

## Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 20 23 )

<b>Department Name:</b>	Iowa Department of Revenue	<b>Date:</b>	9/1/2023	<b>Total Rule Count:</b>	13
<b>IAC #:</b>	701	<b>Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):</b>	Chapter 201	<b>Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:</b>	Iowa Code section 421.14, 423.25, 423.36, 423.42
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Alana Stamas	<b>Email:</b>	alana.stamas@iowa.gov	<b>Phone:</b>	515-350-3932

**PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE**

**What is the intended benefit of the rule?**

Chapter 201 describes the requirements surrounding sales and use tax permits. The rules are intended to help the public understand how to obtain a permit and what is required to obtain one.

**Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.**

To the extent the Department proposes to re-promulgate rules, the Department has determined that the rules aid the public in better understanding the requirements surrounding obtaining and maintaining a sales tax permit. The evidence for the benefit of the rules is demonstrated from the text of the rules themselves and the greater certainty they provide taxpayers.

**What are the costs incurred by the public to comply with the rule?**

There is no cost to comply with these rules. Any costs to comply with the rules are associated with the underlying statute. There is no fee for obtaining a permit.

**What are the costs to the agency or any other agency to implement/enforce the rule?**

There are no costs to the agency of implementing these rules beyond those that would otherwise be required to administer the statute. There are tax administration expenses associated with administering sales tax permit requirements. The Department must have processes in place to issue permits and enforce permitting requirements.

**Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.**

There are no costs of the rules themselves. The cost of inaction is potential confusion about the process of obtaining and remaining in compliance with a sales tax permit.

**Are there less restrictive alternatives to accomplish the benefit?  YES  NO**

**If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other states, if applicable. If NO, please explain.**

The rules have been revised where possible to rescind statutory text or obsolete language. The rules that will be re-promulgated have been determined to be necessary. There is no less restrictive alternative to achieve the benefit of additional certainty.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or un-necessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language? [list chapter/rule number(s) that fall under any of the above categories]

**PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE**

Yes. Chapter 201 contains language that is outdated, redundant of statute, or unnecessary.

**RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):**

None.

**RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):**

201.1 is amended to remove language duplicative of statute and for clarity.  
201.2 is amended with edits for clarity and with items moved for more logical organization.  
201.3 is re-promulgated in its entirety.  
201.4 is amended for clarity and to remove restrictive terms.  
201.5 is amended for clarity.  
201.6 is amended for clarity.  
201.7 is amended for clarity.  
201.8 is amended for clarity.  
201.9 is amended for clarity.  
201.10 is amended for clarity and to remove language duplicative of statute.  
201.11 is amended for clarity and to remove language duplicative of statute.  
201.12 is amended to remove obsolete language and restrictive terms.  
201.13 is amended to remove obsolete language and language duplicative of statute.

The text of the proposed rules will be published with the Regulatory Analysis in the Iowa Administrative Code Bulletin in the coming months.

**\*For rules being re-promulgated with changes, you may attach a document with suggested changes.**

#### METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	0
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	406
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	11

**ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES?**

No.