CATA CALL FOR ACTION: MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS IN CANADA'S SYSTEM OF FEDERAL TAX SUPPORT FOR BUSINESS INNOVATION

Date: September 27, 2016

Foreword

The proposals in this submission are directed to assisting the Canadian Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) sector and are part of a multi topic innovation advocacy Campaign. However, based on discussions with R&D performers and their advisors, as well as CATA's Innovation Leadership Council, our proposals should be expanded to promote innovation generally across all sectors, as well as in the ICT sector.

Issues with the $ 3 billion Scientific Research and Experimental Development (SR&ED) Tax Incentive Program are hampering innovation initiatives by ICT companies throughout the country. It is obvious to us that these issues and frustrations with the SR&ED program are also being experienced by many businesses in many other sectors, as well as the ICT sector.

CATA believes that a much more effective, well managed, and better targeted system of tax based innovation support is needed to promote economic growth across the economy.

CATA proposes that a new business oriented agency focused on growing the Canadian economy be created to manage, develop, and evaluate all tax based innovation support, including the SR&ED program. The proposed agency's duties as outlined here within the context of a model for the ICT should be broadened to apply to all sectors.

John Reid
jreid@cata.ca
CEO
CATA*Alliance*

Russ Roberts
Senior Vice President, Tax, Finance & Advocacy
CATA*Alliance*

Proposals

CATA calls for the Government to:

I. **Overhaul the system of tax incentives to maximize the impact of tax expenditures on business innovation in the Canadian Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) sector. This proposal includes the following components:**

1. implement effective and timely, independent, authoritative third party **redress** of disagreements/problems as they arise in the reviews of SR&ED claims. Concerns about redress can be documented as far back as 1998;

2. eliminate **retrospective** claims for SR&ED tax credits;

3. require that refundable (smaller businesses) SR&ED claims in the ICT sector obtain **certification of eligibility at the concept phase**, including detailed work plans and appropriate benchmarking of existing technological capabilities. Certification to be administered by the proposed new Agency (board / entity), which is described below.

4. require that non-refundable (larger businesses) SR&ED claims in the ICT sector obtain **certification of eligibility at the concept phase**, including detailed work plans and appropriate benchmarking of existing technological capabilities.

   Permit program level claims by non-refundable filers, as well as claims at the project level. (A program is an integrated and linked group of projects with a common goal.)

   Introduce "**above the line ('ATL')" accounting for SR&ED tax credits** for non-refundable (larger businesses) SR&ED claims in the ICT sector.

5. **"digital innovation" tax credit** - for refundable (smaller businesses - to be defined in parallel with the SR&ED program) claimants, create outside the SR&ED program, a new refundable labour based "digital innovation" tax credit as an alternative to the existing SR&ED tax credit for refundable claims coupled with a new "innovation box" incentive (below) to support commercialization and export.

   The proposed "digital innovation" tax credit would apply to reduce both income taxes and payroll taxes owing by claimants. The objective is to increase the effectiveness of tax credits in creating jobs in Canada. The cost to the Government of this labour based tax credit would be offset to a degree by the income taxes paid by the individuals in these Canadian jobs.

6. **"innovation box" incentive for commercialization and export** - for both refundable (smaller businesses) and non-refundable (larger businesses) claimants, create, outside the SR&ED program, a new "innovation box" incentive for commercialization and export. It would apply to innovations resulting from work supported by the proposed new refundable digital innovation tax credit (above) and to successful digital innovations supported by the SR&ED program.

7. **independent working innovation tax group -** We suggest that the Government may want to task an independent working group of business leaders, tax experts, and a senior Finance official with the responsibility for consulting on and creating proposed legislation for the proposed "digital innovation" tax credit and the proposed "innovation box" incentive summarized in items # 5 and # 6 above. (For additional detail, see under "Detailed Proposals, Proposal I", items # 5 and # 6, on pages 12 and 13 below.)

II. Create a new Agency (board / entity) to manage the delivery of tax incentive programs to the Canadian Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) sector. These programs would include the $ 3 billion Scientific Research and Experimental Development (SR&ED) Tax Incentive Program, the proposed new "digital innovation" tax credit, and the proposed new "innovation box" incentive.

Some of the Responsibilities of the Proposed New Agency (board / entity)

1. Create and monitor a truly third party redress process for the SR&ED Tax Incentive Program, for the proposed "digital innovation" tax credit, and the "innovation incentive;

2. Review both refundable and non-refundable concept stage submissions for SR&ED tax credits in the ICT sector. If they meet the definitions of eligibility for SR&ED and are reasonably supported, issue certificates of eligibility. The CRA would still provide financial reviews.

3. Review concept stage submissions for the "digital innovation" and "innovation box" incentive. Where definitions and criteria are met, issue certificates of eligibility. The CRA would still provide financial reviews.

4. Monitor progress and do onsite reviews as necessary to establish that the work for all three programs (SR&ED, the proposed digital innovation tax credit, and the proposed

"innovation box" incentive) remains within the boundaries of the approved project or program being claimed;

5. Monitor independently all review activities for timeliness, consistency, predictability, cost-effectiveness, and fairness; and make these results public;

6. Report annually on the results of the programs, their evolution, and proposals for improvements in the ICT sector.

7. Evaluate the SR&ED tax credits, the proposed new "digital innovation" tax credit, and the proposed new "innovation box" incentive for effectiveness and ease of use by the ICT sector to determine what modifications could improve the concepts and their delivery; and

8. Evaluate the effectiveness of the various tax credits available to companies in the ICT sector compared with international best practices to determine where and how improvements can be achieved so that the Canadian system of tax incentives is competitive with international best practices.

Contents

Background

After 30 years, issues with the SR&ED Tax Incentive Program that impact on the program's effectiveness prevail. They simply are not resolving. It is time to move forward.

There have been three decades of continuous advocacy by the business community for improvements in the SR&ED program. Still today, longstanding issues with the SR&ED program persist. Our members are discouraged and many are doubters. For some of their recent commentary and what is typical for us to hear go to: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B7FCgv4p_yy6NThsejQ5enZJMlU/view?usp=sharing

While the program is important there is certainly much room for improvement given their commentary. Econometric studies and tax experts also indicate that there is room for improvement. When asked, our members generally would prefer tax incentives if they could be managed effectively. For a detailed analysis of where the program is at today, please go to https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZQ2B6ZYoItt0k_CqWtwTbdfyLNY5mO8VkDdglJEQR-Q/edit?pref=2&pli=1

For a few of the initiatives calling for improvements over the years, see footnotes 1 (a) to (b) below. [1]

---

[1] **Footnotes**

(a) May 1998, CATA*Alliance*, *The Federal System of Scientific Research and Experimental Development Tax Incentives: Renewing the Partnership Through Consensus, Consistency and Predictability*. http://www.cata.ca/Advocacy/SRandED_Tax_Credits/federal-system.html.

As a result of this document, under the leadership of the Honourable Herb Dhaliwal, Minister of National Revenue, a Minister's Conference, including private sector participants, took place in June 1998. The purpose of the conference was "to make real progress in improving the SR&ED program." Two additional Minister's Conferences tracking progress on the Government's 13 point Action Plan jointly developed with industry to improve the SR&ED program followed in January 2000 and May 2001.

(b) October 2007, *Joint Finance - Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) Consultation, Improving the Scientific Research and Experimental Development Tax Incentives:* http://www.fin.gc.ca/activty/consult/sred_-eng.asp

(c) 2011*, Review of Federal Support to Research and Development - Expert Panel Report,* chaired by Tom Jenkins: http://rd-review.ca/eic/site/033.nsf/eng/home

(d) CATA*Alliance*, *Canada as a Competitive Innovation Nation: What Needs to be Done*: CATA*Alliance* 2012 (White Paper) http://www.cata.ca/Media_and_Events/Press_Releases/cata_pr11241101.html

Some critical SR&ED issues impacting the ICT sector: What's a technological advance in the Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) sector? What's a SR&ED project? Disconnect between the CRA's expectations for documentation and what normally exists in the ICT sector - what's reasonable?

After five attempts over the years CRA is still struggling to get to a clear explanation and with its reviews of SR&ED claims in the sector.

The need for effective and timely, independent, authoritative third party redress of disagreements/problems as they arise in the reviews of SR&ED claims.

Concerns about redress can be documented as far back as 1998. See CATA's report and recommendations to the Minister of National Revenue in association with seven other associations, May 1998, Issue 4, at: http://www.cata.ca/Advocacy/SRandED_Tax_Credits/federal-system.html.

The issue of redress was also extensively covered in the independent report by Paul Daniel Muller, consultant, to the Minister of National Revenue in November 2009. See unredacted pages 28 to 36 of this report dealing with dispute resolution process, second reviews, and appeals, which was obtained under an Access to Information request to the Department of Finance: http://www.cata.ca/files/PDF/2014/Muller_and_CRA_Action_Plan_for_Linked-in.pdf

The impact of the CRA's decentralized management model on administering the SR&ED program.

With reviewers of claims for the SR&ED tax credits located in tax services offices throughout the country, it has proven to be an ongoing challenge for the CRA's leadership to maintain coherency and consistency in the administration of the program. Historically, individual offices have had a tendency to develop their own approaches and positions on issues and we hear that they are still doing so.

Despite many attempts over the past 30 years, the CRA has not successfully dealt with this issue for any length of time.

There is an inherent conflict between the Agency's normal focus on compliance and the focus that's needed to deliver incentives. There continues to be after 3 decades a need to achieve an effective balance between the incentive nature of the SR&ED program and the normal compliance orientation of the CRA.

The SR&ED program is an incentive program located in an Agency (CRA) that to a substantial degree administers programs to collect and recover tax. It is concerning that performance in the SR&ED program appears to be driven by dollar recovery. In its Annual Report to Parliament, the CRA reports on the dollars it recovers from its reviews of claims in the SR&ED program. (For example, in 2014-2015, the "CRA identified over $394 million in non-compliance" in the SR&ED program. See page 58 of Canada Revenue Agency *Annual Report to Parliament 2014-2015* at: http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/gncy/nnnl/2014-2015/ar-2014-15-eng.pdf.)

The Government's focus of the last decade appears to have been on deficit reduction; containment of the size of the SR&ED program (which has no cap); and the redirection of funding out of the SR&ED program.

- due to the CRA's new, restrictive interpretive and administrative policies, the annual "tax assistance" provided through the SR&ED program has been reduced on average by approximately $700 million annually in the 6 years from 2008-2009 to 2014-2015. This amounts to a total reduction of $ 4.2 billion over those 6 years. A significant portion of this drop appears to have occurred before the recession would have impacted on SR&ED filings, because claimants have 18 months after their fiscal year ends in which to file. (For source, see under statistics section, below.)
- in addition, the Government redirected $500 million out of the SR&ED program to other programs, as announced and projected by Finance Canada in the 2012 Budget. (The report of the Jenkins Expert Panel on Federal Support to R&D appears to be the basis for this.)

Current SR&ED statistics

- currently, $ 3.1 to $ 3.3 billion in "tax assistance" is provided through the SR&ED tax credits claimed each year. In contrast, the program provided $ 4.1 billion in "tax assistance" in each of 2007-2008 and 2008-2009. Current funding levels represent a total decrease of $ 4.2 billion over the six years since 2008-2009. As noted above, a significant portion of this drop appears to have occurred before the recession would have impacted on SR&ED filings, because claimants have 18 months after their fiscal year ends in which to file. (Source: CRA's Annual Reports to Parliament 2007-2008 to 2014-2015.)

- about 50% total tax expenditures on the program are for refundable claims, while the other 50% is for non-refundable claims;

- about 40% of total tax expenditures are related to the ICT sector;

- the increased complexity of the program has increased claimants' use of external advisors to between 60% - 70% from around 50%;

- **retrospective claims**. Something like 30% or more of total tax expenditures relate to retrospectively filed claims. While Finance Canada and the CRA would have this number, there is a dearth of information publicly available on this.

  Retrospective claims are those being filed for previous years. Under the legislation, a business has 18 months after its year end to submit a claim for the SR&ED incentive, which means that SR&ED can be claimed for work that occurred 2 1/2 years prior to the date the claim is filed. And, these projects may have started long before this. Retrospective claims often relate to projects undertaken at a time when businesses were not aware of their potential eligibility for the SR&ED incentive and tend to be of a poorer quality, as documentation becomes lost and claimant staff change over time.

  We have asked whether eliminating retrospective claiming could free up perhaps $ 700 million or more of Government expenditures on SR&ED. To our knowledge, this question has not been addressed by the Government.

  Retrospective claims have very questionable value as incentives for the claimed SR&ED. SR&ED funding of retrospective claims represents a **windfall after-the-fact rather than an incentive to undertake R&D in the first place.**

The ICT sector has incurred one of the largest hits due to the Government's focus on Budget reductions. Results of the current situation:

- $ 3 billion plus is currently being spent in a program where there is sufficient uncertainty about the credits that firms are being advised to significantly discount them when making decisions on investment;

- experience suggests that a significant portion of ICT claims are retrospective and only windfall earnings; and

- other countries like the UK appear to be achieving much more for less with their programs.

CATA is hearing strong concerns expressed that the program is sufficiently complex and unpredictable for the sector that companies are forced to engage the services of external advisors to prepare claims. Even then, the reviews are problematic so claimants have to significantly discount the potential value of claims in making investment decisions.

From statements made by CRA officials in public meetings, between 60% to 70% of claimants now use the services of advisors.

For larger claimants, the lack of refundability of the SR&ED tax credit and the elimination of "Process Reviews" by the CRA are issues.

Most recently, we've heard that the CRA has rescinded their "Process Review" agreements with the users of the SR&ED program, i.e., some of the country's largest companies. This has generated a great deal of uncertainty amongst some ICT companies that had been participating in this system based review process. That is, CRA reviewers would review a company's systems early on, monitor them, and rely on those systems to provide credible information on that company's R&D work, thereby reducing the amount of detailed transaction based review otherwise required. The objective was to increase the efficiency of reviews of SR&ED claims by some of Canada's largest companies. The increased uncertainty created by the situation is a major concern to the sector, given the size of the associated investments.

Foreign tax jurisdictions do better

Canada is not doing as well as others in international evaluations of R&D investment and innovation success. Canadians are not getting what this country needs out of this program.

There is a huge opportunity for improvement:

1) the UK uses similar definitions, but their administration of their program gets better results. See 2016 paper prepared by RDP Associates Inc., *A comparison of the administration of the Canadian Scientific Research and Experimental Development (SR&ED) tax credit program to the UK R&D tax credit program*. Please go to: http://www.cata.ca/files/PDF/CDA_UK_R_D_Tax_Credits.pdf .

2) some countries like the Netherlands and provinces require pre-submission and approval of proposed projects. Better independent third party redress is not uncommon in other jurisdictions. The result is better early identification of problem fillings, much greater certainty for applicants and investors and better control of the cost of the programs themselves.

3) Other countries like the Netherlands are exploring and using approaches that avoid the problems associated with retrospective claims.

AFTER 30 YEARS, LET'S MOVE FORWARD.

Detailed Proposals

Proposal I

Overhaul the system of tax incentives to maximize the impact of tax expenditures on business innovation in the Canadian Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) sector.

1. **Implement effective and timely, independent, authoritative third party redress of problems as they arise in the reviews of SR&ED claims.**
   See CATA's report and recommendations to the Minister of National Revenue in association with seven other associations, May 1998, Issue 4, at: http://www.cata.ca/Advocacy/SRandED_Tax_Credits/federal-system.html.

   See independent report by Paul Daniel Muller, consultant, to the Minister of National Revenue in November 2009. See unredacted pages 28 to 36 of this report dealing with dispute resolution process, second reviews, and appeals that was obtained under an Access to Information request to the Department of Finance: http://www.cata.ca/files/PDF/2014/Muller_and_CRA_Action_Plan_for_Linked-in.pdf.

2. **Eliminate retrospective claims for SR&ED tax credits.**

   The idea is to eliminate retrospective claiming where companies are currently allowed to file a claim up to 18 months after the end of the fiscal year for which the claim is being made. Require that all claims be filed a maximum of six months after fiscal year end (the same deadline as for income tax returns).

   The elimination of retrospective claims should produce an efficiency/effectiveness gain for both government and businesses. These claims give rise to time-consuming controversies and complexities during reviews, because they tend to be of poorer quality due to the loss of documentation and changes in claimant staff over time.

   Other countries like the Netherlands are exploring and using new approaches to avoid the problems associated with retrospective claims.

   Presumably, eliminating retrospective claiming would help address the types of undefined "abuse" of the SR&ED program that the CRA often alludes to, albeit the CRA has yet to publicly explain what they mean and provide some examples.

3. **For refundable (smaller businesses) SR&ED claims in the ICT sector, require certification of eligibility at the concept phase to be administered by the proposed new Agency (board / entity). This would increase the effectiveness of the SR&ED tax credits as an incentive for investments in R&D rather than using them just as a windfall after-the-fact. Investors and Companies would have much greater assurance about the value of their claims.**

   Revisit the SR&ED tax incentive for the refundable claims, i.e., smaller businesses engaged in R&D, to require certification of eligibility at the concept phase, including detailed work plans and appropriate benchmarking of existing technological capabilities, to assist in determining SR&ED eligibility.

   Consider phasing out the refundable tax credits for the ICT sector as the proposed new "digital innovation" tax credit (described below) is phased in.

   The proposed new Agency (board / entity) (Proposal II) would administer this certification.

4. **For <u>non</u>-refundable (larger businesses) SR&ED claims in the ICT sector, require certification of eligibility at the concept phase to be administered by the proposed new Agency (board / entity); permit program level claims, as well as project level claims; and introduce "above the line ('ATL')" accounting for SR&ED tax credits.**

   1) As with refundable (smaller businesses) SR&ED claims, revisit the SR&ED tax incentive for the non-refundable claims, i.e., larger businesses engaged in R&D, and require certification of eligibility at the concept phase, including detailed work plans and appropriate benchmarking of existing technological capabilities to assist in determining SR&ED eligibility. This would increase the effectiveness of the SR&ED tax credits as an incentive for investments in R&D rather than using them just as a windfall after-the-fact.

      The proposed new Agency (board / entity) (Proposal II) would administer this certification.

   2) Permit non-refundable claims to be made at the program level, as well as at the project level in a technical sense. (A program is an integrated and linked group of projects with a common goal.)

3) Introduce "above the line ('ATL')" accounting for all SR&ED tax credits so that the benefit of the credit is treated as a reduction of SR&ED expenditure within the profit and loss account (income statement) of the claimant.

   In respect to the above the line tax credit introduced in the UK, the EY July 2013 Tax Services document, "Above the line R&D Tax Credit", states that:

   > *The principal intention for the introduction of an ATL R&D tax credit scheme is to increase the visibility and certainty of UK R&D relief. Additionally, it is to provide greater financial support to loss making companies through having the R&D tax credit repayable where there is no corporation tax liability.*

   For the EY July 2013 Tax Services document, "Above the line R&D Tax Credit", go to http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-Tax-services-Above-the-line-RD-Tax-Credit/$FILE/EY-Tax-services-Above-the-line-RD-Tax-Credit.pdf

   Also, see the UK Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA) newsletter, *In.Practice*, 25 October 2013, at: http://accainpractice.newsweaver.co.uk/accainpractice/tatbc6xt3qh

5. **"digital innovation" tax credit** - for refundable (smaller businesses - to be defined in parallel with the SR&ED program) claimants, create outside the SR&ED program, a new refundable labour based "digital innovation" tax credit as an alternative to the existing SR&ED tax credit for refundable claims coupled with a new "innovation box" incentive (below) to support commercialization and export.

   The proposed "digital innovation" tax credit would apply to reduce both income taxes and payroll taxes owing by claimants. The objective is to increase the effectiveness of tax credits in creating jobs in Canada. The cost to the Government of this labour based tax credit would be offset to a degree by the income taxes paid by the individuals in these additional Canadian jobs.

   The advanced developments to be supported by the proposed digital innovation tax credit would be characterized by the formal benchmarking of the existing state of the art, the opportunities created by the anticipated advancements; and a formal development plan, including initial costs. These initial development documents would constitute the first application for the certificate of eligibility by an applicant.

While the definitions for what is an innovation under the proposed "digital innovation" tax credits could parallel those used by some provinces which have tended to be specifically targeted areas rather than broadly targeted like the SR&ED tax incentive; this is seen as too narrow. The benchmarking approach is seen as more appropriate and as a less subjective reference point. In fact, requiring the submission, including the benchmarking, as outlined above is seen to be advantageous to the companies in that it would help companies focus and better see where to invest their creative efforts.

In addition, establishing a similar formal upfront benchmarking requirement for ICT SR&ED claims could significantly improve the claim process.

6. **"innovation box" incentive for commercialization and export** - for <u>both</u> refundable (smaller businesses) and <u>non</u>-refundable (larger businesses) claimants, create, outside the SR&ED program, a new "innovation box" incentive for commercialization and export. It would apply to innovations resulting from work supported by the proposed new refundable digital innovation tax credit (above) and to successful digital innovations supported by the SR&ED program.

7. **independent working innovation tax group -** We suggest that the Government may want to task an independent working group of business leaders, tax experts, and a senior Finance official with the responsibility for consulting on and creating proposed legislation for the proposed "digital innovation" tax credit and the proposed "innovation box" incentive summarized in items # 5 and # 6 above. (For additional detail, see under "Detailed Proposals, Proposal I", items # 5 and # 6, on pages 12 and 13 below.)

Proposal II

Create a new Agency (board / entity) to manage the delivery of tax incentive programs to the Canadian Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) sector. These programs would include the $ 3 billion Scientific Research and Experimental Development (SR&ED) Tax Incentive Program, the proposed new "digital innovation" tax credit, and the proposed new "innovation box" incentive.

Specifically, because of the depth and complexity of the issues in the ICT sector and the inability of the CRA to resolve these longstanding and contentious issues over the 30 years of the SR&ED Program's existence, we propose creating an Agency (board / entity) of senior, independent, leaders with private sector experience, e.g., computer scientists and technologists, business people, and tax experts.

This Agency (board / entity) would not be driven by performance measures of tax recovery. Rather, the objective would be to manage the tax incentives so they effectively incent the companies that use them and achieve an increased level of commercialization. The Agency would be measured on its success in establishing and refining programs that demonstrably contribute to the increase in return (ROI) that Canada receives on its tax based investments in innovation.

The CRA would still review financial issues.

Note: A comment we heard while consulting on this proposal was that the CRA should not be doing the financial reviews, because of the potential conflicts between the expectations of the two organizations. There are examples over the years where this model has worked, e.g., film tax credits, but the concern would need to be recognized in the mandates given to the two parties to avoid conflicts.

Some of the Responsibilities of the Proposed New Agency (board / entity)

1. Create and monitor a truly third party redress process for the SR&ED Tax Incentive Program, for the proposed "digital innovation" tax credit, and the "innovation box" incentive;

2. Review both refundable and non-refundable concept stage submissions for SR&ED tax credits in the ICT sector. If they meet the definitions of eligibility for SR&ED and are reasonably supported, issue certificates of eligibility. The CRA would still provide financial reviews.

3. Review concept stage submissions for the "digital innovation" and "innovation box" incentive. Where definitions are met, issue certificates of eligibility for the projects as conceived. The CRA would still provide financial reviews.

4. Monitor progress and do onsite reviews as necessary to establish that the work for all three programs (SR&ED, proposed digital innovation tax credit, and proposed "innovation box" tax credit) remains within the boundaries of the approved project or program being claimed;

5. Monitor independently all review activities for timeliness, consistency, predictability, cost-effectiveness, and fairness; and make these results public;

6. Report annually on the results of the programs, their evolution, and proposals for improvements in the ICT sector.

7. Evaluate the proposed new "digital innovation" and "innovation " incentive for effectiveness and ease of use, as well as the SR&ED tax credits used by the ICT sector, to determine what modifications could improve the concepts and their delivery; and

8. Evaluate the effectiveness of the various tax credits available to companies in the ICT sector compared with international best practices to determine where and how improvements can be achieved so that the Canadian system of tax incentives is competitive with international best practices.

Conclusion

Of course, there are other ways of resolving the historical issues with Canada's innovation tax support. Other countries are exploring and trying to develop support programs that maximize returns to their economies. It is not good enough to just say that we've designed one of the best systems in the world on paper if the administration cannot deliver it. What is proposed here requires the Government to step outside the box not only by supporting the creation of the agency but a more efficient cadre of supporting legislation.

We suggest that the Government may want to task an independent working group of business leaders, tax experts, and a senior Finance official with the responsibility for consulting on and creating proposed legislation for the proposed "digital innovation" tax credit and the proposed "innovation box" incentive described under "Detailed Proposals, Proposal I", items # 5 and # 6 on pages 12 and 13 above.)

Please note that the footnotes and links are formally part of this submission to the Government's consultations. Please review all.

Russ Roberts, PhD
Senior Vice President, Tax, Finance and Advocacy
CATA*Alliance*
roberts-bishop@sympatico.ca