

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

(TD 8786)

1. CIRCUMSTANCES NECESSITATING COLLECTION OF INFORMATION

Section 863 of the Internal Revenue Code gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority to prescribe regulations relating to the source of income from sales of personal property. The regulation provides rules for allocating and apportioning income from sales of inventory (within the meaning of section 865(i)(1)) produced (in whole or in part) in the United States and sold in a possession of the United States, or produced (in whole or in part) in a possession of the United States and sold in the United States. The regulation also provides rules for allocating and apportioning income from the purchase of inventory in a possession of the United States and its sale in the United States.

2. USE OF DATA

The data will be used by the Service to determine whether the taxpayer determined the source of its income consistently with the regulation.

3. USE OF IMPROVED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TO REDUCE BURDEN

The collection of information does not involve the use of automated, electronic, or other technological collection techniques.

4. EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY DUPLICATION

We have attempted to eliminate duplication within the agency wherever possible.

5. METHODS TO MINIMIZE BURDEN ON SMALL BUSINESSES OR OTHER SMALL ENTITIES

Not applicable.

6. CONSEQUENCES OF LESS FREQUENT COLLECTION ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS OR POLICY ACTIVITIES

Not applicable.

7. **SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRING DATA COLLECTION TO BE INCONSISTENT WITH GUIDELINES IN 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2)**

Not applicable.

8. **CONSULTATION WITH INDIVIDUALS OUTSIDE OF THE AGENCY ON AVAILABILITY OF DATA, FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION, CLARITY OF INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMS, AND DATA ELEMENTS**

A notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the Federal Register on October 10, 1997 (62 FR 52953). The final regulations were published in the Federal Register on October 14, 1998 (63 FR 55020).

In response to the **Federal Register Notice** dated November 27, 2012(77 FR 70878), we received no comments during the comment period regarding TD 8786.

9. **EXPLANATION OF DECISION TO PROVIDE ANY PAYMENT OR GIFT TO RESPONDENTS**

Not applicable.

10. **ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESPONSES**

Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential as required by 26 USC 6103.

11. **JUSTIFICATION OF SENSITIVE QUESTIONS**

Not applicable.

12. **ESTIMATED BURDEN OF INFORMATION COLLECTION**

The collection of information is in §1.863-3(f)(6), which requires taxpayers to attach a statement to their tax return furnishing certain information regarding the methodology used to determine the source of their income from cross-border sales of inventory, and the amount of income allocated or apportioned to U.S. or foreign sources in these sales. We are estimating 200 taxpayers will be required to file the information. The estimated burden per respondent will vary from 1 hour to 5 hours, depending on the number of sales by the respondent. We estimate an average burden of 2.5 hours for each respondent for a total burden of 500 hours.

Estimates of the annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens shown are not available at this time.

13. ESTIMATED TOTAL ANNUAL COST BURDEN TO RESPONDENTS

As suggested by OMB, our **Federal Register** notice dated November 27, 2012, requested public comments on estimates of cost burden that are not captured in the estimates of burden hours, i.e., estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information. However, we did not receive any response from taxpayers on this subject. As a result, estimates of the cost burdens are not available at this time.

14. ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Not applicable.

15. REASONS FOR CHANGE IN BURDEN

There is no change in the paperwork burden previously approved by OMB. We are making this submission to renew the OMB approval.

16. PLANS FOR TABULATION, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND PUBLICATION

Not applicable.

17. REASONS WHY DISPLAYING THE OMB EXPIRATION DATE IS INAPPROPRIATE

We believe that displaying the OMB expiration date is inappropriate because it could cause confusion by leading taxpayers to believe that the regulations sunset as of the expiration date. Taxpayers are not likely to be aware that the Service intends to request renewal of the OMB approval and obtain a new expiration date before the old one expires.

18. EXCEPTIONS TO THE CERTIFICATION STATEMENT ON OMB FORM 83-I

Not applicable.

Note: The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information in this submission:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

OMB EXPIRATION DATE

We believe the public interest will be better served by not printing an expiration date on the form(s) in this package.

Printing the expiration date on the form will result in increased costs because of the need to replace inventories that become obsolete by passage of the expiration date each time OMB approval is renewed. Without printing the expiration date, supplies of the form could continue to be used.

The time period during which the current edition of the form(s) in this package will continue to be usable cannot be predicted. It could easily span several cycles of review and OMB clearance renewal. In addition, usage fluctuates unpredictably. This makes it necessary to maintain a substantial inventory of forms in the supply line at all times. This includes supplies owned by both the Government and the public. Reprinting of the form cannot be reliably scheduled to coincide with an OMB approval expiration date. This form may be privately printed by users at their own expense. Some businesses print complex and expensive marginally punched continuous versions, their expense, for use in their computers. The form may be printed by commercial printers and stocked for sale. In such cases, printing the expiration date on the form could result in extra costs to the users.

Not printing the expiration date on the form(s) will also avoid confusion among taxpayers who may have identical forms with different expiration dates in their possession.

For the above reasons we request authorization to omit printing the expiration date on the form(s) in this package.