



Tax Provisions in Administration's FY 2016 Budget Proposals

Insurance

February 2015

kpmg.com

HIGHLIGHTS OF INSURANCE TAX PROPOSALS IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET

KPMG has prepared a 111-page [book](#) that summarizes and makes observations about the revenue proposals in the Administration's FY 2016 budget. For ease of reference, we have compiled our summaries and observations relating to certain specific industries and topics in separate booklets. This booklet highlights revenue proposals that may be of interest to the insurance industry. Other booklets will address proposals relating to the following topics:

- International Tax
- General Corporate Tax
- Tax Accounting
- Business Tax Credits
- Financial Institutions & Products
- Passthrough Entities
- Practice, Procedures, & Administration
- Charitable Deductions & Exempt Organizations
- Compensation, Benefits, & Qualified Plans
- Energy & Natural Resources
- Real Estate
- Taxation of Individuals

Background

On February 2, 2015, President Obama transmitted to Congress the administration's recommendations to Congress for spending and taxation for the fiscal year that begins on October 1, 2015 (i.e., FY 2016).

Among other things, the president proposed a six-year \$478 billion program for transportation infrastructure, the cost of which would be offset in part by a one-time tax on the unrepatriated foreign earnings of U.S. multinational corporations. This tax would be part of a transition to a proposed fundamental change in the taxation of the future foreign earnings of U.S. corporations that would effectively eliminate deferral of tax on foreign earnings, causing them generally to be taxed on a current basis at a reduced rate.

The president also proposed a reserve for business tax reform, but not one of sufficient magnitude for significant rate reduction. The president has called for reducing the corporate income tax rate to 28%, but the budget does not provide revenue to offset the cost of such a reduction. Instead, the budget refers only to eliminating tax expenditures, such as accelerated depreciation and "reducing the tax preference for debt financed investment."

Many of the “general” business tax proposals in the FY 2016 budget are familiar, having been included in previous budgets. These proposals include, for example:

- Limitations on the ability of domestic entities to expatriate
- Repeal of natural resources production preferences
- Repeal of LIFO and LCM accounting
- Taxation of carried interests in partnerships as ordinary income
- Mark-to-market of financial derivatives
- Modification of the like-kind exchange rules
- Modification of the depreciation rules for corporate aircraft
- Denying a deduction for punitive damages
- Make permanent and reform the credit for research and experimentation

The president also re-proposed a tax on the liabilities of financial institutions with assets in excess of \$50 billion. The rate would be reduced relative to the prior proposal from 17 basis points to 7 basis points, but the base of the tax would be different and the application of the tax would be significantly broadened to include **insurance companies**, savings and loan holding companies, exchanges, asset managers, broker-dealers, specialty finance corporations, and financial captives. These changes have roughly doubled the revenue raised relative to the proposal in the FY 2015 budget. The application of this proposal to insurance companies is described in more detail later in this booklet.

The budget also includes a host of proposed changes to the individual income tax system. These include increasing the highest tax on capital gains from 23.8% (including the 3.8% net investment income tax) to 28%. In addition, a transfer of appreciated property would generally be treated as a sale of the property, subject to various exceptions and exclusions. For example, relief would be provided to lessen the immediate impact of the proposed change on the transfers of small businesses.

Insurance Tax Proposals

This booklet addresses the following budget proposals:

Taxation of Insurance Companies	4
Impose a financial fee on “financial entities”	4
Conform net operating loss rules of life insurance companies to those of other corporations	5
Require information reporting for private separate accounts of life insurance companies.....	5
Repeal special estimated tax payment (SETP) provision for certain insurance companies.....	6
Disallow the deduction for excess non-taxed reinsurance premiums paid to affiliates	7
Make permanent the exception under subpart F for active financing income	7
Modify proration rules for life insurance company general and separate accounts ..	8
Taxation of Insurance Products.....	8
Modify rules that apply to sales of life insurance contracts	8
Expand and simplify the tax credit provided to qualified small employers for non-elective contributions to employee health insurance	9
Expand pro rata interest expense disallowance for corporate-owned life insurance (COLI)	9
Taxation of Investments	10
Require that derivative contracts be marked to market with resulting gain or loss treated as ordinary	10
Require current inclusion in income of accrued market discount and limit the accrual amount for distressed debt	12
Require that the cost basis of stock that is a covered security must be determined using an average cost basis method.....	13
International Provisions	13
Make permanent the exception under subpart F for active financing income	13
Extend the look-through treatment of payments between related controlled foreign corporations (CFCs).....	14
Close loopholes under subpart F	14

Taxation of Insurance Companies

Impose a financial fee on “financial entities”

The administration proposes to impose a financial fee on financial entities. The administration cites excessive risk undertaken by major financial firms as a significant cause of the recent financial crisis and an ongoing potential risk to macroeconomic stability. The administration believes this fee will reduce the incentive for large financial institutions to leverage, reducing the cost of externalities arising from financial firm default as a result of high leverage. The structure of this fee would be broadly consistent with the principles agreed to by the G-20 leaders.¹

The fee would apply to both U.S. and foreign banks; bank holding companies; and “nonbanks,” such as insurance companies, savings and loan holding companies, exchanges, asset managers, broker-dealers, specialty finance corporations, and financial captives. Firms with worldwide consolidated assets of less than \$50 billion would not be subject to the fee for periods when their assets are below this threshold. According to The Treasury Department’s general explanation of the tax proposals of the budget—the so-called “[Green Book](#)”—U.S. subsidiaries and branches of foreign entities that fall into these business categories and that have assets in excess of \$50 billion also would be covered.

The fee would apply to the “covered liabilities” of a financial entity. Covered liabilities would be “assets less equity for banks and nonbanks based on audited financial statements with a deduction for separate accounts (primarily for insurance companies).”

The rate of the fee applied to covered liabilities would be seven basis points, and the fee would be deductible in computing corporate income tax. A financial entity subject to the fee would report it on its annual federal income tax return. Estimated payments of the fee would be made on the same schedule as estimated income tax payments.

According to the administration’s estimates, the fee would raise \$112 billion over 10 years and would apply to roughly 100 firms with assets over \$50 billion.

The fee would be effective as of January 1, 2016.

KPMG observation

While the administration previously proposed a similar fee on financial institutions, this fee proposal is much broader in scope and in purpose. The fee was previously proposed as a means to recoup remaining costs of assistance provided through the Troubled Asset Relief Program. Now, for the first time, the fee is described primarily as a disincentive to incur excess leverage.

¹ See Staff of the International Monetary Fund, “A Fair and Substantial Contribution by the Financial Sector: Final Report for the G-20” (June 2010).

The proposed fee could apply to many types of institutions not previously covered by similar proposals. The proposed fee would apply not just to banks, but could also apply to insurance companies, exchanges, asset managers, broker-dealers, specialty finance companies, and financial captives. This would greatly expand the base of entities subject to the tax. It is unclear how some of these entities (e.g., asset manager and specialty finance companies) would be defined.

The proposal would effectively apply to foreign-headquartered financial institutions, i.e., branches of foreign entities that have assets in excess of \$50 billion, and not just U.S. subsidiaries that meet the asset test. Some financial groups may end up with multiple groups subject to this fee, although the rule would presumably be drafted to avoid double-counting of assets and liabilities.

The definition of covered liabilities is also broader than prior proposals. Prior proposals excluded insured deposits from the calculation of covered liabilities. The current proposal would define covered liabilities as assets less equity based on audited financial statements, with no exclusion for deposits. The only exclusion would be for separate accounts, which primarily applies to insurance companies. It is unclear how this test would be applied to some of these types of entities (e.g., measuring assets and liabilities for entities with joint ventures).

Conform net operating loss rules of life insurance companies to those of other corporations

The administration's FY 2016 proposal would replace the section 810 three-year carryback and 15-year carryforward rule for a life insurance company's losses from operations with the section 172 net operating loss rules applicable to other corporations, allowing instead a two-year carryback and a 20-year carryforward.

The provision would be effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2015.

KPMG observation

This new provision is consistent with the proposal outlined in the *Tax Reform Act of 2014* proposed by the former Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Dave Camp, in the last congress. If enacted the proposal would have a significant impact on a life insurance company's deferred tax asset (DTA) admissibility computations for statutory accounting purposes.

Require information reporting for private separate accounts of life insurance companies

The administration's FY 2016 proposal would require life insurance companies to report to the IRS—for each contract with cash value that is partially or wholly invested in a private separate account for any portion of the tax year and represents at least 10% of the value of the account—(1) the policyholder's taxpayer identification number; (2) the

policy number; (3) the amount of accumulated untaxed income; (4) the total contract account value; and (5) the portion of that value that was invested in one or more private separate accounts.

For this purpose, a private separate account would be defined as any account with respect to which a related group of persons owns policies with cash values, in the aggregate, of at least 10% of the value of the separate account. Whether a related group of persons owns policies with cash values at 10% or greater of the account value would be determined quarterly, based on information reasonably within the contract issuer's possession.

The provision would be effective for private separate accounts maintained on or after December 31, 2015.

This provision was included in the administration's FY 2012 through FY 2015 revenue proposals.

Repeal special estimated tax payment (SETP) provision for certain insurance companies

The administration's FY 2016 proposal would repeal section 847, effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2015. The entire balance of any existing special loss discount account would be included in gross income for the first tax year beginning after December 31, 2015, and the entire amount of existing SETPs would be applied against additional tax that is due as a result of the provision. Any SETPs in excess of the additional tax that is due would be treated as an estimated tax payment under section 6655.

In lieu of immediate inclusion in gross income of the full special loss discount account balance for the first tax year beginning after December 31, 2015, taxpayers could elect to include the amount in gross income ratably over a four-tax-year period, beginning with the first tax year beginning after December 31, 2015. During this period, taxpayers would be permitted to use existing SETPs to offset any additional tax that is due as a result of the income inclusion. At the end of the fourth year, any remaining SETPs would be treated as an estimated tax payment under section 6655.

KPMG observation

This provision, which is revenue neutral and is designed to reduce recordkeeping burdens, is consistent with the Camp tax reform bill and was included in the administration's FY 2011 through FY 2015 revenue proposals.

Disallow the deduction for excess non-taxed reinsurance premiums paid to affiliates

The administration's FY 2016 proposal would: (1) deny an insurance company a deduction for reinsurance premiums for property and casualty risks paid to affiliated foreign reinsurance companies to the extent that the foreign reinsurer (or its parent company) is not subject to U.S. income tax with respect to the premiums received; and (2) exclude from the insurance company's income (in the same proportion that the premium deduction was denied) any ceding commissions received or reinsurance recovered with respect to reinsurance policies for which a premium deduction is wholly or partially denied.

A foreign corporation that receives a premium from an affiliate that would otherwise be denied a deduction under this proposal would be permitted to elect to treat the premium and the associated investment income as income effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States, and attributable to a permanent establishment for tax treaty purposes.

For foreign tax credit purposes, reinsurance income that is treated as effectively connected under this rule would be treated as foreign source income and would be placed into a separate category within section 904.

The provision would be effective for policies issued in tax years beginning after December 31, 2015.

KPMG observation

Similar proposals have been made in the last four budget proposals. The FY 2016 proposal, like the FY 2015 proposal, would limit the disallowance to property and casualty reinsurance premiums, making it consistent with the Camp tax reform bill.

Make permanent the exception under subpart F for active financing income

The administration's FY 2016 budget includes a new proposal that would make permanent the temporary active financing exception to subpart F income for certain insurance, banking, financing, and similar income.

KPMG observation

Although deferral would no longer be available, by extending this exception, active financing income would benefit from the 19% reduced U.S. rate described above rather than being subjected to (28%) U.S. residual tax at the full corporate rate.

Modify proration rules for life insurance company general and separate accounts

The administration's FY 2016 proposal would change the existing regime for prorating investment income between the "company's share" and the "policyholders' share" for purposes of the dividends-received deduction (DRD). Instead of keying off the policyholders' and company's shares of net investment income, under the proposal the policyholders' share would equal the ratio of an account's mean reserves to mean assets and the company's share would equal one less the policyholders' share.

The provision would be effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2015.

KPMG observation

Separate account DRD provisions have been included in the administration's FY 2012 through FY 2015 revenue proposals. The FY 2016 proposal is consistent with the proposal in the Camp tax reform bill. The proposal would in effect eliminate the separate account DRD for most life insurance companies that issue variable life insurance and variable annuity products.

Taxation of Insurance Products

Modify rules that apply to sales of life insurance contracts

The administration's FY 2016 proposal would require a person or entity who purchases an interest in an existing life insurance contract with a death benefit equal to or exceeding \$500,000 to report the purchase price, the buyer's and seller's taxpayer identification numbers (TINs), and the issuer and policy number to the IRS, to the insurance company that issued the policy, and to the seller.

Upon the payment of any policy benefits to the buyer, the insurance company would be required to report the gross benefit payment, the buyer's TIN, and the insurance company's estimate of the buyer's basis to the IRS and to the payee.

The proposal also would modify the transfer-for-value rule so that certain exceptions to that rule would not apply to buyers of policies, i.e., by eliminating the existing exception to transfer-for-value for sales of policies to a partner of the insured, a partnership in which the insured is a partner, or a corporation in which the insured is a shareholder or officer. The exception to the transfer-for-value rule would continue to apply to transfers to the insured, and would apply also to transfers to a partnership or corporation that is at least 20% owned by the insured.

The provision would apply to sales or assignments of interests in life insurance policies and payments of death benefits in tax years beginning after December 31, 2015.

KPMG observation

This provision was designed to address life settlement transactions. The proposal would impose reporting burdens on both purchasers of life insurance contracts and on life insurance companies that pay death benefits. The requirement for the insurance company to provide an “estimate” of a policy purchaser’s basis in the contract being reported on is problematic.

This provision was included in the administration’s 2012 through 2015 revenue proposals.

Expand and simplify the tax credit provided to qualified small employers for non-elective contributions to employee health insurance

The *Affordable Care Act of 2010* created a tax credit designed to help small employers provide health insurance for their employees and their employees’ families. To qualify for the credit, an employer must make uniform contributions of at least 50% of the premium. A qualified employer is one with no more than 25 full-time equivalent employees during the tax year and whose employees have annual full-time equivalent wages that average no more than \$50,000 (indexed for inflation beginning in 2014.)

The credit is phased out on a sliding scale for employers with between 10 and 25 full-time equivalent employees, and also for average annual employee wages between \$25,000 and \$50,000 (these amounts are indexed for inflation.)

The administration’s FY 2016 proposal would expand the group of employers that are eligible for the credit to include employers with up to 50 full-time equivalent employees, and would begin the phase-out at 20 full-time equivalent employees. In addition, the coordination of the phase-outs between the number of employees and the average wage would be amended to provide for a more gradual combined phase-out. The proposal also would eliminate a requirement that the employer make a uniform contribution on behalf of each employee, and eliminate the limit imposed by the rating area average premium.

The provision would be effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2014.

Expand pro rata interest expense disallowance for corporate-owned life insurance (COLI)

The administration’s FY 2016 proposal would repeal the section 264(f)(4)(A)(ii) exception from the overall section 264(f) pro rata interest expense disallowance rule for life insurance, annuity, and endowment contracts covering employees, officers, or directors of a business that is the owner or beneficiary of the contracts. The proposal would leave intact the section 264(f)(4)(A)(i) exception for contracts covering 20% owners of the business that owns the contract.

The proposal would apply to contracts issued after December 31, 2015, in tax years ending after that date. For this purpose, any material increase in the death benefit or other material change in the contract would cause the contract to be treated as a new contract, except in the case of a master contract, for which the addition of covered lives would be treated as a new contract only with respect to the additional covered lives.

KPMG observation

This provision, which diminishes the attractiveness of purchasing corporate owned life insurance (COLI), was included in the administration's FY 2011 through FY 2015 revenue proposals.

Taxation of Investments

Require that derivative contracts be marked to market with resulting gain or loss treated as ordinary

The timing and character of gain or loss on derivative contracts may vary under current law depending on how the contracts are classified or traded. For example, gain or loss with respect to a forward contract is generally recognized only when the contract is transferred or settled and is generally capital if the contract is a capital asset in the hands of the taxpayer. Certain futures contracts, in contrast, must be marked to market with capital gain or loss treated as 60% long-term and 40% short-term. Furthermore, certain options that are otherwise similar may be subject to disparate tax treatment depending on whether they are entered into over-the-counter or traded on certain exchanges.

Similar to the administration's FY 2015 proposal, the administration's FY 2016 proposal would generally require that a "derivative contract," as defined in the proposal, be marked to market annually (no later than the last business day of a taxpayer's tax year). Gain or loss would be recognized for tax purposes and would be treated as ordinary and as attributable to a trade or business of the taxpayer for purposes of section 172(d)(4). The source of income associated with a derivative would continue to be determined under current law. The proposal would also eliminate or amend a number of other provisions of the Code that address specific taxpayers and transactions, including section 475 (mark to market for securities dealers), section 1256 (mark to market and 60/40 capital treatment), section 1092 (tax straddles), section 1233 (short sales), section 1234 (gain or loss from an option), section 1234A (gains or losses from certain terminations), section 1258 (conversion transactions), section 1259 (constructive sale transactions), and section 1260 (constructive ownership transactions).

The proposal would define a "derivative contract" broadly to include any contract the value of which is determined, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by the value of actively traded property. An embedded derivative contract would also be subject to mark to market if the derivative itself would be. Thus, contingent debt or structured

notes linked to actively traded property would be taxed as derivative contracts under the proposal.

In addition, actively traded stock that would not otherwise be subject to mark to market under the proposal would be required to be marked to market if it is part of a straddle transaction with a derivative contract (i.e., a derivative contract that substantially diminishes the risk of loss on the actively traded stock). Under such circumstances, pre-existing gain on the financial instrument would be recognized at the time of the mark, and loss would be recognized when such loss would have been recognized on the stock in the absence of the straddle.

The proposal would also provide the Secretary with the authority to issue regulations matching the timing, source, and character of income, gain, deduction, and loss from a capital asset and a transaction that diminishes the risk of loss or opportunity for gain from that asset. As an example, the proposal provides the following example:

For example, in the case of stock issued by a U.S. corporation, the source of dividends on the stock would be U.S., while gain or loss on a sale of the stock is generally sourced based on the residence of the recipient. Thus, if a taxpayer were to hedge the stock with a notional principal contract (NPC), the Secretary would have the authority to write regulations that provide that dividend equivalent payments on the NPC are matched to the dividends on the stock for timing, source, and character, while gain or loss on the NPC could be matched to the gain or loss on the stock for timing, source, and character.

The proposal would not, however, apply mark-to-market treatment to a transaction that qualifies as a business hedging transaction. A business hedging transaction is a transaction that is entered into in the ordinary course of a taxpayer's trade or business primarily to manage risk of certain price changes (including changes related to interest rates, currency fluctuations, or creditworthiness) with respect to ordinary property or ordinary obligations, and that is identified as a hedging transaction before the close of the day on which it was acquired, originated, or entered into. The proposal provides that the identification requirement would be met if the transaction is identified as a business hedge for financial accounting purposes and it hedges price changes on ordinary property or obligations.

The proposal would apply to derivative contracts entered into after December 31, 2015.

KPMG observation

The administration's FY 2016 proposal imposes mark-to-market treatment on derivative contracts only when the value of the derivative contract is determined, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by the value of actively traded property. Although the administration's FY 2016 proposal would provide a framework for more uniform treatment of derivative contracts, taxpayers would still need to determine whether a

particular financial instrument fits the definition of a derivative contract and thus be subject to mark-to-market treatment. Several details would need to be clarified, such as what constitutes actively traded property and what is an embedded derivative.

Require current inclusion in income of accrued market discount and limit the accrual amount for distressed debt

Market discount generally arises when a debt instrument is acquired in the secondary market for an amount less than its stated principal amount (or adjusted issue price, if it was issued with original issue discount (OID)). A holder of a debt instrument with market discount generally treats gain from a disposition of the instrument and principal payments under the instrument as ordinary income to the extent of the accrued market discount. Generally, market discount accrues ratably over the term of a debt instrument unless the holder elects to accrue on a constant yield basis instead. A holder may also elect to include market discount into income as it accrues.

The administration's FY 2016 proposal would require holders of debt instruments with market discount to include market discount currently in taxable ordinary income as it accrues. The proposal would require accrual of market discount on a constant yield basis. The proposal would also limit the accrual of market discount to the greater of: (1) the bond's yield to maturity plus 5%; or (2) the applicable federal rate for such bond plus 10%.

The proposal would apply to debt securities acquired after December 31, 2015.

KPMG observation

The proposal is based upon the premise that market discount that arises as a result of changes in interest rates or decreases in an issuer's creditworthiness subsequent to issuance is economically similar to OID, and like OID is to be accrued into income currently.

The proposal notes that current inclusion of market discount has historically been complicated by the fact that the amount of market discount on a debt instrument can vary from holder to holder since it is based upon each holder's acquisition price. The new information reporting rules would require brokers to include, on annual information returns, market discount accruals together with basis and other information for debt instruments, simplifying taxpayer compliance as well as the administrability of the proposal. Brokers are required to report cost-basis information, including market-discount accruals, for less complex debt instruments acquired after 2013 and more complex debt instruments acquired after 2015.

Require that the cost basis of stock that is a covered security must be determined using an average cost basis method

A taxpayer computes gain or loss upon disposition of stock as the difference between the stock's adjusted basis and its amount realized. Under current law, taxpayers who purchase identical stock at different times and for different prices may specifically identify which lots they sold. A first-in, first-out (FIFO) rule applies in the absence of a specific identification. An average basis method is permitted for stock in a regulated investment company, and for stock acquired in connection with a dividend investment plan.

For portfolio stock with respect to which the taxpayer has a long-term holding period, the administration's FY 2016 proposal would require taxpayers to determine the basis of stock sold using an average basis method. The average basis method would be applied to all identical shares of portfolio stock with a long-term holding period held by the taxpayer, including stock held through a different broker or in a separate account, but would not apply to shares held in a nontaxable account, such as an individual retirement account. The statute would provide authority to the Secretary to draft regulations applying the average basis method to stock other than portfolio stock. Special rules could also be required to coordinate the average basis method with the rules applicable to stock in passive foreign investment company.

The proposal would apply to portfolio stock acquired after December 31, 2015.

KPMG observation

The proposal would only apply to portfolio stock with respect to which a taxpayer has a long-term holding period, and only to portfolio stock acquired on or after December 31, 2015. However, it does not define portfolio stock. This term is defined in section 246A, but it is not clear that the proposal is relying upon this definition.

The proposal would also require taxpayers to apply average basis to all identical stock, whether held in the same account or multiple accounts with different brokers. Because the broker cost-basis reporting rules for stock apply on an account-by account-basis, the proposal would require taxpayers holding identical stock in multiple accounts to compute their average basis across accounts rather than relying upon annual statements provided by their brokers.

International Provisions

Make permanent the exception under subpart F for active financing income

The administration's FY 2016 budget includes a new proposal that would make permanent the temporary active financing exception to subpart F income for certain insurance, banking, financing, and similar income.

KPMG observation

Although deferral would no longer be available, by extending this exception, active financing income would benefit from the 19% reduced U.S. rate described above rather than being subjected to (28%) U.S. residual tax at the full corporate rate.

Extend the look-through treatment of payments between related controlled foreign corporations (CFCs)

The administration's FY 2016 budget includes a new proposal that would make permanent the temporary subpart F "look-through" exception for certain payments between related CFCs.

KPMG observation

Like the extension for active financing income, when taken together with the other budget proposals, this proposal would allow income to qualify for a lower U.S. rate.

Close loopholes under subpart F

The administration's FY 2016 proposals to create a new category of subpart F income for digital income and to expand the foreign base company sales income rules to include income related to manufacturing services arrangements are substantially similar to provisions in the administration's FY 2015 budget, except that they would be effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2015.

The administration's FY 2016 proposal includes two new provisions that would modify the thresholds for applying subpart F in two ways. First, for purposes of determining whether a foreign corporation is a CFC and a U.S. person is a U.S. shareholder of a CFC, the proposal would amend the ownership attribution rules of section 958(b) to attribute stock of a foreign corporation from a foreign person to a related U.S. person. However, the pro rata share of a CFC's subpart F income that a U.S. shareholder is required to include in gross income would continue to be determined based on direct or indirect ownership of the CFC, without application of section 958(b).

Second, the administration's proposal would eliminate the requirement for a foreign corporation to be a CFC for an uninterrupted period of at least 30 days in order for a U.S. shareholder to be required to include in gross income its pro rata share of the CFC's subpart F income.

Both proposals would be effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Contact a KPMG professional:

Craig Pichette

Washington National Tax

Partner

Financial Institutions and Products

T 312-665-5267

E cpichette@kpmg.com

Sheryl Flum

Washington National Tax

Managing Director

Financial Institutions and Products

T 202-533-3394

E sflum@kpmg.com

Jean Baxley

Washington National Tax

Director

Financial Institutions and Products

T 202-533-3008

E jbaxley@kpmg.com

John Gimigliano

Washington National Tax

Principal in Charge

Federal Legislative and Regulatory Services

T 202-533-4022

E jgimigliano@kpmg.com

Tom Stout

Washington National Tax

Director

Federal Legislative and Regulatory Services

T 202-533-4148

E tstoutjr@kpmg.com

ANY TAX ADVICE IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN BY KPMG TO BE USED, AND CANNOT BE USED, BY A CLIENT OR ANY OTHER PERSON OR ENTITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF (i) AVOIDING PENALTIES THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON ANY TAXPAYER OR (ii) PROMOTING, MARKETING OR RECOMMENDING TO ANOTHER PARTY ANY MATTERS ADDRESSED HEREIN.

KPMG is a global network of professional firms providing Audit, Tax and Advisory services.

We operate in 152 countries and have 145,000 people working in member firms around the world.

The independent member firms of the KPMG network are affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. Each KPMG firm is a legally distinct and separate entity and describes itself as such.

© 2015 KPMG LLP, a Delaware limited liability partnership and the U.S. member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved. Printed in the U.S.A. NDPPS 336883

The KPMG name, logo and "cutting through complexity" are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International.