK 820 million in 2001.

In the total costs of tax authorities, Tax Administration (TA) participated with the largest share, 51%. It was followed by Customs Administration

stoms Administrations. The assessment of these departments' efficiency should be based on the costs incurred by them in the course of revenue collection. The results obtained are significant (the costs account for 0.6% of GDP, 2.2% of tax revenues and 1.6% of total Budget revenues). However, in order to see how realistic these indicators are and whether they imply high or low values, a comparison should

*Table 3 Number of employees in tax and customs authorities*

Number of employees	1997.	%	1998.	%	1999.	%	2000.	%	2001.	%
<b>TA</b>	3.285	48,5	3.679	50,3	3.915	51,4	3.956	51,3	3.814	51,7
<b>FP</b>	820	12,1	846	11,5	873	11,0	872	11,3	700*	9,5
<b>CA</b>	2 670	39,4	2 795	38,2	2 861	37,6	2 885	37,4	2859	38,8
<b>Total</b>	6.775	100,0	7.320	100,0	7.613	100,0	7.713	100,0	7.373*	100,0

\* As the data on the number of employees in FP during 2001 did not exist, we used the data from Vjesnik of 25 May 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Excluding social security contributions

## How much do tax authorities cost us?

---

be made with the research results in similar countries, which is currently impossible.

It needs emphasising that in the last three observed years all major determinants of the costs of tax authorities (the share in GDP and the shares in Budget and tax revenues) decreased. These trends are favourable, but both Tax and Customs Administrations should continue to reduce their costs and increase efficiency in the next period. In order to increase their efficiency, the Tax and Customs Administrations must do the following:

- Improve communication with tax and customs payers;
- Establish special departments for developing closer relationships with taxpayers (particularly big taxpayers);
- Increase the level of staff specialisation;
- Provide incentives for employees by offering them performance-related pay, further education and professional advancement opportunities; avoid employment discrimination.