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MR. ALLEN: Good morning and welcome.
The Office of the United States Trade Representative, in conjunction with the Interagency Section 301 Committee, is holding this public hearing regarding a potential trade action in connection with its Section 301 investigation of the digital services tax, or DST, adopted by Italy.

The United States Trade Representative initiated this investigation on June 2nd, 2020. In a notice published on March 31st, USTR announced the proposed trade action in this investigation. This notice may be found at 86 FR 16819.

Earlier today, we held a hearing with respect to the proposed trade action in the Section 301 investigation of the United Kingdom's DST. Later today, we will hold hearings with respect to the proposed trade actions in the Section 301 investigations of DSTs adopted by

Spain and Austria.
The Section 301 Committee will
carefully consider the testimony provided at this public hearing and the multijurisdictional hearing held on Monday, May 3rd. The Committee will also review the written comments received in response to the March 31st notice of the proposed trade action, as well as post-hearing rebuttal comments from interested parties. The Section 301 Committee will then make a recommendation to the U.S. Trade Representative.

Before we begin today's testimony, I'll provide some procedural and administrative instructions and introduce the U.S. Government representatives that will participate in the hearing.

This hearing consists of one panel with one individual scheduled to testify. The provisional list of witness list has been posted to USTR's website.

Each witness appearing at the hearing is limited to five minutes of direct testimony.

After the testimony from the panel, the Section 301 Committee will have an opportunity to ask questions.

Post-hearing comments, including any written responses to questions from the Section 301 Committee, are due by May 12th. The rules and procedures for written submissions are set out in the March 31st Federal Register notice.

A written transcript of this hearing will be posted on the USTR website as soon as possible after the conclusion of this hearing.

Now a few technical points. For those participating in the hearing, when it is not your turn to speak, please be sure to leave your video and microphone muted.

If you are having technical difficulty and need help, please let us know in the chat box on the BlueJeans platform.

When you are speaking, you are responsible for keeping time. As a reminder, you are limited to five minutes of direct testimony. Should you exceed this time, we will ask you to
conclude your comments.
I would now like to introduce the U.S. Government panel that will be presiding over this hearing.

I am Benjamin Allen from USTR's Office of General Counsel. I'm joined in the room by my USTR colleague Patrick Childress, who is also from USTR's Office of General Counsel.

Also joining from USTR is our colleague Rob Tanner from the Office of Services and Investment.

We are also pleased to be joined today by several international trade and economic experts from a range of U.S. Government agencies.

From the Department of State, we have David Moo.

From the Department of Commerce, we have Jessica Huang.

From Treasury, we have Won Chang.
From the Department of Agriculture, we have Andrew Stephens.

And from the Small Business

Administration, we have Sarah Bonner.
We will now proceed with testimony from our panel. The panel is comprised of Mike Sax of ACT, The App Association.

Mr. Sax, you may proceed with your testimony when you are ready.

MR. SAX: Thank you for this opportunity to share our views on the Italian digital service tax and its impact on the American small business digital economy community.

The App Association represents thousands of small businesses, software companies and technology firms that create apps used on mobile devices and in enterprise systems around the world. This ecosystem today, which we call the app economy, is valued at around \$1.7 trillion and is responsible for over 5.9 million American jobs. Alongside the world's rapid embrace of mobile technology, our members create innovative solutions that power the internet of things across modalities and segments of the
economy.
Italy is an important market for The App Association members. Since 2014, annual net revenue for apps on major platforms has increased from nearly 189 million to just under 562 million in 2020. That's a 198 percent increase. And generally, The App Association believes that the imposition of digital service taxes is unreasonable and discriminatory; that they disjoint the digital economy and impede U.S. exports and investment abroad.

Their imposition on U.S. digital
exports directly impacts America's most innovative service industries and the small businesses that are driving those industries, in particular, including software development and connected devices.

Italy's DST, effective as of January 2020, is a sweeping tax imposed at a rate of 3 percent. It unduly discriminates against American companies. It's retroactive and extraterritorial and would unreasonably increase
administrative burdens. Such taxes are, in effect, tariffs on the digital economy, and The App Association agrees with the USTR that unilateral digital taxes are significant trade barriers.

The App Association also agrees that the imposition of digital service taxes gives rise to conflicts with international treaties and taxation principles reflected in the OECD's Model Taxation Convention on Income and Capital, the U.N. Model Double Taxation Convention, and numerous bilateral tax treaties. These established approaches recommend the taxation of income, and not revenue, and discourage assessing taxes to entities without considering if they are established in that country, and avoid assessing taxes retroactively.

Further, digital service taxes conflict with commitments made under the WTO General Agreement on Trade in Services, and especially Articles II and XVII. And, in effect, we believe that, in its multijurisdictional and
country-specific investigations, we would like to strongly encourage the USTR to reinforce the DSTs at issue do not align with these important multilateral and bilateral constructs; and that the proposed unilateral DSTs at issue are unreasonable and discriminatory.

The App Association notes agreement that some changes may be needed with respect to international taxation due to the rise of the digital economy. We endorse and urge the U.S. Government to support the ongoing OECD efforts to reach consensus on needed tax changes and support the development of such a solution as soon as possible, which has seen significant progress as of late.

Country-specific digital service taxes put into place while the OECD solution is being pursued will ultimately undermine the global consensus needed to reach a workable international taxation agreement and will damage the ability of American small businesses and the digital economy to innovate and create new jobs.

Should USTR decide that some or all of the tax policies being investigated are actionable under Section 301 of the Trade Act, The App Association recommends that the U.S. Government focus on attaining a consensus multilateral agreement through the OECD process and avoid imposition of retaliatory tariffs that would most impact American small businesses like the members of The App Association.

We really appreciate the opportunity to provide our views, and we are very happy to help you in any way we can moving forward. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you very much for your testimony.

We will now turn to questions from the Section 301 Committee.

For that, we will start with Rob Tanner from USTR.

MR. TANNER: Thanks again and good morning.

So, I wanted to ask, many of the app
developers that you represent are small and medium-sized business, and therefore, would not appear to be covered directly by the national digital service acts at issue. So, I was hoping that you might be able to speak a bit to what impact the DST would be on these smaller businesses, particularly for small to mediumsized U.S. app developers and other small businesses in your association.

MR. SAX: Well, the most important element of that is that our SMEs work in an ecosystem that they have suppliers, that they are suppliers to other companies. So, while they might not directly always be affected by this, it will affect their business partners and it might impact their business partners' ability to afford their services or complicate the business interactions that they have. I think that is the most important thing.

The second thing is that not all these small businesses have the -- you know, they need to understand what their obligations are. And
whenever there are regulations that might or might not apply to certain businesses, just finding out whether those regulations are applicable to them may in itself become a burden, especially for the medium-sized businesses that are possibly on the threshold.

MR. TANNER: Thank you.
MR. ALLEN: All right. For our next question, we'll go to Treasury.

MR. CHANG: Hi, Mr. Sax.
Following up on the last question, could you elaborate on the relationship between your members, particularly SMEs, small and medium-sized companies, and the large digital services companies, particularly U.S. digital companies that appear to be subject to the national DST at issue?

Thank you.
MR. SAX: Yes. So, a lot of our members create apps that use digital platforms like app stores to get their distribution. Their apps are sold on these stores, and it's what our
companies essentially depend on to get their international distribution and wide reach.

I'm not sure exactly if you would like me to elaborate on specific aspects of that relationship. I mean, they depend on these platforms to sell their apps, and it's in most cases the only mechanism that they use to reach customers in those countries.

So, if those platforms end up being affected, then that will end up affecting them directly, actually, almost directly as well, because it will impact their revenue and the simplicity of their business process.

MR. CHANG: Thank you. Thank you for that answer.

MR. ALLEN: For our next question, we will go to State.

MR. MOO: Hi. Can you hear me, Ben?
MR. ALLEN: Yes, we can hear you.
MR. M00: Great.
Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Sax. It's very helpful.

In your testimony, you noted that you do not support the imposition of tariffs on Italy in connection with this dispute. But the question $I$ have is whether you believe that the imposition of tariffs might be effective in bringing about a change of policy at the Italian government. Do you think that the tariffs would be effective in this respect? Why or why not?

MR. SAX: Well, I think we're mostly concerned that tariffs would end up causing a war that ends up being very destructive, especially for our members. If it starts escalating that way, it goes into a direction that we are not sure would be helpful for anyone. And overall, I think we would advocate for a more wholegovernment approach where we work to foster a positive relationship and bring everybody to the table towards an agreement.

MR. M00: Okay. Thank you.
MR. ALLEN: Next, we'll move to Commerce.

MS. HUANG: Hello.

MR. SAX: Hello.
MS. HUANG: Thank you for your
testimony.
You note that The App Association strongly endorses efforts within the OECD. What specific outcome would you like to see as a result of the OECD negotiations? And also, you just mentioned a whole-of-government approach where everyone is at the table.

MR. SAX: Well, we would love to see an approach that leads to no, as little trade barriers or taxes imposed specifically on digital goods as possible. We believe that these conventions that have been in place for a long time, or agreements that have been in place for a long time, have really helped to make sure that the internet does not get balkanized, that we have a single -- or not a single market, but we have a global reach for companies to do commerce, and that digital companies have the ability to compete on a global scale, regardless of their size; and that, both financially and in terms of
business complexity, there are no barriers that would impede their entry to specific markets or their ability to compete in terms of having too much overhead or too complex regulations that make it very hard for smaller companies to figure that out and deal with it.

MS. HUANG: Thank you.
MR. SAX: You're welcome.
MR. ALLEN: Okay. For our next question, we'll go to USDA.

I think you're muted.
MR. STEPHENS: Here we go.
In your testimony, you noted that Italy is a key market for The App Association members looking to grow their customer base abroad. Will you please tell us a bit more about your members' companies' specific interest in Italy? Is it games? Is it perhaps coapplications? You know, what's the market like?

MR. SAX: We have a very diverse membership. And so, many of our companies are interested in both providing entertainment
services, like games, and everything, or media, but also we have companies that create medical applications and health applications. We have a lot of industrial and logistics companies that create software that helps companies essentially run their business. So, it's a really diverse membership, and the interest really ends up covering pretty much all the aspects of the economy.

MR. STEPHENS: Great. Thank you. MR. SAX: Thank you. MR. ALLEN: And lastly, we'll go to SBA.

MS. BONNER: Hi, Mr. Sax.
MR. SAX: Hello. Yes?
MS. BONNER: The written comments indicate that the Italian DST requires the appointment of a tax representative in fulfilling payment and filing obligations. Can you share any estimate of what this local representative could cost in terms of trade costs on U.S. SMEs?

MR. SAX: That is an excellent
question. I don't have a specific number for you, but I can definitely follow up with that information for you.

MS. BONNER: Thank you very much.
MR. SAX: Thank you.
MR. ALLEN: Great.
Before concluding this panel, we will pause to see if any member of the Section 301 Committee has any remaining questions for our witness.
(No audible response.)
Okay. Hearing none, finally, Mr. Sax, would you like to make any final comment on the matters we've discussed this morning?

MR. SAX: No. I want to thank you for all your efforts, and we are very hopeful that a positive agreement can be reached.

Thank you so much.
MR. ALLEN: Great. Thank you.
That concludes this panel. Thank you for your time today. I would like you for testifying today and your important contributions
to our investigations.
As a reminder, the deadline for rebuttal comments, which may include written answers to the questions posed at today's hearing, is one week from today. Those comments should be submitted through USTR's online portal at comments.ustr.gov.

Today's hearing is now adjourned.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:19 a.m.)
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Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Section 301 Investigations Public Hearing

Before: U.S. Trade Representative

Date: 05-06-21

Place: teleconference
was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

> Meal $\operatorname{lors} \rho$ ------------------Court Reporter

