

**ACKNOWLEDGED SIGNIFICANT ADVICE, MAY BE DISSEMINATED**

**Office of Chief Counsel  
Internal Revenue Service**

**ACKNOWLEDGED 9-10-97  
SCA 1997-011**

**memorandum**

CC:DOM:IT&A:3  
CAProhofsky WTA-N-108819-97

date: May 23, 1997

to: Janet M. Balbo, Acting National Director,  
Submission Processing, T:S  
Attn: Curt Reuter

from: Assistant Chief Counsel, CC:DOM:IT&A

---

subject: Significant Service Center Advice

This responds to your request for Significant Advice dated May 8, 1997, in connection with questions posed by the Submission Processing function of the National Office.

Disclosure Statement

Unless specifically marked "Acknowledged Significant Advice, May Be Disseminated" above, this memorandum is not to be circulated or disseminated except as provided in the CCDM. This document may contain confidential information subject to the attorney-client and deliberative process privileges. Therefore, this document shall not be disclosed beyond the office or individual(s) who originated the question discussed herein and are working the matter with the requisite "need to know." In no event shall it be disclosed to taxpayers or their representatives.

**Issues**

- 1) If a taxpayer claims the earned income credit and attaches Schedule EIC showing a year of birth for the qualifying child that would qualify for the EIC, but the Service's National Account Profile (NAP) data from the Social Security Administration show a different year of birth that would make the child too old to qualify, may the Service treat this discrepancy as a mathematical or clerical error?
- 2) If a taxpayer claims the EIC without qualifying children, can the Service use NAP data to determine whether the taxpayer meets the age criteria for EIC eligibility, and disallow the EIC if the taxpayer does not?

WTA-N-108819-97

3) If a taxpayer claims the dependent care credit and the Service uses NAP data to determine that the child claimed is more than 12 years old, and therefore not qualified, can the Service treat the entry claiming the credit as a math error and reduce or remove the credit?

### **Conclusion**

The Service does not have authority to treat these discrepancies as mathematical or clerical errors. If a "qualifying child" or "eligible individual" for the EIC, or a "qualifying individual" for the dependent care credit is not qualified for age reasons, adjustments must be made through the deficiency procedures.

### **Discussion**

The Service uses NAP data to determine whether correct TINs have been reported for the EIC, dependent care credit, and personal exemptions, disallowing the entries as math errors if correct TINs were omitted. The Service also uses NAP data to determine whether various age criteria are met for the EIC and the dependent care credit. You ask whether the credits can be disallowed as math errors when the NAP data show that age criteria are not met.

A "qualifying individual" for purposes of the dependent care credit includes a dependent of the taxpayer who is under the age of 13 and with respect to whom the taxpayer is entitled to a personal exemption deduction under § 151(c). § 21(b)(1)(A) of the Code.

An individual must be under the age of 19, or a student under the age of 24, to be a "qualifying child" for the earned income credit. § 32(c)(3)(C).

An individual who does not have a qualifying child must have attained the age of 25, but not attained the age of 65, to be an "eligible individual" for the earned income credit. § 32(c)(1)(A)(ii)(II).

Section 6213(b) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that the Service may summarily assess additional tax due as a result of a mathematical or clerical error ("math error") without sending the taxpayer a notice of deficiency and without giving the taxpayer an opportunity to petition the Tax Court. The assessment must be abated at the taxpayer's request. Section 6213(g)(2) defines the term "mathematical or clerical error" to mean:

WTA-N-108819-97

(A) an error in addition, subtraction, multiplication, or division shown on any return;

(B) an incorrect use of any table if the incorrect use is apparent from the existence of other information on the return;

(C) an entry on a return of an item that is inconsistent with another entry of the same or another item on the return;

(D) an omission of information required to be supplied on the return to substantiate an entry on the return;

(E) an entry on a return of a deduction or credit in an amount that exceeds a statutory limit, if the limit is expressed as a specified monetary amount, or as a percentage, ratio, or fraction, and if the items entering into the application of such limit appear on such return;

(F) an omission of a correct taxpayer identification number (TIN) required under § 32 (relating to the earned income credit) to be included on a return;

(G) an entry on a return claiming the credit under § 32 with respect to net earnings from self-employment described in § 32(c)(2)(A) to the extent self-employment tax on the earnings has not been paid; and

(H) an omission of a correct TIN required under § 21 (relating to expenses for household and dependent care necessary for gainful employment) or § 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions).

Prior to recent legislative changes, the only situations in which the math error procedures could be used were those in which the error was apparent from the face of the return, and the correct amount was determinable with a high degree of probability from the information that appears on the return. General Explanation of the Tax Reform Act of 1976, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 372-74 (1976), 1976-3 (Vol. 2) C.B. 1, 384-86.

The Small Business Job Protection Act, P.L. No. 104-188, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, P.L. No. 104-193, modified this rule by adding specific authority for the Service to treat missing or incorrect TINs as math errors for certain purposes. § 6213(g)(2)(F) and (H). Our understanding is that the Service discovers most of these TIN errors by checking the reported information against NAP data. However, the authority in § 6213(g)(2)(F) and (H) is limited to

WTA-N-108819-97

missing or incorrect TINs. The math error definitions in § 6213(g)(2)(F) and (H) do not include other inaccuracies revealed by NAP data. Thus, failure to meet age criteria is not a math error under § 6213(g)(2)(F) or (H).

Of the other meanings of "math error," only § 6213(g)(2)(C) and (E) are potentially applicable. However, § 6213(g)(2)(C) requires that two entries on the return are inconsistent. As discussed above, age inaccuracies are determined by checking entries on the return against the NAP data, information not on the return. Because only one entry on the return is involved, § 6213(g)(2)(C) does not apply.

Section 6213(g)(2)(E) pertains to entries claiming deductions or credits. Nevertheless, the definition only includes entries claiming a deduction or credit in excess of a statutory limit expressed as a specified monetary amount, or as a percentage, ratio, or fraction. For example, an entry claiming the medical expense deduction under § 213 without meeting the 7.5%-of-adjusted-gross-income floor is a math error. The age provisions for the earned income credit and dependent care credit are not within this definition.

We note that eligibility for the dependent exemption under § 151 may also depend on meeting age requirements. See § 151(c)(1)(B). Since an individual may qualify as a dependent, regardless of age, if his or her income is less than the exemption amount, see § 151(c)(1)(A), it is unlikely that the Service can determine that an individual is ineligible based solely on NAP data. However, to the extent it is possible, our conclusion would apply in the § 151 context as well.

If you have any comments or suggestions on the interpretation of this provision, please call Cathy Prohovsky at 622-4930.

Assistant Chief Counsel  
(Income Tax & Accounting)

by \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael D. Finley  
Chief, Branch 3

cc: EOSCO, T:S  
EOCSO, T:C