

Title: An Exact Analytical Grossing-Up Algorithm for Tax-Benefit Models

Authors: Verbič Miroslav, Čok Mitja, Turk Tomaž

The final version of this preprint (working paper) was published in an article entitled *An Exact Analytical Grossing-Up Algorithm for Tax-Benefit Models* in the journal *Informatica*.

URL: <http://www.informatica.si/index.php/informatica/article/view/748/594>

Suggested citation:

Verbič Miroslav, Čok Mitja, Turk Tomaž: An Exact Analytical Grossing-Up Algorithm for Tax-Benefit Models. *Informatica*, 39(2015), 1, pp. 23-34.



Inštitut za ekonomska raziskovanja
Institute for Economic Research

**AN EXACT ANALYTICAL
GROSSING-UP ALGORITHM FOR
TAX-BENEFIT MODELS**

*Miroslav Verbič
Mitja Čok
Tomaž Turk*

WORKING PAPER No. 85, 2015

April, 2015

Miroslav Verbič¹, Mitja Čok², Tomaž Turk³

AN EXACT ANALYTICAL GROSSING-UP ALGORITHM FOR TAX-BENEFIT MODELS

Printed by the Institute for Economic Research – IER
Copyright retained by the authors.

Number of copies – 50 pieces

WORKING PAPER No. 85, 2015

Editor of the WP series: Boris Majcen.

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

330.4:336.22

VERBIČ, Miroslav

An exact analytical grossing-up algorithms for tax-benefit models / Miroslav Verbič, Mitja Čok, Tomaž Turk. - Ljubljana : Inštitut za ekonomska raziskovanja = Institute for Economic Research, 2015. - (Working paper / Inštitut za ekonomska raziskovanja, ISSN 1581-8063 ; no. 85)

ISBN 978-961-6906-32-6

1. Čok, Mitja 2. Turk, Tomaž, 1966-
279747840

¹ University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Economics & Institute for Economic Research, Ljubljana, Slovenia; miroslav.verbic@ef.uni-lj.si

² University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Economics, Ljubljana, Slovenija; mitja.cok@ef.uni-lj.si

³ University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Economics, Ljubljana, Slovenija; tomaz.turk@ef.uni-lj.si

Abstract

In this paper, we are proposing a grossing-up algorithm which allows for gross income calculation on the basis of tax rules and observed variables in the sample. The algorithm is applicable in tax-benefit microsimulation models which are mostly used by taxation policy makers, to support government legislative processes. Typically, tax-benefit microsimulation models are based on datasets, where only the net income is known, but the data about gross income is needed to successfully simulate the impact of taxation policies to the economy. The algorithm that we are proposing allows for an exact reproduction of a missing variable by applying a set of taxation rules which are known to refer to the variable in question and to other variables in the dataset during the data generation process. Researchers and policy makers can adapt the proposed algorithm with respect to the rules and variables in their legislative environment which allows for the complete and exact restoration of the missing variable. The algorithm incorporates an estimation of partial analytical solutions and a trial-and-error approach to find the initial true value. Its validity was proven by a set of tax rules combinations at different levels of income which are used in contemporary tax systems. The algorithm is generally applicable for data imputation on datasets derived from tax systems around the world.

Keywords: deductive data imputation; household budget survey; tax-benefit models

1. Introduction

There are various techniques for data imputation which give to the researcher an opportunity to remedy the situation when the dataset is not complete. This doesn't come without costs, since data imputation can easily introduce biased parameter estimates in statistical applications (see, for instance Rancourt (2007) and Rueda et al. (2005)) or other domains (Smirilis, 2006). Imputation techniques rely on deterministic and stochastic approaches, mostly under the assumption that the variable in question is in some way related to other variables under investigation. In this paper, we are exploring a case of deductive approach (Franklin et. al., 2003), a possibility to estimate a missing variable by applying a set of rules for which it is known that they refer to the variable in question and to other variables in the dataset. This set of rules might be enforced in various contexts, for instance by legislation, government policy, or other institutional or social constraints. If there is a consistent set of rules which are enforced in practice, and the rules are comprehensive, the researcher could develop a formal algorithm with respect to the rules and variables in the dataset, which would allow for the data imputation of the missing variable.

Let's consider the case of household budget survey (hereinafter HBS) datasets. HBS surveys are implemented at the national level of EU member states (Fuest et al., 2008), where taxpayers report their net income for different income sources (e.g. wages, rents, pensions) as well as socio-economic data which enable estimations of tax allowances and tax credits. HBS datasets are most valuable in many microsimulation tax-benefit models. Such models are standard tools in academia, in financial industry, and for underpinning everyday policy decisions and government legislative processes (Immervoll et al., 2001; D'Amuri et al., 2009; Betti et al., 2011; ISER, 2012).

Gross income represents a starting point for any tax simulation (including tax-benefit modeling), but HBS datasets are usually reporting only net amounts. As Immervoll & O'Donoghue (2001) note, one possibility to generate gross income is the *statistical approach* based on information on both net and gross income. Using this information, a statistical model can be developed that yields estimates of net/gross ratios. These estimates are then applied to net incomes in order to compute gross amounts.

The second known technique is the *iterative algorithm* which exploits the tax and contribution rules already built into tax-benefit models to convert gross income into net income (D'Amuri et al., 2009; Betti et al., 2011). The procedure takes different levels of gross income for each observation, applies them to the tax rules, calculates the net income and compares it with the actual net income as long as the gross income fits the actual net income within approximation limits.

Both techniques, namely the statistical approach and iterative algorithm, give gross income values which are estimates and not the actual gross income values. The task is not trivial, since modern tax systems include various rules for taxation and their combinations, and they usually involve bracketing system for one or more parameters. Involvement of bracketing systems (especially their combination) means that the calculation of net income from gross income is analytically non-reversible function.

In this paper, we are presenting a solution to this problem, namely an algorithm which enables a full restoration of gross income value. The algorithm includes a set of analytical inversions

combined with a trial-and-error approach to deal with bracketing systems combinations. The proposed algorithm allows for the calculation of gross income from net income for a broad set of taxation possibilities where only information on net income is available, along with information about tax reliefs. The algorithm is feasible in cases of proportional and progressive tax schedules of personal income tax (hereinafter PIT) and social security contributions. It also covers tax allowances as well as tax credits. It is thereby generally applicable to contemporary tax systems around the world.

The validity and accuracy of the proposed algorithm was tested by its application to a synthetic sample of taxpayers using an artificial system of personal income tax (PIT) and social security contributions. A comparison of gross income, calculated from net income using the proposed technique, with the initial gross income demonstrates the complete accuracy of the algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we analyse taxation rules which are used in contemporary taxation systems. The analysis is a basis for the formalization of the imputation algorithm, which is explained in Section 3, including detailed solutions and proofs for various combinations of tax rules and bracketing systems. A test of the validity and accuracy of the proposed algorithm is presented in Section 4. In the conclusion, the proposed algorithm is presented in its full form, which can be directly applied in practice.

2. Analysis of taxation rules

Gross income is a starting point for the taxation of personal income, as to which we can distinguish three basic approaches (Zee, 2005; OECD, 2006): comprehensive income tax; dual income tax; and flat tax. Under a comprehensive income tax system, all types of labor and capital incomes are taxed uniformly by the same progressive tax schedule. A dual income tax system retains progressive rates on labor income, while introducing a proportional tax rate on capital income (e.g. the Scandinavian dual income tax (Sorenson, 2005)). The third option, which has been dominating income tax reforms in Eastern Europe (Ivanova et al., 2005; Moore, 2005), is the flat-tax concept, although it is noted that this concept has not been implemented in any country in Western Europe (Fuest et al., 2008).

Hereby we follow the most comprehensive procedure for the taxation of gross income, which is presented in Table 1 and includes a combination of progressive tax schedules and flat rates, with the addition of tax allowances and tax credits.

Table 1 contains the general procedure for the taxation of gross income. From gross income, employee social security contributions and other costs related to the acquisition of income (e.g. travel allowances or standardized costs set as a proportion of gross income) are deducted. Further, the tax allowances are subtracted and the tax base is obtained, which is subject to a PIT calculation using the tax schedule or a proportional (flat) tax rate. In this way, the initial PIT is calculated, which could be further reduced by a tax credit in order to calculate the final PIT and the net income.

From the taxation point of view, other costs related to the acquisition of income have consequences identical to social security contributions or tax allowances. Therefore, our further development implicitly incorporates these costs into the concepts of social security contributions and tax allowances.

Gross income
- Social security contributions ^a
- determined by the social security contributions schedule
- set as a proportion of gross income
- given in absolute amounts
- Other costs related to the acquisition of net income
- determined by a schedule
- set as a proportion of gross income
- given in absolute amounts
- Tax allowances
= Tax base
Initial PIT
- Tax credit
Final PIT
= Net income

^a Employee social security contributions

Table 1: General procedure for taxing gross income

When the schedules are applied, the PIT schedule or social security contributions schedule consists of a number of tax brackets with different marginal tax rates. The amount of PIT is calculated from the tax base according to the PIT schedule. Likewise, the amount of social security contributions is determined by gross income and the social security contributions schedule.

In general, at the annual level tax bases from different income sources are summed up into a single tax base, which is subject to a single tax schedule (or a single flat rate), and then the final annual PIT is calculated. An alternative option is a dual-tax system where the PIT is calculated separately for different income sources.

During the year, when a particular income source is paid out, the advance (in-year) PIT is usually paid at the time of disbursing the income source. This advance PIT is taken into account once the final annual PIT is calculated (i.e. advance PIT is consolidated with the annual PIT).

Understanding the mechanism of (in-year) advance PIT is important when we are dealing with survey data such as HBS datasets. In a typical survey, respondents report their net income from different income sources for a certain period of the year, when their income sources are only subject to (in-year) advance PIT. In order to calculate the overall annual gross income, the reported net income from different income sources should be initially grossed-up using the algorithms that take account of various rules of advance (in-year) PIT and social security contributions for each income source separately. The focus of our paper is

the development of these grossing-up algorithms for different income sources. Once the grossed-up amounts from different income sources are calculated, they can be summed up into overall taxpayers' annual gross income, which is the starting point for building a microsimulation model.

Table 1 can be transformed into the following equation:

$$N = G - S - PIT \quad (1)$$

N and G represent the net and gross income (respectively), S is the sum of social security contributions and PIT is the personal income tax.

S is a function of the gross income. Similarly, PIT is a function of the tax base, which is the difference between gross income (reduced by social security contributions) and tax allowances, TA . This can be generalized as follows:

$$N = G - f_S(G) - f_{PIT}(G - f_S(G) - TA) \quad (2)$$

Function $f_S(G)$ can be defined in practice in different ways. A common approach is to use a schedule system, but it can also be defined as a proportion of gross income or as an absolute amount.

In practice, function $f_{PIT}(G - f_S(G) - TA)$ is usually defined by a schedule system (different from the schedule system for social security contributions). As mentioned, f_{PIT} can also incorporate the concept of a tax credit.

Our task is to estimate gross income G from (2) from the known values of N and TA and from a set of constraints that are usually given by social security contributions and PIT schedule systems, or by other legislative rules. The combination of two schedule systems makes solving equation (2) for G particularly challenging. The solution we propose in this paper has a trial-and-error nature. The idea is to prepare a set of all possible (PIT and social security contributions) bracket combinations. Then, for each taxpayer we calculate 'candidate' gross income values for each bracket combination, calculate net incomes from these candidate gross incomes, and compare the results to the starting value of net income. The gross income candidate that fits (or equals) the net income is the true gross income value. The fit is exact, i.e. we find the actual gross income in a non-iterative way.

The following section describes the construction and design of the procedures we propose to deal with different income sources taxed by different rules. The general setup of grossing-up algorithm is explained. Sections 3.2 and 3.3 set out a detailed examination of various taxation rules for social security contributions and tax crediting, together with the proposed grossing-up procedures for specific tax rules combinations.

3. Data imputation algorithm

In this section, we explore a general setup where the tax system involves a combination of the following elements:

- a social security contributions schedule;
- a PIT schedule; and
- tax allowances.

This general setup forms the basis for the development of the proposed algorithm. In the next steps, we incorporate other tax complexities, i.e. other rules for calculating social security contributions and various rules for determining tax credits.

Function $f_S(G)$ can be expanded by the rules of the social security contributions schedule to:

$$f_S(G) = S = Sr_s(G - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \quad (3)$$

That is, for each bracket, social security contributions are equal to the social security contributions marginal rate Sr_s , multiplied by the difference between gross income G and the lower bracket margin (s denotes the social security contributions bracket). This amount is added to the social security contributions, which are collected for all ‘lower’ brackets (i.e. brackets from 1 to $s - 1$). H_s and L_s denote the upper and lower social security bracket margins.

Similarly, function f_{PIT} can be expanded by the rules of the schedule system for PIT to:

$$f_{PIT}(G) = PIT = Tr_b(G - f_S(G) - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \quad (4)$$

where Tr_b is the marginal tax rate for PIT bracket b , L_b is the lower margin for bracket b , Tr_i is the marginal rate for bracket i , and H_i and L_i are the upper and lower margins of bracket i , respectively.

By combining (3) and (4) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} N_{sb} = & G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - \\ & - \left(Tr_b \left(G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - TA - L_b \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The above equation holds for an individual taxpayer when PIT was calculated by the tax authorities in such a way that social security bracket s corresponds to gross income G , and PIT bracket b corresponds to $(G - S - TA)$. Since we do not know the actual G and S , we cannot directly establish which PIT and social security contributions brackets (and corresponding marginal rates) were actually used for each individual taxpayer by the tax authorities.

By reordering equation (5), we can express gross income as follows:

$$G_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_s L_s - Tr_b L_t + Sr_b Tr_b L_s - Tr_b TA - Tr_b \Sigma_s + \Sigma_s + \Sigma_b}{(Sr_s - 1)(Tr_b - 1)} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\Sigma_b = \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i (H_i - L_i)$$

and

$$\Sigma_s = \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j (H_j - L_j)$$

Following our general trial-and-error scheme, the grossing-up algorithm is as follows:

1. For each statistical unit, calculate the matrix with $S \cdot B$ candidate gross incomes as its elements, according to equation (6):

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_{11} & \dots & G_{S1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G_{1B} & \dots & G_{SB} \end{pmatrix}$$

where S and B are the number of social security contributions brackets and the number of PIT brackets, both defined by the PIT and social security contributions system, respectively, and where $k = 1 \dots S$ and $l = 1 \dots B$.

2. Calculate the net incomes from the matrix of candidate gross incomes according to the tax rules:

$$\begin{pmatrix} N_{11} & \dots & N_{S1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ N_{1B} & \dots & N_{SB} \end{pmatrix}$$

3. In the above matrix, find the net income N_{kl} which is equal to the starting net income for this individual taxpayer:

$$N = N_{kl}$$

4. The actual gross income G for this individual taxpayer is then

$$G = G_{kl}$$

In the next sections, we discuss the following extensions to this general setup:

1. social security contributions are not determined by the schedule system, but as a proportion of gross income or as an absolute amount (Section 3.1); and
2. tax credits are included according to various rules for their determination (Section 3.2).

3.1. Variations of social security contributions

In the following section, we extend the general setup to include cases where social security contributions are not determined by a schedule but as a proportion of gross income or as an absolute amount.

3.1.1. Social security contributions as a proportion of gross income

When social security contributions are set as a proportion of gross income, equation (2) can be rewritten as:

$$N = (1 - Sr)G - f((1 - Sr)G - TA) \quad (7)$$

where Sr is the rate of social security contributions, expressed as a proportion of the gross income. By simplifying equation (5), we obtain:

$$N_b = (1 - Sr)G_b - \left(Tr_b((1 - Sr)G_b - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) \quad (8)$$

which holds for each PIT bracket b . By reordering, we can express the gross income with the equation:

$$G_b = \frac{N_b - Tr_bTA - Tr_bL_b + \Sigma_b}{(1 - Sr) - Tr_b(1 - Sr)} \quad (9)$$

From here, we can proceed according to the general setup.

3.1.2. Social security contributions as an absolute amount

When social security contributions are set as an absolute amount, we can simplify equation (5):

$$N_b = G_b - S - \left(Tr_b(G_b - S - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) \quad (10)$$

and by reordering we obtain

$$G_b = \frac{N_b + S - Tr_b S - Tr_b TA - Tr_b L_b + \Sigma}{1 - Tr_b} \quad (11)$$

From here, we can proceed according to the general setup.

3.2. Grossing-up procedure when PIT is subject to a tax credit

A tax credit means that PIT is reduced by a certain amount (called a tax credit) and that the gross income source is effectively not taxed with the full PIT (the ‘initial PIT’), but with the PIT reduced by the amount of the tax credit (the ‘final PIT’). In practice, if a tax credit is calculated to be greater than the initial PIT then net income N equals gross income G , as the net income cannot exceed the gross income (i.e. a tax credit can be as high as the initial PIT). In various tax systems a tax credit can be defined in three ways:

- as a proportion of the initial PIT;
- as a proportion of the gross income; or
- as an absolute amount.

3.2.1. A tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT

In general, we can express a tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT as:

$$N = G - f_s(G) - f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) + c_{PIT} \cdot f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) \quad (12)$$

where c_{PIT} is the share of the tax credit in the initial PIT. Following the above, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} N_{sb} = & G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - \\ & - \left(Tr_b \left(G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - TA - L_b \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + \\ & + c_{PIT} \left(Tr_b \left(G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - TA - L_b \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which holds for a specific combination of social security contributions and PIT brackets. Solving (13) for G we obtain:

$$G_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_b L_s - Tr_b L_t + c Tr_b L_t + Tr_b Sr_b L_s - c_{PIT} Tr_b Sr_b L_s - Tr_b TA + c_{PIT} Tr_b TA - \Sigma_s (Tr_b (1 - c_{PIT}) - 1) - (c_{PIT} - 1) \Sigma_b}{(1 - Sr_s)(Tr_b(c_{PIT} - 1) + 1)} \quad (14)$$

When the tax credit is set as a proportion of the initial PIT and social security contributions are defined by a schedule, the above equation should be used instead of (6) in the general setup.

A tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT and social security contributions as a proportion of the gross income

Where social security contributions are set as a proportion of the gross income, the general procedure can be simplified. In this case, the net income can be expressed as:

$$N = (1 - Sr)G - f((1 - Sr)G - TA) + c_{PIT} \cdot f((1 - Sr)G - TA) \quad (15)$$

The following equation holds for a particular tax bracket b :

$$N_b = (1 - Sr)G_b - \left(Tr_b((1 - Sr)G_b - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + c_{PIT} \left(Tr_b((1 - Sr)G_b - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) \quad (16)$$

By reordering we obtain:

$$G_b = \frac{N_b - (1 - c_{PIT})(Tr_b L_b + Tr_b TA - \Sigma_b)}{(1 - Sr)(1 - Tr_b + c_{PIT} Tr_b)} \quad (17)$$

Thus, when a tax credit is set as a proportion of the initial PIT and social security contributions are set as a proportion of the gross income the above equation should be used instead of (6) in the general setup.

A tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT and social security contributions as an absolute amount

If social security contributions are set as an absolute amount, we can redefine equation (10) to incorporate tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT:

$$N_b = G_{sb} - S - \left(Tr_b(G_b - S - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + c_{PIT} \left(Tr_b(G_b - S - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) \quad (18)$$

and by reordering we obtain

$$G_b = \frac{N_b + S + (c_{PIT} - 1)(Tr_b L_b + Tr_b S + Tr_b TA - \Sigma_b)}{(1 - Tr_b + c_{PIT} Tr_b)} \quad (19)$$

Thus, when a tax credit is set as a proportion of the initial PIT and social security contributions are set in an absolute amount the above equation should be used instead of (6) in the general setup.

3.2.2. A tax credit as a proportion of the gross income

If the amount of a tax credit is defined as a proportion of the gross income, the net income calculation can be formalized as:

$$N = G - f_s(G) - f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) + c_G \cdot G \quad (20)$$

where c_G is the tax credit share of the gross income. For clarity, we can denote the initial PIT as:

$$PIT_I = f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) \quad (21)$$

and the final PIT as:

$$PIT_F = f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - c_G \cdot G \quad (22)$$

Since a tax credit can be as high as the initial PIT, the following rule applies:

$$N = \begin{cases} G - f_s(G) - PIT_F & \text{if } c_G \cdot G < PIT_I \\ G - f_s(G) & \text{if } c_G \cdot G \geq PIT_I \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Due to this rule, the gross income cannot be easily estimated from net income N and tax allowances TA since PIT_I and $c_G \cdot G$ are not known at this stage. The rule implies that the actual calculation of net income N for each taxpayer was done by the tax authorities either by:

$$N = G - f_s(G) - f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) + c_G \cdot G \quad (24)$$

when $c_G \cdot G < f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA)$, or by:

$$N = G - f_s(G) \quad (25)$$

when $c_G \cdot G \geq f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA)$.

When we are interested in G , we can use these two approaches in reverse fashion (calculating G and not N), but we do not know which one (24 or 25) is correct.

Let us consider the case when we calculate G for a particular taxpayer from known values of N , TA and the PIT schedule (as in Table 1), once by using the rule expressed in equation (24) and once by using the rule expressed in (25). We obtain two estimates for the taxpayer's gross income G :

$$G' = N + f_s(G) + f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - c_G \cdot G \quad (26)$$

and

$$G'' = N + f_s(G) \quad (27)$$

If net income N for this particular taxpayer was actually calculated according to (24), this inequality holds true:

$$(N + f_s(G) + f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - c_G \cdot G) > (N + f_s(G)) \quad (28)$$

since $c_G \cdot G < f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA)$ must hold. By using (26) and (27) we obtain

$$G' > G'' \quad (29)$$

The proper value of gross income G is G' since net income N for this particular taxpayer was actually calculated according to (24).

Let us consider the opposite case where net income N for our taxpayer was actually calculated (by the tax authorities) according to (25). In this case, we can write:

$$(N + f_s(G) + f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - c_G \cdot G) \leq (N + f_s(G)) \quad (30)$$

since $c_G \cdot G \geq f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA)$ must hold. By using (26) and (27) we obtain:

$$G' \leq G'' \quad (31)$$

The proper value of gross income G in this case is G'' . Following (29) and (31) we can conclude that in both cases the highest value of G' and G'' is the one that actually holds:

$$G = \max(G', G'') \quad (32)$$

or

$$G = \max((N + f_s(G) + f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - c_G \cdot G), (N + f_s(G))) \quad (33)$$

For the construction of a general setup in the case of tax credits given as a proportion of the gross income, where social security contributions and PIT are calculated according to their schedules, we need to express equation (33) in a more exact way, for a specific combination of social security contribution and PIT brackets. The specific form for equation (26) is then:

$$\begin{aligned} N_{sb} = & G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - \\ & - \left(Tr_b \left(G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - TA - L_b \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) - c_G G_{sb} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

and for equation (27):

$$N_{sb} = G_{sb} - Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \quad (35)$$

From (34) we obtain:

$$G'_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_s L_s - Tr_b \Sigma_s - Tr_b L_b + Sr_b Tr_b L_s - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_s + \Sigma_b}{1 + c_G - Sr_b - Tr_b + Sr_b Tr_b} \quad (36)$$

and from (35):

$$G''_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_b L_s + \Sigma_s}{1 - Sr_b} \quad (37)$$

According to (32), we can establish the right value for gross income G_{sb} :

$$G_{sb} = \max(G'_{sb}, G''_{sb}) \quad (38)$$

A tax credit as a proportion of the gross income and social security contributions as a proportion of the gross income

Where social security contributions are set as a proportion of the gross income, the calculation of net income N for each taxpayer was done by the tax authorities either by

$$N = (1 - Sr)G - f_{PIT}((1 - Sr)G - TA) + c_G \cdot G \quad (39)$$

when $c_G \cdot G < f_{PIT}((1 - Sr)G - TA)$, or by:

$$N = (1 - Sr)G \quad (40)$$

when $c_G \cdot G \geq f_{PIT}((1 - Sr)G - TA)$. The reasoning is similar to that above where we constructed equations (34) and (35). These two equations can be simplified since we only have one social security contributions rate Sr , and we obtain:

$$N_b = (1 - Sr)G_b - \left(Tr_b((1 - Sr)G_b - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + c_G G_b \quad (41)$$

and

$$N_b = (1 - Sr)G_b \quad (42)$$

From this, we obtain two solutions for G_b :

$$G'_b = \frac{N_b - Tr_b L_b - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{1 + c_G - Sr - Tr_b + Sr Tr_b} \quad (43)$$

and

$$G''_b = \frac{N_b}{1 - Sr} \quad (44)$$

which should be used in the general setup instead of (36) and (37), respectively. Again, the matrix of candidate solutions is one-dimensional (a vector for gross income candidates, i.e. one value for each PIT bracket) since there is only one social security contributions rate.

A tax credit as a proportion of the gross income and social security contributions as an absolute amount

In this case, the procedure can follow the same principles we used to construct equations (34) and (35). Since social security contributions are now set as an absolute amount, these two equations can be simplified in this way:

$$N_b = G_b - S - \left(Tr_b(G_b - S - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + c_G G_b \quad (45)$$

$$N_b = G_b - S \quad (46)$$

The gross income for both cases can then be calculated from:

$$G'_b = \frac{N_b + S - Tr_b L_b - Tr_b S - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{1 + c_G - Tr_b} \quad (47)$$

and

$$G''_b = N_b + S \quad (48)$$

which should be used in the general setup instead of (36) and (37), respectively.

3.2.3. A tax credit as an absolute amount

If the amount of a tax credit is defined as an absolute amount, the procedure is similar to the one described in Section 2.3.2. The net income can be expressed as:

$$N = G - f_S(G) - f_{PIT}(G - f_S(G) - TA) + C \quad (49)$$

where C is the amount of the tax credit. The initial PIT is the same as in Section 2.3.2 (equation (21)) and the final PIT is

$$PIT_F = f_{PIT}(G - f_S(G) - TA) - C \quad (50)$$

The following rule applies:

$$N = \begin{cases} G - f_S(G) - PIT_F & \text{if } C < PIT_I \\ G - f_S(G) & \text{if } C \geq PIT_I \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

If net income N for a particular taxpayer was actually calculated (by the tax authorities) according to $C < PIT_I$ in (51), this inequality holds true:

$$(N + f_s(G) + f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - C) > (N + f_s(G)) \quad (52)$$

since $C < f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA)$ must hold. In the opposite case, i.e. if net income N was calculated according to $C \geq PIT_t$, then

$$(N + f_s(G) + f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - C) \leq (N + f_s(G)) \quad (53)$$

since $C \geq f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA)$ must hold.

Following a similar reasoning to that in Section 2.3.2, we can conclude that the actual gross income G for a particular taxpayer must be:

$$G = \max\left((N + f_s(G) + f_{PIT}(G - f_s(G) - TA) - C), (N + f_s(G))\right) \quad (54)$$

G' can be estimated from

$$\begin{aligned} N_{sb} = & G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - \\ & - \left(Tr_b \left(G_{sb} - \left(Sr_s(G_{sb} - L_s) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} Sr_j(H_j - L_j) \right) - TA - L_b \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + C \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

and solving for G_{sb} :

$$G'_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} + C + Sr_s L_s + Tr_b L_b - Sr_s Tr_b L_s + Tr_b TA + Tr_b \Sigma_s - \Sigma_s - \Sigma_b}{(Sr_s - 1)(Tr_b - 1)} \quad (56)$$

whereas the estimation of G'' is already explained in (36) and (38).

We can conclude that the general setup in cases where the amount of a tax credit is defined as an absolute amount is the same as that described in Section 2.3.2, except for equation (36) which should be substituted by (56).

A tax credit as an absolute amount and social security contributions as a proportion of the gross income

Where when social security contributions are set as a proportion of the gross income, the calculation of net income N for each taxpayer was done by the tax authorities either by

$$N = (1 - Sr)G - f_{PIT}((1 - Sr)G - TA) + C \quad (57)$$

when $C < f_{PIT}((1 - Sr)G - TA)$, or by:

$$N = (1 - Sr)G \quad (58)$$

when $C \geq f_{PIT}((1-Sr)G - TA)$. The reasoning is similar to that in Section 2.3.2. Equation (41) can be rewritten as:

$$N_b = (1-Sr)G_b - \left(Tr_b((1-Sr)G_b - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + C \quad (59)$$

and from this, we can obtain:

$$G'_b = \frac{N_b - C - Tr_b L_b - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{(Sr-1)(Tr_b-1)} \quad (60)$$

which should be used in the general setup instead of (43), whereas equation (44) also applies in this case for obtaining G''_b . Again, the matrix of candidate solutions is one-dimensional (a vector for gross income candidates, i.e. one value for each PIT bracket).

A tax credit as an absolute amount and social security contributions as an absolute amount

In this case, the procedure can follow the same principle we introduced in Section 2.3.2. Since social security contributions are given as an absolute amount, equation (34) can be written in this way:

$$N_b = G_b - S - \left(Tr_b(G_b - S - TA - L_b) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} Tr_i(H_i - L_i) \right) + C \quad (61)$$

whereas equation (46) also holds in the case social security contributions are set as an absolute amount. The gross income can then be calculated from (61) as:

$$G'_b = \frac{N_b - C + S - Tr_b L_b - Tr_b S - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{1 - Tr_b} \quad (62)$$

which should be used in the general setup instead of (36), together with (48), which was derived from (46).

3.3. Algorithm in its full form

For clarity, the grossing-up procedure we developed in the above sub-sections is given below, including all combinations of the taxation rules that we described in the sections following the basic setup at the beginning of Section 3.

1. For each statistical unit, calculate the matrix of $S \cdot B$ candidate gross incomes according to equation (6):

$$G = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} G_{11} & \cdots & G_{S1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G_{1B} & \cdots & G_{SB} \end{array} \right\}$$

where S and B are the number of social security contribution brackets and the number of tax brackets, both defined by the tax and social security contribution systems, respectively, where $k = 1 \dots S$ and $l = 1 \dots B$. Formulas for specific combinations of taxation rules can be found in Table 2.

In cases where only the tax schedule system is used and social security contributions related to the acquisition of the income are set as one parameter, the above matrix of candidate gross incomes becomes a vector $\{G_1 \dots G_l \dots G_B\}$.

2. Calculate the net incomes from the matrix of candidate gross incomes according to the tax rules:

$$N = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} N_{11} & \cdots & N_{S1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ N_{1B} & \cdots & N_{SB} \end{array} \right\}$$

(or $\{N_1 \dots N_l \dots N_B\}$)

3. In the above matrix, find net income N_{kl} (or N_l) which is equal to the starting net income:

$$N = N_{kl}$$

(or $N = N_l$)

4. The actual gross income G is then

$$G = G_{kl}$$

(or $G = G_l$)

A system without tax credits		
I	Schedule for social security contributions	$G_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_s L_s - Tr_b L_t + Sr_b Tr_b L_s - Tr_b TA - Tr_b \Sigma_s + \Sigma_s + \Sigma_b}{(Sr_s - 1)(Tr_b - 1)}$ (6)
II	Social security contributions as a proportion of gross income	$G_b = \frac{N_b - Tr_b TA - Tr_b L_b + \Sigma_b}{(1 - Sr) - Tr_b (1 - Sr)}$ (9)
III	Social security contributions as an absolute amount	$G_b = \frac{N_b + S - Tr_b S - Tr_b TA - Tr_b L_b + \Sigma}{1 - Tr_b}$ (11)
A tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT		
IV	Schedule for social security contributions	$G_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_b L_s - Tr_b L_t + c_{PIT} Tr_b L_t + Tr_b Sr_b L_s - c_{PIT} Tr_b Sr_b L_s - Tr_b TA + c_{PIT} Tr_b TA - \Sigma_s (Tr_b (1 - c_{PIT}) - 1) - (c_{PIT} - 1) \Sigma_b}{(1 - Sr_s)(Tr_b (c_{PIT} - 1) + 1)}$ (14)
V	Social security contributions as a proportion of gross income	$G_b = \frac{N_b - (1 - c_{PIT})(Tr_b L_b + Tr_b TA - \Sigma_b)}{(1 - Sr)(1 - Tr_b + c_{PIT} Tr_b)}$ (17)
VI	Social security contributions as an absolute amount	$G_b = \frac{N_b + S + (c_{PIT} - 1)(Tr_b L_b + Tr_b S + Tr_b TA - \Sigma_b)}{(1 - Tr_b + c_{PIT} Tr_b)}$ (19)

		A tax credit as a proportion of gross income	
VII	Schedule for social security contributions	$G_{sb} = \max(G'_{sb}, G''_{sb})$	(38)
		$G'_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_s L_s - Tr_b \Sigma_s - Tr_b L_b + Sr_b Tr_b L_s - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_s + \Sigma_b}{1 + c_G - Sr_b - Tr_b + Sr_b Tr_b}$	(36)
		$G''_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_b L_s + \Sigma_s}{1 - Sr_b}$	(37)
VIII	Social security contributions as a proportion of gross income	$G_b = \max(G'_b, G''_b)$	(38)
		$G'_b = \frac{N_b - Tr_b L_b - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{1 + c_G - Sr - Tr_b + Sr Tr_b}$	(43)
		$G''_b = \frac{N_b}{1 - Sr}$	(44)
IX	Social security contributions as an absolute amount	$G_b = \max(G'_b, G''_b)$	(38)
		$G'_b = \frac{N_b + S + Tr_b L_b - Tr_b S - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{1 - c_G - Tr_b}$	(47)
		$G''_b = N_b + S$	(48)

		A tax credit as an absolute amount	
X	Schedule for social security contributions	$G_{sb} = \max(G'_{sb}, G''_{sb})$	(38)
		$G'_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} + C + Sr_s L_s + Tr_b L_b - Sr_s Tr_b L_s + Tr_b TA + Tr_b \Sigma_s - \Sigma_s - \Sigma_b}{(Sr_s - 1)(Tr_b - 1)}$	(56)
		$G''_{sb} = \frac{N_{sb} - Sr_b L_s + \Sigma_s}{1 - Sr_b}$	(37)
XI	Social security contributions as a proportion of gross income	$G_b = \max(G'_b, G''_b)$	(38)
		$G'_b = \frac{N_b - C - Tr_b L_b - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{(Sr - 1)(Tr_b - 1)}$	(60)
		$G''_b = \frac{N_b}{1 - Sr}$	(44)
XII	Social security contributions as an absolute amount	$G_b = \max(G'_b, G''_b)$	(38)
		$G'_b = \frac{N_b - C + S - Tr_b L_b - Tr_b S - Tr_b TA + \Sigma_b}{1 - Tr_b}$	(62)
		$G''_b = N_b + S$	(48)

Table 2: Equations for specific combinations of taxation rules

4. Results and discussion

Table 3 presents a summary of all possible social security contributions and tax credit combinations explored in Section 3. In reality, for any income source one of these combinations is applicable. Parallel to this, the PIT schedule system and tax allowances in absolute amounts are assumed. Our approach can also be applied to flat PIT systems (i.e. with a single proportional PIT rate). If this is a case, we apply only one PIT bracket with a positive marginal PIT rate. Where tax allowances are not set as absolute amounts, they can be expressed as an ‘additional layer’ of social security contributions.

	Schedule for social security contributions	Social security contributions as a proportion of the gross income	Social security contributions as an absolute amount
System without tax credits	I	II	III
Tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT	IV	V	VI
Tax credit as a proportion of the gross income	VII	VIII	IX
Tax credit as an absolute amount	X	XI	XII

Table 3: Summary of tax rules combinations (detailed equations are given in Table 4)

To test for the validity and accuracy of the proposed algorithm, we created a synthetic sample of 10,000 taxpayers with a normally distributed gross income, where the mean gross income was 50,000 mu (monetary units) and the standard deviation 11,500 mu. We assumed the following tax parameters:

1. The PIT schedule includes three brackets:
 - 0 – 20,000 mu; a 15% marginal PIT rate
 - 20,000 – 50,000 mu; a 25% marginal PIT rate
 - over 50,000 mu; a 45% marginal PIT rate.
2. The social security schedule includes three brackets:
 - 0 – 10,000 mu; a 17% marginal rate
 - 10,000 – 40,000 mu; a 20% marginal rate
 - over 40,000 mu; a 0% marginal rate.

3. Social security contributions as a proportion of the gross income were set at 22%.
4. Social security contributions as an absolute amount were set at 500 mu.
5. Tax allowances were set at an absolute amount of 2,000 mu.
6. The amounts of tax credits were given as follows:
 - 13% of the gross income;
 - 6% of the initial PIT; or
 - 200 mu.

These parameters were applied to the entire population of taxpayers according to the general procedure for taxing gross income (Table 1) and the specific combination of tax rules from Table 3.

In the first step, we generated the amount of gross income for each taxpayer. In the second step, we calculated the net income according to combinations I to XII (from Table 3) of the tax rules, as is done in practice by tax authorities.

In the third step, we applied the proposed grossing-up algorithm to combinations I – XII for each taxpayer. Finally, we compared the grossed-up income with the initial gross income.

The comparison of the gross income, calculated from the net income using the grossing-up algorithm, with the initial gross income demonstrates the complete accuracy of the algorithm for all income types.

As an example, we can repeat the steps for an individual taxpayer with a gross income equal to 49,433.10 mu. In the second step, we calculated the net income amount for all 12 combinations of the tax rules (see Table 4).

	Schedule for social security contributions	Social security contributions as a proportion of the gross income	Social security contributions as an absolute amount
System without tax credits	33,799.80 (I)	31,418.30 (II)	39,199.80 (III)
Tax credit as a proportion of the initial PIT	34,275.80 (IV)	31,846.70 (V)	39,783.80 (VI)
Tax credit as a proportion of the gross income	40,226.10 (VII)	37,844.60 (VIII)	45,626.10 (IX)
Tax credit as an absolute amount	33,999.80 (X)	31,618.30 (XI)	39,399.80 (XII)

Table 4: Net income for a chosen taxpayer with $G = 49,433.10$ mu

For each net income from Table 4 we applied the grossing-up algorithm (i.e. equations from Table 2). According to the technique, several gross income candidates were calculated for each of these net incomes. Due to space limitations, here we (arbitrarily) present the gross income candidates for net income VII:

$$G^{VII} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} 48,465.20 & 50,134.40 & 48,465.20 \\ 49,907.60 & 51,371.40 & 49,907.60 \\ 47,926.10 & 49,433.10 & 47,926.10 \end{array} \right\}$$

To each of these gross income candidates we applied the taxation rules (in this case the combination of taxation rules VII) and calculated the net income:

$$N^{VII} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} 39,374.40 & 40,843.20 & 39,374.40 \\ 40,643.70 & 41,931.80 & 40,643.70 \\ 38,900.00 & 40,226.10 & 38,900.00 \end{array} \right\}$$

By comparing the elements of matrix N^{VII} with the net income for a combination of tax rules VII from Table 4, which equals 40,226.10 (VII), we identified the matching element in the third row and the second column. The corresponding gross income in matrix G^{VII} equals 49,433.10, which is identical to the initial gross income of this particular taxpayer. In other words, for this combination of tax rules (VII), the proposed grossing-up algorithm is accurate. We repeated such tests for all 12 tax rule combinations and for 10,000 individual cases.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a detailed construction of deterministic data imputation algorithm. In particular, we described an exact grossing-up algorithm for calculating the pre-tax income from data which are only available in net (after-tax) form, and proved that it is successful since it leads to a complete data reconstruction.

Contemporary tax systems are rich in complexity, and some of tax rules combinations might not be covered by our technique. However, we believe that the general architecture of our proposition is sound and flexible enough to incorporate additional, locally specific tax rules.

In general, if a set of rules which relates to the variables under investigation could be assembled, researchers and policy makers can perform data imputation in deterministic fashion, and construct the algorithm for the exact analytical generation of the missing values. In future research efforts, a framework for feasibility assessment of such approach could be envisioned, which would employ estimates on rules' consistency and complexity on the one hand, and measures of the quality of replicated data on the other hand.

6. References

- Betti, G., Donatiello, G. & Verma, V. (2011) The Siena microsimulation model (SM2) for net-gross conversion of EU-silc income variables. *International Journal of Microsimulation*, 4 35-53.
- D'Amuri, F. & Fiorio, C. V. (2009) Grossing-Up and Validation Issues in an Italian Tax-Benefit Microsimulation Model. *Econpubblica Working Paper*, 117, Milano: University of Milan.
- EUROSTAT, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/household_budget_surveys/policy_context (April 16th, 2012).
- Franklin, S. & Walker, C. (2003) *Survey methods and practices*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Fuest, C., Peichl, A. & Schaefer, T. (2008) Is a flat tax reform feasible in a grown-up democracy of Western Europe? A simulation study for Germany. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 15, 620–636.
- Immervoll, H. & O'Donoghue, C. (2001) Imputation of gross amounts from net incomes in household surveys: an application using EUROMOD, *EUROMOD Working Papers EM1/01*. Colchester: ISER-Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- Ivanova, A., Keen, M. & Klemm, A. (2005) The Russian 'flat tax' reform. *Economic Policy* 20, 397–444.
- ISER – Institute for Social and Economic Research, <https://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/euromod> (April 16th, 2012)
- Moore, D. (2005) Slovakia's 2004 tax and welfare reforms. *IMF Working Paper*, 133, Washington: International Monetary Fund.
- OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2006) Reforming Personal Income Tax. *Policy Brief March*. Paris: OECD.
- Raghunathan, T.E., Lepkowski, J.M., Van Hoewyk, J. & Solenberger, P. (2001) A Multivariate Technique for Multiply Imputing Missing Values Using a Sequence of Regression Models. *Survey Methodology*, 27, 85-95.
- Rancourt, E. (2007) Assessing and dealing with the impact of imputation through variance estimation. *Statistical Data Editing: Impact on Data Quality*. New York: United Nations.
- Rueda, M.M., Gonzalez, S. & Arcos, A. (2005) Indirect methods of imputation of missing data based on available units. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 164 249–261.
- Smirlis, Y.G., Maragos, E.K. & Despotis, D.K. (2006) Data envelopment analysis with missing values: An interval DEA approach. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 177 1–10.
- Sorenson, P.B. (2005) Dual income tax: Why and how? *FinanzArchiv* 61 559–586.
- Zee, H.H. (2005) Personal income tax reform: Concepts, issues, and comparative country developments. *IMF Working Paper*, 87. Washington: International Monetary Fund.

PUBLISHED PAPERS IN THE SERIES

1. Lado Rupnik: **THE NEW TAX SYSTEM IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1993, 16 p.
2. Franc Kuzmin: **SOME DILEMMAS IN THE THEORY OF COST-PUSH INFLATION – SLOVENIAN CASE**, IER, Ljubljana, 1993, 17 p.
3. Miroslav Glas: **SLOVENE SMALL BUSINESS**, IER, Ljubljana, 1993, 26 p.
4. Tine Stanovnik: **SOCIAL SECURITY IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1993, 14 p.
5. Peter Stanovnik, Ivo Banič: **THE ROLE OF FDI IN SLOVENIA'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**, IER, Ljubljana, 1993, 13 p.
6. Vladimir Lavrač: **THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE SLOVENIAN MONETARY SYSTEM TO THE EUROPEAN MONETARY INTEGRATION PROCESS**, IER, Ljubljana, 1993, 14 p.
7. Andrej Kumar: **EUROPEAN INTEGRATION – REALITY OR A DREAM?**, IER, Ljubljana, 1994, 20 p.
8. Frančiška Logar, Danica Zorko: **UPSWING OF TOURISM IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1994, 23 p.
9. Milena Bevc: **EDUCATIONAL CAPITAL IN SLOVENIA IN THE EARLY 90s**, IER, Ljubljana, 1994, 28 p.
10. Franc Kuzmin: **THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF SLOVENE LABOUR MARKET DURING TRANSITION PERIOD – THE PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT**, IER, Ljubljana, 1994, 9 p.
11. Emil Erjavec, Miroslav Rednak, Jernej Turk: **THE MAIN ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE ECONOMIC TRANSITION OF SLOVENE AGRICULTURE**, IER, Ljubljana, 1994, 16 p.
12. Stanka Kukar: **THE HIDDEN ECONOMY AND THE LABOUR MARKET IN SLOVENIA IN THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION**, IER, Ljubljana, 1994, 16 p.
13. Milan Lapornik, Peter Stanovnik: **INDUSTRIAL AND ENTERPRISE RESTRUCTURING IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1995, 24 p.
14. Vladimir Lavrač: **COMMON CAPITAL MARKET OF CEFTA COUNTRIES – A POSSIBLE WAY OF DEEPENING CEFTA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1997, 15 p.
15. Valentina Prevolnik: **HEALTH CARE REFORM IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1997, 17 p.
16. Tine Stanovnik: **THE TAX SYSTEM AND TAX REFORM IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1997, 16 p.

WORKING PAPERS

1. Vladimir Lavrač: **EXCHANGE RATE OF THE SLOVENIAN TOLAR IN THE CONTEXT OF SLOVENIA'S INCLUSION IN THE EU AND IN THE EMU**, IER, Ljubljana, 1999, 18 p.
2. Tine Stanovnik, Nada Stropnik: **ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE ELDERLY AND PENSION REFORM IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1999, 34 p.
3. Marjan Simončič, Franc Kuzmin: **MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE PENSION REFORM IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 1999, 26 p.
4. Jože Pavlič Damijan: **EFFICIENCY OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS: DID THE REDUCTION OF TRADE BARRIERS HAVE ANY EFFECT ON INCREASING TRADE BETWEEN SLOVENIA AND THE CEFTA COUNTRIES?**, IER, Ljubljana, 1999, 18 p.
5. Boris Majcen: **SECTOR PERFORMANCE IN THE SLOVENE ECONOMY: WINNERS AND LOSERS OF EU INTEGRATION**, IER, Ljubljana, 2000, 37 p. + appendix
6. Peter Stanovnik, Art Kovačič: **SOME QUESTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS OF NATIONAL ECONOMIES WITH EMPHASIS ON SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 2000, 24 p.
7. Janez Bešter: **TAKEOVER THEORIES AND PREDICTION MODELS – THE CASE OF SLOVENIAN PRIVATISED COMPANIES**, IER, Ljubljana, 2000, 16 p.
8. Jeffrey David Turk, Hedvika Usenik: **BUYER SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIPS IN THE ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES IN SLOVENIA AND COMPARISONS WITH HUNGARY**, IER, Ljubljana, 2000, 22 p.
9. Jože Pavlič Damijan, Boris Majcen: **TRADE REORIENTATION, FIRM PERFORMANCE AND RESTRUCTURING OF SLOVENIAN MANUFACTURING SECTOR**, IER, Ljubljana, 2001, 16 p.
10. Jože Pavlič Damijan, Boris Majcen, Matija Rojec, Mark Knell: **THE ROLE OF FDI, R&D ACCUMULATION AND TRADE IN TRANSFERRING TECHNOLOGY TO TRANSITION COUNTRIES: EVIDENCE FROM FIRM PANEL DATA FOR EIGHT TRANSITION COUNTRIES**, IER, Ljubljana, 2001, 26 p.
11. Matija Rojec, Jože Pavlič Damijan, Boris Majcen: **EXPORT PROPENSITY OF ESTONIAN AND SLOVENIAN MANUFACTURING FIRMS: DOES FOREIGN OWNERSHIP MATTER?**, IER, Ljubljana 2001, 22 p.
12. Nevenka Hrovatin, Sonja Uršič: **THE DETERMINANTS OF FIRM PERFORMANCE AFTER OWNERSHIP TRANSFORMATION IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 2001, 21 p.
13. Vladimir Lavrač, Tina Žumer: **EXCHANGE RATE ARRANGEMENTS OF ACCESSION COUNTRIES IN THEIR RUN-UP TO EMU: NOMINAL CONVERGENCE, REAL CONVERGENCE AND OPTIMUM CURRENCY AREA CRITERIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 2002, 35 p.
14. Vladimir Lavrač: **MONETARY, FISCAL AND EXCHANGE RATE POLICIES FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EUROZONE: SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE**, IER, Ljubljana, 2002, 21 p.
15. Jože Pavlič Damijan, Črt Kostevc: **THE EMERGING ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana 2002, 30 p.
16. Boris Majcen: **THE EFFECTS OF FOREIGN TRADE LIBERALIZATION AND FINANCIAL FLOWS BETWEEN SLOVENIA AND EU AFTER THE ACCESSION**, IER, Ljubljana 2002, 33 p.
17. Jože Pavlič Damijan, Mark Knell, Boris Majcen, Matija Rojec: **TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER THROUGH FDI IN TOP-10 TRANSITION COUNTRIES: HOW IMPORTANT ARE DIRECT EFFECTS, HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL SPILLOVERS?**, IER, Ljubljana, 2003, 23 p + appendix

18. Jože Pavlič Damijan, Črt Kostevc: **THE IMPACT OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION ON ADJUSTMENT PATTERN OF REGIONAL WAGES IN TRANSITION COUNTRIES: TESTING COMPETITIVE ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY MODELS**, IER, Ljubljana, 2003, 27 p.
19. Vladimir Lavrač: **ERM 2 STRATEGY FOR ACCESSION COUNTRIES**, IER, Ljubljana, 2003, 21 p.
20. Renata Slabe Erker: **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IN SLOVENIA**, IER, Ljubljana, 2003, 25 p.
21. Tine Stanovnik, Miroslav Verbič: **PERCEPTION OF INCOME SATISFACTION AND SATISFACTION WITH THE QUALITY OF LIVING; AN ANALYSIS OF SLOVENIAN HOUSEHOLDS**, IER, Ljubljana, 2003, 18 p.
22. Vladimir Lavrač: **FULFILLMENT OF MAASTRICHT CONVERGENCE CRITERIA FOR SLOVENIA AND OTHER ACCEDING COUNTRIES**. IER, Ljubljana, 2004, 15 p.
23. Janez Bešter: **ANATOMY OF A POST-MERGER INTEGRATION: THE CASE OF SLOVENIA**. IER, Ljubljana, 2004, 21 p.
24. Miroslav Verbič: **ECONOMETRIC ESTIMATION OF PARAMETERS OF PRESERVATION OF PERISHABLE GOODS IN COLD LOGISTIC CHAINS**. IER, Ljubljana, 2004, 33 p.
25. Egbert L. W. Jongen: **AN ANALYSIS OF PAST AND FUTURE GDP GROWTH IN SLOVENIA**. IER, Ljubljana, 2004, 42 p.
26. Egbert L. W. Jongen: **FUTURE GDP GROWTH IN SLOVENIA: LOOKING FOR ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT**. IER, Ljubljana, 2004, 37 p.
27. Peter Stanovnik, Marko Kos: **TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT IN SLOVENIA**. IER, Ljubljana, 2005, 22 p.
28. Art Kovačič: **COMPETITIVENESS AS A SOURCE OF DEVELOPMENT**. IER, Ljubljana, 2005, 25 p.
29. Miroslav Verbič, Boris Majcen, Renger van Nieuwkoop: **SUSTAINABILITY OF THE SLOVENIAN PENSION SYSTEM: An analysis with an overlapping-generations General Equilibrium Model**. IER, Ljubljana, 2005. 24 p.
30. Miroslav Verbič: **AN ANALYSIS OF THE SLOVENIAN ECONOMY WITH A QUARTERLY ECONOMETRIC MODEL**. IER, Ljubljana, 2006. 26 p.
31. Vladimir Lavrač, Boris Majcen: **ECONOMIC ISSUES OF SLOVENIA'S ACCESSION TO THE EU**. IER, Ljubljana, 2006. 37 p.
32. Miroslav Verbič, Renata Slabe Erker: **ECONOMIC VALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES OF THE LANDSCAPE DEVELOPMENT AND PROTECTION AREA OF VOLČJI POTOK**. IER, Ljubljana, 2007. 28.p.
33. Boris Majcen, Miroslav Verbič. **MODELLING THE PENSION SYSTEM IN AN OVERLAPPING-GENERATIONS GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM FRAMEWORK**. IER, Ljubljana, 2007. 37 p.
34. *Boris Majcen, Miroslav Verbič (corresponding author), Ali Bayar and Mitja Čok*. **THE INCOME TAX REFORM IN SLOVENIA: SHOULD THE FLAT TAX HAVE PREVAILED?** IER, Ljubljana, 2007. 29 p.
35. Miroslav Verbič. **VARYING THE PARAMETERS OF THE SLOVENIAN PENSION SYSTEM: AN ANALYSIS WITH AN OVERLAPPING-GENERATIONS GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM MODEL**. IER, Ljubljana, 2007. 28 p.
36. Miroslav Verbič, **SUPPLEMENTARY PENSION INSURANCE IN SLOVENIA: AN ANALYSIS WITH AN OVERLAPPING-GENERATIONS GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM MODEL**. IER, Ljubljana, 2007. 32 p.
37. Matjaž Črnigoj: **RISK AVERSE INSIDERS WITH SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE FUNCTION AND CAPITAL STRUCTURE**. IER, Ljubljana, 2007. 13 p.
38. Renata Slabe Erker, Janez Filipič: **MONITORING SUSTAINABILITY FOR SLOVENIA'S REGIONS**. IER, Ljubljana, 2007, 22 p.

39. Jože P. Damijan, Črt Kostevc: **TRADE LIBERALIZATION AND ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY IN TRANSITION COUNTRIES: CAN FDI EXPLAIN THE ADJUSTMENT PATTERN OF REGIONAL WAGES?** IER, Ljubljana, 2008, 40 p.
40. Jože P. Damijan, Matija Rojec, Boris Majcen, Mark Knell: **IMPACT OF FIRM HETEROGENEITY ON DIRECT AND SPILLOVER EFFECTS OF FDI: MICRO EVIDENCE FROM TEN TRANSITION COUNTRIES.** IER, Ljubljana, 2008, 25 p.
41. Jože P. Damijan, Črt Kostevc, Matija Rojec. **INNOVATION AND FIRMS' PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH IN SLOVENIA: SENSIVITY OF RESULTS TO SECTORAL HETEROGENEITY AND TO ESTIMATION METHOD.** IER, Ljubljana, 2008, 37 p.
42. Jože P. Damijan, Jose de Sousa, Olivier Lamotte. **DOES INTERNATIONAL OPENNESS AFFECT PRODUCTIVITY OF LOCAL FORMS? EVIDENCE FROM SOUTHERN EUROPE.** IER, Ljubljana, 2008, 29 p.
43. Jože P. Damijan, Črt Kostevc, Sašo Polanec. **FROM INNOVATION TO EXPORTING OR VICE VERSA?** IER, Ljubljana, 2008, 28 p.
44. Milena Bevc. **DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONALLY COMPARABLE INDICATORS OF FORMAL EDUCATION – CASE STUDY FOR A NON-OECD COUNTRY.** IER, Ljubljana, 2009, 27 p.
45. Miroslav Verbič, Boris Majcen, Mitja Čok. **EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN SLOVENIA: A DYNAMIC GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM APPROACH WITH ENDOGENOUS GROWTH.** IER, Ljubljana, 2009, 21 p.
46. Miroslav Verbič, Boris Majcen, Mitja Čok. **R&D AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN SLOVENIA: A DYNAMIC GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM APPROACH WITH ENDOGENOUS GROWTH.** IER, Ljubljana, 2009, 21 p.
47. Valentina Prevolnik Rupel, Marko Ogorevc. **LONG TERM CARE SYSTEM IN SLOVENIA.** IER, Ljubljana, 2010, 34 p.
48. Jože P. Damijan, Črt Kostevc. **LEARNING FROM TRADE THROUGH INNOVATION: CAUSAL LINK BETWEEN IMPORTS, EXPORTS AND INNOVATION IN SPANISH MICRODATA.** IER, Ljubljana, 2010, 30 p.
49. Peter Stanovnik, Nika Murovec. **TERRITORIAL ICT KNOWLEDGE DYNAMICS IN SLOVENIA.** IER; Ljubljana, 2010, 35 p.
50. Nika Murovec, Peter Stanovnik. **THE KNOWLEDGE DYNAMICS OF ICT IN SLOVENIA – Case study.** IER; Ljubljana, 2010, 59 p.
51. Vladimir Lavrač. **INCLUSION OF SLOVENIA IN THE EURO AREA AND PERSPECTIVES OF ENLARGEMENT AFTER THE GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS.** IER, Ljubljana, 2010. 15 p.
52. Sašo Polanec, Aleš Ahčan, Miroslav Verbič. **RETIREMENT DECISIONS IN TRANSITION: MICROECONOMETRIC EVIDENCE FROM SLOVENIA.** IER, Ljubljana, 2010. 24 p.
53. Tjaša Logaj, Sašo Polanec. **COLLEGE MAJOR CHOICE AND ABILITY: WHY IS GENERAL ABILITY NOT ENOUGH?** IER, Ljubljana, 2011. 41 p.
54. Marko Ogorevc, Sonja Šlander. **SHAREHOLDERS AND WAGE DETERMINATION.** IER, Ljubljana, 2011. 13 p.
55. Boris Majcen, Miroslav Verbič, Sašo Polanec. **INNOVATIVENESS AND INTANGIBLES: THE CASE OF SLOVENIA.** IER, Ljubljana, 2011. 31 p.
56. Valentina Prevolnik Rupel, Marko Ogorevc. **QUALITY COUNTRY REPORT FOR SLOVENIA.** IER, Ljubljana, 2011. 13 p.
57. Mitja Čok, Jože Sambt, Marko Košak, Miroslav Verbič, Boris Majcen. **DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONAL INCOME TAX CHANGES IN SLOVENIA.** IER, Ljubljana, 2011. 13 p.

58. Miroslav Verbič, Rok Spruk, **AGING POPULATION AND PUBLIC PENSIONS: THEORY AND EVIDENCE**. IER, Ljubljana, 2011. 35 p.
59. Boris Majcen, Mitja Čok, Jože Sambt, Nataša Kump. **DEVELOPMENT OF PENSION MICROSIMULATION MODEL**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 40 p.
60. Tine Stanovnik, Miroslav Verbič. **THE DISTRIBUTION OF WAGES AND EMPLOYEE INCOMES IN SLOVENIA, 1991-2009**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 20 p.
61. Mitja Čok, Ivica Urban, Miroslav Verbič. **INCOME REDISTRIBUTION THROUGH TAX AND SOCIAL BENEFITS: THE CASE OF SLOVENIA AND CROATIA**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 16 p.
62. Nika Murovec, Damjan Kavaš, Aidan Cerar. **CLUSTERING, ANALYSIS AND CHALLENGES OF THE CREATIVE INDUSTRIES IN SLOVENIA**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 18 p.
63. Mohammad Sharifi Tehrani, Miroslav Verbič, Jin Young Chung. **ECONOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF ADOPTING DUAL PRICING FOR MUSEUMS: THE CASE OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF IRAN**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 26 p.
64. Stefanie A. Haller, Jože Damijan, Ville Kaitila, Črt Kostevc, Mika Maliranta, Emmanuel Milet, Daniel Mirza, Matija Rojec. **A PORTRAIT OF TRADING FIRMS IN THE SERVICES SECTORS-COMPARABLE EVIDENCE FROM FOUR EU COUNTRIES**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 37 p.
65. Jože Damijan, Stefanie A. Haller, Ville Kaitila, Mika Maliranta, Emmanuel Milet, Matija Rojec, Daniel Mirza. **THE PERFORMANCE OF TRADING FIRMS IN THE SERVICES SECTORS – COMPARABLE EVIDENCE FROM FOUR EU COUNTRIES**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 45 p.
66. Renata Slabe Erker, Simon Ličen. **REVIEW OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY PREDICTORS AND POPULATION GROUPS AT RISK OF POOR HEALTH**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 18 p.
67. Marina Tkalec, Miroslav Verbič. **A NEW LOOK INTO THE PREVALENCE OF BALANCE SHEET OR COMPETITIVENESS EFFECT OF EXCHANGE RATE DEPRECIATION IN A HIGHLY EUROIZED ECONOMY**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 25 p.
68. Damjan Kavaš. **POSSIBLE PPP MODELS FOR COOPERATION IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF LJUBLJANA**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 30 p.
69. Boris Majcen, Jože Sambt, Mitja Čok, Tomaž Turk, Gijs Dekkers, Vladimir Lavrač, Nataša Kump. **DEVELOPMENT OF MICRO-SIMULATION PENSION MODEL: LINKING THE MODULES WITHIN GRAPHIC INTERFACE**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 68 p.
70. Nika Murovec, Damjan Kavaš. **CREATIVE INDUSTRIES IN LJUBLJANA URBAN REGION**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 24 p.
71. Matjaž Črnigoj, Dušan Mramor. **ALTERNATIVE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PARADIGM AND CORPORATE FINANCING: CAPITAL STRUCTURE CHOICE IN EMPLOYEE-GOVERNED FIRM**. IER, Ljubljana, 2012. 24 p.
72. Matjaž Črnigoj, Miroslav Verbič. **FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS AND CORPORATE INVESTMENTS: THE CREDIT CRUNCH AND INVESTMENT DECISIONS OF SLOVENIAN FIRMS**. IER, Ljubljana, 2013. 13 p.
73. Matjaž Črnigoj, Miroslav Verbič. **FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS AND CORPORATE INVESTMENTS: THE CREDIT CRUNCH AND INVESTMENT DECISIONS OF SLOVENIAN FIRMS**. IER, Ljubljana, 2013. 15 p.
74. Dorjan Marušič, Valentina Prevolnik Rupel, Jakob Ceglar. **DRG IMPLEMENTATION IN SLOVENIA – LESSONS LEARNED**. IER, Ljubljana, 2013. 16 p.
75. Mitja Čok, Mateja Ana Grulja, Tomaž Turk, Miroslav Verbič. **TAXATION OF WAGES IN THE ALPS-ADRIATIC REGION**. IER, Ljubljana, 2013. 18 p.
76. Mitja Čok, Miroslav Verbič, Darija Šinkovec. **SOME EVIDENCE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ENHANCED RELATIONSHIP**. IER, Ljubljana, 2013. 17 p.

77. Marina Tkalec, Miroslav Verbič, Maruška Vizek. **LONG-RUN AND SHORT-RUN DETERMINATIONS OF ORIGINAL SINNERS' SOVOREIGN SPREADS.** IER, Ljubljana, 2013. 20 p.
78. Renata Slabe Erker, Irena Mrak, Maja Klun, Matej Bedrač, Barbara Lampič, Tomaž Cunder. **AGRICULTURAL SUSTAINABILITY INDEX OF SLOVENIA.** IER, LJUBLJANA, 2013. 16 p.
79. Miroslav Verbič, Mitja Čok, Ana Božič. **DEMAND FOR FOOD DURING ECONOMIC TRANSITION: AN AIDS ECONOMETRIC MODEL FOR SLOVENIA, 1988-2008.** IER, LJUBLJANA, 2014. 19 p.
80. Jernej Mencinger, Aleksander Aristovnik, Miroslav Verbič. **THE IMPACT OF GROWING PUBLIC DEBT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE EUROPEAN UNION.** IER, LJUBLJANA, 2014. 13 p.
81. Nika Berlic, Valentina Prevolnik Rupel, Renata Erker Slabe. **OPERATION OF EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT (EUnetHTA) ON THE EXAMPLE OF COLORECTAL CANCER.** IER, LJUBLJANA, 2014. 15 p.
82. Nika Murovec, Damjan Kavaš. **ANALYSIS OF DESIGN IN SLOVENIA – THE SUPPLY SIDE.** IER, Ljubljana, 2014. 11 p.
83. Miroslav Verbič, Matjaž Črnigoj. **CORPORATE INVESTMENT AND CORPORATE TAXATION DURING THE ECONOMIC CRISIS IN SLOVENIA.** IER, Ljubljana, 2015. 26 p.
84. Andreja Cirman, Marko Pahor, Miroslav Verbič. **DETERMINANTS OF TIME ON THE MARKET IN A THIN REAL ESTATE MARKET.** IER, Ljubljana, 2015. 13 p.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

1. Helen O'Neill: **IRELAND'S ECONOMIC TRANSITION: THE ROLE OF EU REGIONAL FUNDS – AND OTHER FACTORS**, IER, Ljubljana, 2000, 16 p.
2. Sanja Maleković: **CROATIAN EXPERIENCE IN REGIONAL POLICY**, IER, Ljubljana 2000, 13 p.
3. Peter Backé, Cezary Wójcik: **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS FOR THE MONETARY INTEGRATION OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN EU ACCESSION COUNTRIES**, IER, Ljubljana, 2002, 17 p.
4. Andreas Freytag: **CENTRAL BANK INDEPENDENCE IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE ON THE EVE OF EU-ENLARGEMENT**, IER, Ljubljana, 2003, 29 p.
5. Jasmina Osmanković: **REGIONALIZATION AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD**, IER, Ljubljana, 2004, 16 p.
6. Carlos Vieira, Isabel Vieira, Sofia Costa: **MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES IN EMU: SOME RELEVANT ISSUES**, IER, Ljubljana, 2004, 36 p.
7. Bojan Radej. **THE FOUR CAPITAL MODEL, MATRIX AND ACCOUNTS**. IER, Ljubljana, 2007. 25 p.
8. Bojan Radej. **APPLES AND ORANGES IN PUBLIC POLICIES. MESO-MATRICAL SYNTHESIS OF THE INCOMMENSURABLE**. IER, Ljubljana, 2008. 23 p.