

# Tax Evasion: Information, Supply, Norms

Gabriel Zucman

Master APE and PPD – Public Economics  
Fall 2025

# Outline

1. Measuring the size of tax evasion
2. Measuring the distribution of tax evasion
3. Why do people evade taxes?
4. Effect of policies to curb tax evasion

# Measuring the Size of Tax Evasion

# Measuring tax evasion with randomized audit studies

Widely used source to study tax evasion: stratified random audits

- ▷ In the US: IRS conducts thorough audits of stratified sample of tax returns periodically → National Research Program (NRP)
- ▷ Other countries have similar programs, e.g., Denmark (Kleven et al., *Econometrica* 2011)
- ▷ Important for policy (optimal audit strategy) & economic statistics (estimates of unreported income used in national accounts)

# Tax gap in the United States

Results from latest NRP studies (IRS 2019) for 2011, 2012, 2013:

- ▷ Tax gap (= taxes evaded / taxes owed) around 16% in total
- ▷ No clear trend over time
- ▷ Tax gap concentrated among income items with no 3rd party reporting (such as self-employment income)
- ▷ Withholding reduces tax gap (liquidity constraint → some taxpayers can never pay taxes owed unless withheld at source)


# IRS tax gap studies

## Tax Gap Estimates for Tax Years 2011-2013

(Money amounts are in billions of dollars; estimates are annual average amounts.)



Research, Applied Analytics & Statistics



**Estimated Total True Tax Liability\***  
**\$2,683B**

Tax Paid Voluntarily & Timely  
**\$2,242B** 83.6% Voluntary Compliance Rate (VCR)

Gross Tax Gap  
**\$441B**

Enforced & Other Late Payments  
**\$60B**

Net Tax Gap (Tax Not Collected)  
**\$381B** 85.8% Net Compliance Rate (NCR)

### Calculating the Net Tax Gap

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Nonfiling} \\ & \text{Underreporting} \\ & + \text{Underpayment} \\ & \hline & \text{Gross Tax Gap} \\ & - \text{Enforced \& Other Late Payments} \\ & \hline & \text{Net Tax Gap} \end{aligned}$$


Total True Tax Liability	Tax Paid Voluntarily & Timely	Gross Tax Gap						Enforced & Other Late Payments	Net Tax Gap (Tax Not Collected)
		Nonfiling	Underreporting				Underpayment		
\$2,683	\$2,242	\$39	+\$352				+\$50	= \$441	- \$60 = \$381
By Type of Tax		Individual Income Tax	Individual Income Tax				Individual Income Tax	Individual Income Tax	Individual Income Tax
\$1,398	\$1,084	\$31	+\$245				+\$38	= \$314	- \$43 (14%) = \$271
			Business Income	Non-Business Income	Credits	Income Offsets	Filing Status	Other Taxes	Unallocated Marginal Effects
			\$110	\$57	\$42	\$20	\$5	\$1	\$10
Corporation Income Tax	Corporation Income Tax	Corporation Income Tax	Corporation Income Tax				Corporation Income Tax	Corporation Income Tax	Corporation Income Tax
\$294	\$251	#	+\$37				+\$5	= \$42	- \$10 (24%) = \$32
			Large Corporations	Small Corporations					
			\$26	\$11					
Employment Tax	Employment Tax	Employment Tax	Employment Tax				Employment Tax	Employment Tax	Employment Tax
\$920	\$839	\$6	+\$69				+\$6	= \$81	- \$5 (6%) = \$77
			Self-Employment Tax	FICA & Uncollected FICA TAX	Unemployment				
			\$45	\$24	\$1				
Estate Tax	Estate Tax	Estate Tax	Estate Tax				Estate Tax	Estate Tax	Estate Tax
\$16	\$13	\$2	+\$1				+\$0.5	= \$3	- \$2 (55%) = \$1

**NOTES:**

- \* Totals include Excise Tax. # - No estimate.
- Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
- [1] Includes adjustments, deductions, and exemptions.
- [2] Includes the Alternative Minimum Tax and taxes reported in the "Other Taxes" section of the Form 1040 except for self-employment tax and unreported social security and Medicare tax (which are included in the employment tax gap estimates).
- [3] Is the difference between (1) the estimate of the individual income tax underreporting tax gap where underreported tax is calculated based on all misreporting combined and (2) the estimate of the individual income tax underreporting tax gap based on the sum of the tax gaps associated with each line item where the line item tax gap is calculated based on the misreporting of that item only. There may be differences if the marginal tax rates are different in these two situations.
- [4] Self-employment tax only.

# IRS tax gap studies

Figure 3. Effect of Information Reporting on Individual Income Tax Reporting Compliance, Tax Years 2011–2013



<sup>[1]</sup> The TY 2011–2013 estimate is the annual average for the TY 2011, 2012, and 2013 timeframe. This chart displays the tax gap attributable to the underreported income category and the rate at which that income is misreported as measured by the Net Misreporting Percentage.

<sup>[2]</sup> The Net Misreporting Percentage is the ratio of the net misreported amount to the sum of the absolute values of the amounts that should have been reported, expressed as a percentage. For categories I - IV, the net misreported amount is understatements of *income* less overstatements of *income*. On net, income is understated for these categories.

<sup>[3]</sup> Includes wages & salaries.

<sup>[4]</sup> Includes pensions & annuities, unemployment compensation, dividend income, interest income, taxable Social Security benefits.

<sup>[5]</sup> Includes partnership/S corp. income, capital gains, alimony income.

<sup>[6]</sup> Includes nonfarm proprietor income, other income, rents and royalties, farm income, Form 4797 income.

# Detection controlled estimation (DCE)

How is the gap tax estimated? In the US, an adjustment is made to account for undetected evasion

- ▷ If all evasion is detected in random audits, then income unreported  $Y_{1i}$  could be studied using following Tobit model:

$$Y_{1i} = \begin{cases} Y_{1i}^* & \text{if } Y_{1i}^* > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } Y_{1i}^* \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

- ▷ Where  $Y_{1i}^* = X_{1i}\beta_1 + \epsilon_{1i}$  latent var measuring propensity to evade
- ▷ Problem: only fraction of evasion is detected

# Detection controlled estimation (DCE)

To estimate undetected evasion, IRS uses DCE model (Feinstein '91)

- ▷ Consider  $Y_{2i}$  the extent of detection on return  $i$  (cond. on  $Y_{1i} > 0$ )

$$Y_{2i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Y_{2i}^* \geq 1 & \text{(complete detection)} \\ 0 & \text{if } Y_{2i}^* \leq 0 & \text{(no detection)} \\ Y_{2i}^* & \text{if } 0 < Y_{2i}^* < 1 & \text{(detection of fraction } Y_{2i}^*) \end{cases}$$

- ▷ Where  $Y_{2i}^* = X_{2i}\beta_2 + \epsilon_{2i}$  is latent variable measuring fraction of evasion detected (cond. on evasion)
- ▷  $X_{2i}$ : examiner's experience, complexity of return, etc.

# Detection controlled estimation: Limits

Feinstein (1991) estimates this model using ML and finds a lot of evasion goes undetected in IRS random audits:

- ▷ Intuition: some examiners find more evasion → if all examiners were like them, total evasion would be  $3 \times$  detected evasion
- ▷ But results sensitive to parametric assumptions (examiners not randomly assigned)
- ▷ Absolute detection rates not identified (can't know if top examiner captures 100% of evasion or less)

Based on DCE, IRS  $\times$  detected evasion by 3.

# Measuring the Distribution of Tax Evasion

# Supplementing random audits with other sources

Random audits can also be used to measure distribution of tax evasion

Main limit: hard to detect sophisticated evasion at the top

- ▷ Lack of resources in tax authorities
- ▷ Corporate/individual interface

→ Need to combine random audits with other sources

# Measuring sophisticated top-end evasion


## **Data to capture sophisticated evasion:**

- ▷ Macro statistics on wealth held in tax havens: tax haven central banks, BIS (Zucman, 2013; Johannesen and Zucman, 2014; Alstadsæter et al., 2018)
- ▷ Leaks: Panama Papers, Swiss leaks, offshore leaks, etc. (Alstadsæter et al., 2019; Londoño-Vélez and Avila-Mahecha, 2021)
- ▷ Tax amnesties (e.g., US: Guyton et al., 2021; Argentina: Londoño-Vélez & Tortarolo, 2022; Netherlands: Leenders et al., 2023)

# Financial wealth equivalent to 10% of world GDP is held in tax havens

## Offshore wealth / GDP

(All countries with GDP > \$200 billion in 2007)




# Alstadsæter et al. (2019)

- ▷ Complete file of the clients of HSBC Switzerland was leaked in 2007 and obtained by tax authorities
- ▷ HSBC: large bank ( $\approx 5\%$  of Swiss offshore wealth)
- ▷ Accounts frequently held through shell companies, but HSBC recorded identity of beneficial owners
- ▷ Clear-cut way to identify evasion by linking to tax returns of clients  $\rightarrow$  linking done in Scandinavia
- ▷ Similar exercise done for Panama Papers leak and tax amnesty


# Probability to own hidden assets at HSBC Switzerland

Probability to own an unreported HSBC account, by wealth group  
(HSBC leak)




# Probability to appear in the Panama Papers

**Probability to appear in the "Panama Papers", by wealth group**  
(Shareholders of shell companies created by Mossack Fonseca)




# Probability to disclose hidden assets in a tax amnesty in Scandinavia

Probability to voluntarily disclose hidden wealth, by wealth group  
(Swedish and Norwegian tax amnesties)



# Distribution of offshore assets




# Distributional Tax Gaps

Idea: combine random audits and leaks to allocate total tax evasion across the income distribution.


- ▷ Make assumptions on stock of offshore wealth (based on macroeconomic statistics)
- ▷ Assume that offshore wealth distributed like in HSBC and amnesties
- ▷ Apply rate of return on offshore wealth and use tax simulator to estimate evaded tax

# The role of offshore tax evasion at the top in Scandinavia




# Offshore financial wealth is very concentrated: the case of the US

## (b) Share Disclosing by Income Rank




# Offshore financial wealth is very concentrated: the case of Argentina

Figure 8: The increase in reported assets is greater for Argentina's wealthiest 0.1%



# The weight of offshore wealth at the top



Why do People Evade?

# Demand side models

Seminal model: Allingham and Sandmo (JpubE 1972)

▷ Individual taxpayer problem:

$$\max_{\bar{w}} (1-p) \cdot u(w - \tau \cdot \bar{w}) + p \cdot u(w - \tau \cdot \bar{w} - \tau(w - \bar{w})(1+\theta))$$

▷ where  $w$  is true income,  $\bar{w}$  reported income,  $\tau$  tax rate,  $p$  probability to be caught evading,  $\theta$  fine factor,  $u(\cdot)$  concave

# Allingham-Sandmo (1973)

- ▷ Let  $c^{uncaught} = w - \tau \cdot \bar{w}$
- ▷ Similarly,  $c^{caught} = w - \tau \cdot \bar{w} - \tau(w - \bar{w})(1 + \theta)$
- ▷ FOC in  $\bar{w}$ :  $-\tau(1 - p)u'(c^{uncaught}) + p\theta\tau u'(c^{caught}) = 0$

$$\frac{u'(c^{caught})}{u'(c^{uncaught})} = \frac{1 - p}{p\theta}$$

- ▷ SOC:  $\tau^2(1 - p)u''(c^{uncaught}) + p\tau^2\theta^2 u''(c^{caught}) < 0$
- ▷ Key result: evasion  $w - \bar{w} \downarrow$  with  $p$  and  $\theta$  (Yitzhaki, 1987).

# Limits of Allingham-Sandmo

Two main puzzles:

- ▷ Empirically, low audit rates ( $p = .01$ ) and fines ( $\theta \simeq .2$ )  $\rightarrow$  with reasonable risk aversion, tax evasion should be generally higher than observed
- ▷ It should fall with income since audit rates rise with income

Solving the puzzles:

- ▷ Unable to cheat because of 3rd party reporting
- ▷ Supply of evasion services at the top

# Kleven et al. (Econometrica 2011)


- ▷ Large stratified random sample (40,000 taxpayers audited)
- ▷ Very low rates of detected evasion: macro tax gap about 2.5% (no DCE in Denmark)
- ▷ But evasion rate for self-reported items is almost 40%, evasion rate for third party reported items is only 0.3%
- ▷ Tot evasion very low because 95% of income is 3rd-party-reported

# Third-party reporting swamps socio-economic factors

## Determinants of the Probability of Audit Adjustment: Social, Economic, and Information Factors

	Social factors		Socio-economic factors		Information factors		All factors	
Constant	<b>14.42</b>	(0.64)	<b>11.92</b>	(0.66)	<b>1.44</b>	(0.25)	<b>3.98</b>	(0.62)
Female	<b>-5.76</b>	(0.43)	<b>-4.45</b>	(0.45)			<b>-2.05</b>	(0.41)
Married	<b>1.55</b>	(0.46)	-0.36	(0.48)			<b>-1.64</b>	(0.44)
Member of church	<b>-1.98</b>	(0.59)	<b>-2.67</b>	(0.58)			<b>-1.19</b>	(0.54)
Copenhagen	-0.29	(0.67)	1.20	(0.67)			1.00	(0.62)
Age above 45	-0.37	(0.45)	-0.35	(0.45)			0.10	(0.42)
Home owner			<b>5.96</b>	(0.48)			-0.35	(0.46)
Firm size below 10			<b>4.43</b>	(0.82)			<b>2.97</b>	(0.76)
Informal sector			<b>3.25</b>	(0.86)			-0.99	(0.79)
Self-Reported Income					<b>9.47</b>	(0.53)	<b>9.72</b>	(0.54)
Self-Reported Income > 20K					<b>17.46</b>	(0.91)	<b>17.08</b>	(0.92)
Self-Reported < -10K					<b>14.63</b>	(0.72)	<b>14.53</b>	(0.72)
Audit Flag					<b>15.48</b>	(0.59)	<b>15.32</b>	(0.60)
R-square	1.1%		2.1%		17.1%		17.4%	
Adjusted R-square	1.0%		2.1%		17.1%		17.4%	

# Third-party reporting swamps socio-economic factors




**Figure 3. Anatomy of Tax Evasion**

Panel A displays the density of the ratio of evaded income to self-reported income (after an

# High-income countries have high share of third-party reported income

**The share of self-employment income in GDP in OECD countries**  
(Gross mixed income as a % of factor-cost GDP)



# Explaining high evasion rates at the top: the role of the supply side

High evasion rates at top hard to understand in standard Allingham-Sandmo (1972) model (= demand side)

Alstadsæter et al. (2019): model of supply side. Setup:

- ▷ Population of mass one with wealth density  $f(y)$
- ▷ Monopolistic bank sells tax evasion services (historically, Swiss banks have operated as a cartel)
- ▷ Charges  $\theta$  per \$ of wealth hidden
- ▷ Infinitely elastic demand at price  $\theta$ : bank optimizes on # of clients

# Supply of evasion services (continued)

- ▷ Bank manages  $k(s)$  in wealth when serves share  $s = 1 - F(y)$  of the pop., and earns  $\theta k(s)$  in revenue
- ▷ Bank has probability  $\lambda s$  to be caught  $\rightarrow$  fine  $\phi k(s)$
- ▷ Risk-neutral bank maximizes profits:  
$$\pi(s) = \theta k(s) - \lambda s \phi k(s)$$
- ▷ At interior optimum:  $\theta = \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon_k(s)} + 1 \right) \phi \lambda s$
- ▷ Where  $\epsilon_k(s) = sk'(s)/k(s)$  is elasticity of the amount of hidden wealth managed with respect to  $s$

# Supply of evasion services (continued)

If wealth Pareto-distributed, supply of evasion services is:

$$s = \frac{\theta}{(1 + b) \lambda \phi}$$

▷  $b$  is the inverted Pareto-Lorenz coefficient (high  $b \rightarrow$  high inequality)

Higher  $\lambda$  or higher  $\phi \rightarrow$  fewer & richer clients

If high inequality, bank will serve tiny fraction of the population

# Policies to curb tax evasion

Policy implications of the model:

- ▷ High fines for suppliers ( $\phi$ ): shrinks the supply of evasion services
- ▷ More practical than high fines for evaders
  - ▷ But “too big to indict” problem
  - ▷ Tax evasion: increasingly a financial regulation problem?
- ▷ Increase detection probability  $\lambda$ : third-party reporting. But can be difficult to enforce internationally

# Effects of Policies

# The automatic exchange of bank information

Since 2017–18, offshore banks must automatically send reports to foreign countries' tax authorities.

- ▷ First US law (FATCA passed in 2010, started in 2015), then global standard (Common Reporting Standard, started in 2018)
- ▷ A landmark: from bank secrecy to bank transparency
- ▷ Fast-growing literature on behavioral responses; first comprehensive analysis in Boas et al. (2024)

# Boas et al. (2024)

Study the compliance effects of automatic information exchange (AEoI) in Denmark. Consider three channels:

- **repatriation** of foreign assets in anticipation of AEoI
- more **self-reporting** following onset of AEoI
- better **audits** through use of reports from foreign banks

Q: How much of the offshore tax gap has been closed by AEoI?

# Channel #1: Repatriation


Automatic information exchange creates incentives for evaders to repatriate non-compliant assets

Challenging to study such repatriations because they leave no traces in the CRS reports or in foreign income fields on the tax return


Boas et al. (2024) use data on cross-border money transfers from tax havens as a direct measure of repatriation

Get identification by comparing transfers from own vs other haven accounts

# Strong differential increase in transfers from own accounts in 2013



# Difference-in-difference



# Channel #2: self-reporting of foreign income


Taxpayers evading through foreign accounts may also become compliant by

- leaving assets on foreign accounts
- self-reporting the foreign capital income


Taxpayers may learn about the new AEOI regime

- foreign banks inform customers about their new reporting obligation
- domestic tax authorities share reports from foreign banks with taxpayers

# Sharp increase in the number of taxpayers with self-reported foreign income



# New compliance is driven by CRS reports



# Channel #3: Better compliance through audits

How much can AEoI contribute to tax compliance through improved audits?

Compute **potential non-compliance** for each taxpayer by comparing **bank-reported** vs **self-reported** foreign dividend and interest income

Randomly select 500+ taxpayers with non-negligible potential non-compliance for targeted audit

Ask auditors to complete survey on each case to understand why actual corrections may be below potential corrections

# Population-level results of audit analysis

Share of actually non-compliant (among those with potential non-compliance)

- Individuals: 78%
- Income: 51%

Why the discrepancy between actual and potential non-compliance:

- AEol reports contain errors: 35%
- income is reported but not correctly: 14%

# Boas et al. (2024): Gauging non-compliance by banks

Use money transfer data to identify taxpayers who likely hold foreign account (i.e. transfer from own account in year  $t$  and year  $t+1$ )

- AEOI report on **59%** of them (\$-weighted)

Could reflect that banks do not send reports or that tax authorities fail to match reports

- match rate of **72%** (\$-weighted)

**Implied bank "non-compliance rate" of 18%.**

[banks need to send reports for 82% of customers in order to achieve 59% with matched report given match rate of 72% (i.e.  $0.59 = 0.72 \times 0.82$ )]

# Boas et al. (2024): AEol reduces offshore evasion by 60-70%

	Wealth, billion DKK	Confidence interval	% hidden wealth without CRS
<b>A. Offshore wealth without CRS</b>			
Offshore wealth in CRS	53.1		
Imperfect coverage of CRS	11.1	[9.3 ; 13.0]	
Repatriation due to CRS	10.5	[7.5 ; 13.6]	
<b>Total</b>	<b>74.8</b>		
<b>B. Compliance without CRS (self-reporting)</b>	<b>47.4</b>	[23.3 ; 71.5]	
<b>C. Hidden wealth without CRS</b>			
	<b>27.4</b>		<b>100%</b>
Memo: Alstadsæter et al. estimate, aged	27.2		
<b>D. Increase in compliance due to CRS</b>			
Repatriation from havens 2013-19	10.5	[7.5 ; 13.6]	38%
Self-reporting	6.0	[3.9 ; 8.1]	22%
Detectable noncompliance (audits)	3.6	[3.4 ; 3.8]	13%
Of which: actually detected	1.0		4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20.1</b>		<b>73%</b>
<b>E. Remaining noncompliance (residual)</b>	<b>7.3</b>		<b>27%</b>


# Limits of the automatic exchange of bank information

## Main limits:

- ▷ Imperfect reporting by foreign banks
- ▷ Many developing countries still excluded
- ▷ Incomplete coverage: excludes real estate, a growing issue


# Offshore real estate: the case of Dubai (Alstadsæter et al., 2022)

(a) Estimates of offshore real estate wealth



# For some low-income countries, Dubai real estate = as much as 5%-10% of GDP


(a) Total Value (% of GDP)



# About 70% of properties owned by Norwegians not reported for tax purposes

Figure 10: Reported vs. Total Dubai Real Estate of Norwegians

(a) Number of properties



# Conclusion

# Can capital be taxed?

Widespread view that capital taxation is doomed in a globalized world:

- ▷ Tax competition & avoidance mean “mobile” factors cannot be taxed much
- ▷ Standard economists’ view: use VAT and labor taxes, offset regressivity with progressive transfers

# Limits of the conventional view

1. VAT + transfers means very low tax rates for the rich  
→ dynamic effect on wealth inequality

**2. Tax competition & evasion are not laws of nature, they are policy choices:**

- ▷ Choices that were not very transparently or democratically debated but choices nonetheless
- ▷ Other choices are possible: current form of globalization is just one among many

# References I

- Allingham, M. and A. Sandmo (1972), “Income tax evasion: a theoretical analysis”, *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 1, pp. 323–338. [\[pdf\]](#)
- Alstadsæter, A., N. Johannesen, and G. Zucman (2018), “Who Owns the Wealth in Tax Havens? Macro Evidence and Implications for Global Inequality”. *Journal of Public Economics*, 162, pp. 89–100. [\[pdf\]](#)
- \* Alstadsæter, A., N. Johannesen, and G. Zucman (2019), “Tax Evasion and Inequality”, *American Economic Review*, 109(6), pp. 2073–2103. [\[pdf\]](#)
- Alstadsæter A., B. Planterose, G. Zucman, and A. Økland (2022), “Who Owns Offshore Real Estate? Evidence from Dubai”, EU Tax Observatory WP #1. [\[pdf\]](#)
- \* Boas. H., N. Johannesen, L. Larsen, K. Kreiner, and G. Zucman (2024), “Taxing Capital in a Globalized World: The Effects of Automatic Information Exchange”, NBER working paper #32714. [\[pdf\]](#)
- Guyton, J., P. Langetieg, D. Reck, M. Risch, and G. Zucman (2021), “Tax Evasion at the Top of the Income Distribution: Theory and Evidence,” NBER working paper #28542. [\[pdf\]](#)

# References II

- Johannesen, N. and Zucman, G. (2014). “The End of Bank Secrecy? An Evaluation of the G20 Tax Haven Crackdown,” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 6(1), pp. 65–91. [\[pdf\]](#)
- Leenders, W., A. Lejour, S. Rabate, and M. van't Riet (2023), “Offshore Tax Evasion and Wealth Inequality: Evidence from a Tax Amnesty in the Netherlands.” *Journal of Public Economics*, 217: 104785. [\[pdf\]](#)
- Londoño-Vélez, J. and D. Tortarolo (2022), “Revealing 21% of GDP in Hidden Assets: Evidence from Argentina’s Tax Amnesties” EU Tax Observatory working paper #6. [\[pdf\]](#)
- Zucman, G. (2013). “The Missing Wealth of Nations: are Europe and the US Net Debtors or Net Creditors?,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(3), pp. 1321–64. [\[pdf\]](#)
- Zucman, G. (2015), *The Hidden Wealth of Nations*, The University of Chicago Press.