Journal of Management and Economics (ISSN: 2751-1707)

Received: 09 September 2026 | Accepted: 06 October 2026 | Published: 01 November 2026

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Evaluating the GST Framework: Taxation Efficiency, Revenue Generation, And Compliance Optimization

Dr. Budi Santoso
Department of Management and Economics, Indonesia

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue11 2026

PAGE: 01-09

Copyright © 2026 Journal of Management and Economics, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

The Goods and Services Tax (GST) represents a significant reform in indirect taxation, designed to consolidate multiple taxes, improve administrative efficiency, and strengthen revenue collection. However, its effectiveness depends not only on the structure of taxation but also on intergovernmental coordination, compliance mechanisms, taxpayer awareness, and the capacity of businesses to adapt to regulatory requirements. This paper evaluates the GST framework in India through a qualitative, literature-based analytical approach using the seven references provided. It examines the relationship between tax harmonization, revenue stability, compliance optimization, and institutional performance. The analysis identifies three central considerations: the need to balance revenue objectives between central and state governments, the importance of accessible compliance procedures, and the role of administrative performance in achieving sustainable tax outcomes. The paper proposes a conceptual framework connecting taxation design, administrative capacity, taxpayer compliance, and revenue performance. As the study relies on secondary literature rather than original tax-administration data, its findings are interpretive and should not be treated as empirical estimates of GST performance. The paper concludes that effective GST administration requires continuous procedural improvement, transparent revenue assessment, and coordinated implementation across levels of government.

KEYWORDS

Goods and Services Tax, Taxation Efficiency, Revenue Generation, Tax Compliance, Fiscal Federalism, Indirect Taxation, Tax Administration, Revenue Optimization.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Taxation provides governments with resources to finance public services, infrastructure, social development, and administrative functions. Within this system, indirect taxation is particularly important because it affects the prices of goods and services, business transactions, and consumption patterns. However, when indirect taxes operate through multiple overlapping structures, businesses may face complex compliance obligations, inconsistent administrative procedures, and uncertainty concerning the treatment of transactions.

The Goods and Services Tax (GST) was introduced in India as a major reform intended to create a more integrated indirect taxation framework. Its underlying objective was to reduce fragmentation in the tax system and improve the coordination of taxation across different levels of government. The First Discussion Paper on Goods and Services Tax issued by state finance ministers provides an important institutional starting

point for understanding the proposed framework and the coordination challenges associated with its implementation (State Finance Ministers, 2009).

GST should not be assessed solely by examining whether it consolidates taxes. Its effectiveness also depends on whether the resulting system supports reliable revenue collection, manageable compliance requirements, administrative transparency, and predictable treatment of taxpayers. A tax structure may be theoretically efficient yet produce unsatisfactory results if businesses encounter procedural difficulties or if government agencies lack adequate coordination.

1.2 Problem Statement

The principal problem addressed in this study is the relationship between GST design and its practical performance. Tax harmonization may simplify the overall structure, but simplification does not automatically guarantee lower compliance costs, higher voluntary compliance, or stable government revenue. Differences in administrative capacity, business size, accounting practices, and access to tax-related information can affect implementation outcomes.

Revenue distribution also presents a significant institutional consideration. States require predictable financial resources to meet expenditure responsibilities, while the broader tax framework must maintain consistent administration and minimize avoidable distortions. Contemporary discussions surrounding GST and state revenues demonstrate the importance of considering these fiscal relationships alongside tax-system efficiency (NDTV Profit, 2015).

1.3 Research Objectives

The study has four objectives. First, it evaluates the conceptual relationship between GST and taxation efficiency. Second, it examines the connection between tax administration, compliance optimization, and revenue generation. Third, it identifies institutional and operational challenges that may limit the effectiveness of GST implementation. Fourth, it develops a conceptual framework that can guide future empirical research and administrative improvements.

1.4 Scope and Significance

The study focuses on the Indian GST framework from the perspectives of taxation structure, government revenue, taxpayer compliance, and administrative performance. It uses only the references supplied by the user and does not introduce external literature. Its significance lies in integrating fiscal coordination and administrative efficiency into a single analytical perspective. Rather than assuming that tax consolidation necessarily produces superior outcomes, the study considers the institutional conditions under which such outcomes may emerge.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 GST as a Tax Harmonization Framework

The First Discussion Paper on Goods and Services Tax provides a foundation for examining the institutional design of GST in India. Its focus on the proposed tax framework highlights the importance of coordination among state governments and the development of a more integrated indirect taxation structure (State Finance Ministers, 2009). From a theoretical perspective, tax harmonization seeks to reduce fragmentation and establish more consistent rules across jurisdictions. Nevertheless, the extent to which harmonization improves efficiency depends on implementation quality and the distribution of administrative responsibilities.

The article on GST implications published by MBA Rendezvous presents GST as a subject involving broader economic and administrative consequences (MBA Rendezvous, 2014). Read alongside the state finance ministers' discussion paper, this source helps frame GST as both a structural tax reform and an institutional coordination exercise. The distinction matters because a unified tax architecture can still generate operational complexity if reporting requirements, taxpayer guidance, and administrative procedures are difficult to navigate.

2.2 Taxation, Consumption, and Economic Administration

The Investopedia reference on goods and services taxation provides a general conceptual entry point for understanding consumption-based taxation (Investopedia, n.d.). A consumption-oriented tax framework can be evaluated in terms of its tax base, collection arrangements, and potential effects on transactions. However, the efficiency of such a framework depends on how its rules operate in practice, including the treatment of business transactions and the accessibility of compliance procedures.

The Tejas interview concerning GST and the emergence of a new tax regime provides another perspective on the

institutional and policy significance of the reform (Tejas, n.d.). Together, these sources support an examination of GST as a change in the organization of indirect taxation rather than simply a change in the name or number of taxes. However, the supplied material does not establish a common empirical basis for comparing administrative costs, compliance rates, or revenue performance before and after implementation.

2.3 State Revenue and Fiscal Coordination

The report concerning the potential effect of GST on state revenues, published by NDTV Profit in 2015, highlights the importance of fiscal concerns in discussions of tax reform (NDTV Profit, 2015). Deol's paper specifically addresses the effect of GST on state government revenue, making intergovernmental fiscal relationships a central analytical issue (Deol, 2013).

These sources suggest that the assessment of GST requires attention to both overall revenue collection and the distribution of fiscal resources. Even if a tax reform improves administrative consistency, its institutional sustainability may depend on whether states can plan expenditure and manage revenue uncertainty. Nevertheless, the titles and bibliographic information supplied do not independently establish the magnitude or direction of any actual revenue effect. Such conclusions require examination of the underlying evidence.

2.4 Administrative Performance as a Theoretical Lens

Aguines (2009) discusses performance management in the International Journal of Productivity & Performance Management. Although this reference is not specifically about GST, it offers a potential conceptual lens for considering how organizational objectives can be connected with measurable administrative outcomes.

Applied cautiously, a performance-management perspective suggests that tax administration should be evaluated through clearly defined objectives, operational indicators, monitoring procedures, and corrective action. For GST, relevant indicators could include return-filing timeliness, processing delays, error rates, compliance costs, and revenue predictability. These indicators are proposed analytical measures rather than findings reported by Aguines about GST.

2.5 Research Gap and Theoretical Positioning

The supplied references address different dimensions of GST, including tax reform, general implications, state revenue, and administrative performance. However, the provided bibliographic material does not offer a consistent dataset or a directly comparable assessment of taxation efficiency, revenue generation, and compliance optimization.

The principal research gap is therefore integrative: how can these three dimensions be assessed within a single framework without assuming that improvement in one automatically produces improvement in the others? This study addresses the gap by connecting tax-system design, administrative capacity, taxpayer compliance, and fiscal outcomes. The resulting framework is conceptual and requires subsequent empirical testing.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical research design based exclusively on the seven references provided. The approach is appropriate for examining the conceptual relationships among GST architecture, administrative performance, revenue generation, and compliance optimization when no original quantitative dataset has been supplied.

The study does not claim to measure the actual causal impact of GST on government revenue or taxpayer behaviour. Instead, it develops an interpretive framework by identifying recurring themes across the supplied material and examining their theoretical implications. The methodology distinguishes between issues raised by the references, analytical interpretations derived from their subject matter, and propositions that require empirical verification.

3.2 Sources and Analytical Procedure

The reference material is organized into four analytical categories. The first covers GST structure and harmonization, represented by the First Discussion Paper on Goods and Services Tax and the MBA Rendezvous discussion of GST implications. The second concerns the conceptual foundations of consumption-based taxation, represented by the Investopedia reference. The third addresses state revenue and fiscal coordination, represented by Deol's paper and the NDTV Profit report. The fourth concerns administrative and institutional performance, informed by the Tejas interview and Aguines's discussion of performance management.

The analysis follows three stages. First, each source is associated with its apparent subject and relevance to the research objectives. Second, the subjects are compared to

identify connections among tax design, administrative processes, compliance, and fiscal outcomes. Third, those connections are organized into a conceptual framework that can support future research.

Because the supplied material does not include a standardized set of research findings from all seven sources, the analysis does not treat them as directly comparable empirical studies. Nor does it assume that a news report, a discussion paper, an interview, a general explanatory webpage, and an academic article provide equivalent forms of evidence.

3.3 Conceptual Framework

The proposed framework treats GST performance as the outcome of interactions among four principal dimensions: tax-system design, administrative capacity, taxpayer compliance, and fiscal performance.

Tax-system design concerns the clarity and consistency of tax rules, the structure of reporting obligations, and coordination among government authorities. Administrative capacity concerns the ability of institutions to implement rules, communicate requirements, process returns, and address disputes. Taxpayer compliance concerns timely reporting, accurate declarations, payment obligations, and the correction of errors. Fiscal performance concerns revenue adequacy, predictability, and the ability of governments to plan expenditure.

The framework assumes that these dimensions are interdependent rather than independent determinants of success. Clearer rules may reduce avoidable reporting errors, but their benefits may be limited if administrative guidance is inaccessible. Better administrative systems may improve monitoring, but excessive procedural burdens may still discourage timely compliance. Similarly, stronger compliance may support revenue collection, while changes in economic activity and tax policy can influence revenue independently of administrative performance.

The framework can be represented as follows:

Tax-system design → Administrative capacity → Compliance outcomes → Fiscal performance.

This sequence is analytical rather than strictly linear. Feedback operates in both directions: revenue shortfalls may lead to administrative reforms, compliance data may reveal weaknesses in tax design, and disputes may identify unclear regulations. Consequently, effective GST administration requires continuous monitoring and adjustment rather than a one-time structural reform.

3.4 Operational Indicators

To make the framework empirically testable, the following indicators are proposed.

Dimension	Illustrative indicators	Analytical purpose
Tax-system design	Number of reporting steps, rule clarity, frequency of procedural changes	Evaluate administrative simplicity
Administrative capacity	Return-processing time, grievance-resolution time, system availability	Assess operational effectiveness
Taxpayer compliance	Timely filing rate, correction frequency, outstanding liabilities	Evaluate compliance performance
Fiscal performance	Revenue growth, revenue volatility, forecasting accuracy	Assess fiscal adequacy and predictability
Compliance burden	Staff time, professional-service expenses, reporting costs	Examine the cost of meeting obligations

These indicators are proposed for future investigation and are not reported measurements from the supplied references. Their interpretation would require consistent definitions, suitable observation periods, and comparable data across jurisdictions and business categories.

3.5 Analytical Propositions

The methodology produces four propositions for further investigation. First, clearer tax rules and more consistent administration may be associated with lower avoidable compliance costs. Second, improved compliance may contribute to more reliable revenue collection, although it cannot independently determine total revenue. Third,

coordination between central and state authorities may influence the predictability of fiscal resources. Fourth, performance monitoring may help identify operational weaknesses and support targeted improvements.

These propositions are consistent with the study's conceptual synthesis, but they should not be interpreted as tested hypotheses or established causal relationships. A future quantitative study would need administrative records, taxpayer surveys, revenue data, and an appropriate comparison strategy to assess them.

3.6 Methodological Limitations

The study has three principal limitations. First, the supplied references vary in genre and evidentiary depth. Second, no original dataset or systematic review protocol has been provided, limiting the reproducibility and empirical strength of the findings. Third, the bibliographic details alone do not establish the accuracy of every source's claims. The analysis therefore avoids presenting numerical estimates, causal effects, or statistical conclusions that cannot be verified from the supplied material.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Tax Harmonization Is Necessary but Not Sufficient

The analysis identifies tax harmonization as a central feature of the GST framework. The First Discussion Paper places institutional coordination at the centre of the proposed reform, while the MBA Rendezvous reference situates GST within a broader discussion of its implications (State Finance Ministers, 2009; MBA Rendezvous, 2014).

The principal finding of the conceptual analysis is that harmonization should be distinguished from operational simplicity. Consolidating tax structures may reduce fragmentation at the level of system design, but businesses still require understandable rules, predictable procedures, and effective mechanisms for resolving discrepancies. Consequently, the number of taxes alone is an insufficient indicator of administrative efficiency.

For example, a small enterprise may operate under a more integrated tax structure but continue to face substantial compliance costs if it lacks accounting expertise or must repeatedly correct reporting errors. This hypothetical case illustrates why structural reform and practical accessibility should be evaluated separately.

4.2 Revenue Performance Depends on Multiple Factors

The references concerning state revenues establish the relevance of fiscal effects as a distinct area of investigation (Deol, 2013; NDTV Profit, 2015). The analysis indicates that overall revenue collection and the distribution of revenue between levels of government should be examined separately.

An increase in aggregate collections would not, by itself, demonstrate that every state experiences improved fiscal predictability. Likewise, fluctuations in state revenue would not necessarily establish that GST design is the sole cause. Economic activity, changes in tax policy, sectoral composition, enforcement practices, and administrative capacity are potential factors that an empirical assessment would need to consider.

The key finding is therefore methodological: revenue generation should be evaluated through several measures, including collection levels, volatility, forecasting accuracy, and intergovernmental distribution. The available references motivate this approach but do not establish numerical findings for these indicators.

4.3 Compliance Optimization Requires Administrative Support

A third finding concerns the relationship between compliance and administrative capacity. A tax system's formal requirements determine what taxpayers must report, while administrative support influences their ability to satisfy those requirements accurately and on time.

Compliance optimization should not be equated with maximizing enforcement activity. Enforcement may be necessary to discourage deliberate non-compliance, but an effective framework must also address unintentional errors, uncertainty, and procedural barriers. Clear instructions, accessible guidance, timely processing, and proportionate correction procedures are therefore relevant policy considerations.

Consider a hypothetical business that repeatedly submits inaccurate returns because its staff misunderstand reporting requirements. Increasing penalties without improving guidance may impose additional costs without addressing the underlying cause. A combined approach involving clearer instructions, error alerts, and risk-based enforcement may offer a more effective administrative response. The example illustrates a policy proposition rather than an observed outcome.

4.4 Performance Management Offers an Evaluation Lens

Aguines (2009) provides a basis for considering performance management as an organizational perspective. Applied to tax administration, this perspective emphasizes the relationship between defined objectives, operational indicators, performance monitoring, and corrective action.

The analysis suggests that GST administration should be assessed through a balanced set of indicators rather than revenue totals alone. For instance, a revenue increase accompanied by longer processing delays and higher compliance costs may indicate a trade-off between collection outcomes and administrative accessibility. Conversely, lower processing times may indicate procedural improvement but would not independently prove that revenue collection or compliance had improved.

Performance indicators must therefore be interpreted jointly. Their usefulness depends on whether they capture meaningful administrative outcomes and whether the institutions responsible for implementation can act on the results.

4.5 An Integrated Evaluation Framework Emerges

The combined analysis supports an integrated model connecting tax design, administrative capacity, compliance outcomes, and fiscal performance. The framework's main contribution is to distinguish the mechanisms through which GST may influence outcomes from the outcomes themselves.

Its practical implication is that policymakers should avoid treating tax consolidation as a sufficient measure of success. Evaluation should consider the experience of different taxpayer groups, the effectiveness of administrative processes, and the predictability of state revenues. However, these findings remain conceptual because the supplied material does not provide the harmonized empirical evidence required to establish effect sizes or causal relationships.

4.6 Summary of Findings

Overall, the study identifies three connected priorities: effective tax harmonization, coordinated revenue assessment, and compliance procedures that combine accountability with practical support. Performance monitoring can connect these priorities by identifying weaknesses and informing corrective measures. The framework provides a foundation for future empirical research, but it does not establish that GST has produced a specific measurable improvement in efficiency, compliance, or revenue.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpreting GST Efficiency Beyond Tax Consolidation

The analysis indicates that GST efficiency must be understood as a multidimensional concept rather than a direct consequence of consolidating indirect taxes. Structural harmonization can provide a foundation for more consistent tax administration, but its practical value depends on how effectively institutions translate common rules into accessible procedures. The First Discussion Paper on Goods and Services Tax provides the institutional context for this distinction by emphasizing the proposed framework and coordination among state governments (State Finance Ministers, 2009).

A critical implication is that formal uniformity and practical uniformity are not necessarily equivalent. Taxpayers may operate under common legislation while experiencing different compliance burdens because of variations in accounting capabilities, professional assistance, transaction complexity, and access to administrative guidance. A large enterprise with dedicated tax personnel may adapt to reporting requirements more easily than a small business with limited administrative resources. Consequently, a tax system that appears efficient from the government's perspective may still impose considerable costs on particular categories of taxpayers.

The practical challenge is to identify which procedures generate necessary accountability and which create avoidable complexity. Simplification should not weaken the accuracy of reporting or the ability to detect deliberate evasion. Rather, it should improve the relationship between compliance requirements and their administrative purpose. The GST framework should therefore be assessed through both institutional efficiency and taxpayer experience.

5.2 Revenue Generation and Fiscal Federalism

Revenue performance represents a separate but closely connected dimension of GST effectiveness. Deol's study of the effect of GST on state government revenue and the NDTV Profit report concerning state revenues highlight the relevance of fiscal considerations in the reform debate (Deol, 2013; NDTV Profit, 2015).

The distinction between revenue generation and revenue predictability is particularly important. Revenue generation concerns the resources collected through the tax system, whereas predictability concerns the ability of governments to estimate future receipts with reasonable confidence. A

government may collect substantial revenue during a particular period while still experiencing uncertainty in its expenditure planning. Similarly, changes in aggregate collections may conceal differences among states.

This issue has implications for fiscal federalism because different levels of government depend on financial resources to discharge their responsibilities. Coordination should therefore extend beyond the technical administration of tax rules to include transparent revenue reporting, consistent forecasting methods, and timely communication about fiscal developments.

However, it would be inappropriate to infer from the supplied references that GST necessarily increased or decreased state revenues by a particular amount. Such conclusions require verified revenue series, adjustments for economic conditions, and a method for distinguishing the effects of tax reform from other influences. The discussion establishes the importance of the question, not a definitive empirical answer.

5.3 Compliance Optimization and the Cost of Administration

Compliance optimization involves balancing the need for accurate tax reporting with the cost of meeting regulatory obligations. Strong enforcement can discourage deliberate non-compliance, but enforcement alone cannot address confusion, technical difficulties, or inadequate taxpayer knowledge.

The conceptual framework suggests that administrative assistance and enforcement should operate as complementary mechanisms. Clear guidance, standardized procedures, timely notifications, and accessible dispute-resolution channels can help taxpayers meet obligations correctly. Risk-based verification can then direct greater scrutiny toward cases where the probability or potential consequences of non-compliance are higher.

A hypothetical example illustrates the distinction. If several businesses repeatedly make similar reporting errors, the administration could investigate whether the pattern reflects deliberate misconduct or an unclear reporting requirement. If the problem arises from ambiguity, clarifying the instructions may prevent future errors more efficiently than relying exclusively on penalties. If the evidence indicates intentional misreporting, targeted enforcement remains necessary.

This approach recognizes that compliance behaviour can be influenced by both incentives and institutional accessibility. It also avoids treating all errors as equivalent. The appropriate response depends on the nature of the violation, the taxpayer's circumstances, and the reliability of available evidence.

5.4 Performance Management and Institutional Accountability

Aguines (2009) provides a useful performance-management perspective for considering how administrative objectives can be translated into measurable outcomes. In the GST context, this perspective suggests that tax authorities should establish explicit service and compliance objectives, monitor performance consistently, and use the resulting information to improve processes.

Nevertheless, performance indicators must be designed carefully. If tax authorities are evaluated only by the amount of revenue collected, administrators may have insufficient incentives to prioritize taxpayer assistance, timely processing, or procedural fairness. If performance is measured exclusively through processing speed, the quality of verification may receive inadequate attention.

A balanced performance framework should therefore combine revenue indicators with administrative and compliance measures. These may include the accuracy of assessments, the proportion of returns processed within defined periods, the time required to resolve disputes, and the cost of compliance for different taxpayer categories.

The relationship between indicators and institutional accountability also requires attention. Measurement is useful only when the results inform decisions. Repeated delays, frequent errors, or recurring complaints should trigger examination of underlying processes rather than merely being recorded in administrative reports. In this sense, performance management can provide a mechanism for continuous improvement rather than a narrow system of target monitoring (Aguines, 2009).

5.5 Theoretical and Practical Implications

The study's theoretical contribution lies in connecting tax harmonization with administrative capacity and fiscal outcomes. It proposes that GST performance emerges from interactions among institutional design, operational implementation, compliance behaviour, and revenue management. This perspective avoids the assumption that a change in tax architecture necessarily produces a proportional change in economic or administrative outcomes.

Practically, the framework suggests that policymakers should evaluate reform through multiple dimensions. Tax authorities should examine whether reporting requirements are understandable, administrative services are timely, and enforcement is proportionate. Governments should also assess whether revenue data support reliable forecasting and whether intergovernmental arrangements provide sufficient transparency for fiscal planning.

For researchers, the framework provides a basis for comparative analysis across business sizes, economic sectors, and jurisdictions. Future studies could test whether improvements in administrative support are associated with fewer filing errors or lower compliance costs. Researchers could also investigate whether administrative performance measures are associated with more stable revenue collection after controlling for changes in economic activity.

These implications should be interpreted as research propositions and policy considerations rather than established causal findings. The current study does not contain the quantitative evidence necessary to verify the proposed relationships.

5.6 Limitations and Future Research

The main limitation is the narrow and heterogeneous reference base. The supplied sources include an academic article on performance management, a discussion paper, a student research paper, an interview, a news report, and general explanatory material. Their different purposes and methods limit direct comparison.

Furthermore, the present analysis is conceptual rather than a systematic review or empirical evaluation. It does not independently verify the underlying claims of each source, establish a complete historical account of GST implementation, or measure changes in compliance and revenue. The framework should consequently be treated as a basis for further investigation.

Future research should incorporate verified administrative data, taxpayer surveys, and state-level revenue statistics. Longitudinal analysis could examine changes in compliance costs and processing times, while comparative studies could investigate differences in administrative outcomes across taxpayer categories. Such research would allow the proposed framework to be tested and refined.

6. CONCLUSION

This study evaluated the GST framework through the interconnected dimensions of taxation efficiency, revenue generation, and compliance optimization. Based on the seven supplied references, it developed a conceptual interpretation of GST as an institutional and administrative framework whose effectiveness depends on more than tax consolidation.

The analysis identifies three principal conclusions. First, harmonization can support administrative consistency, but its practical benefits depend on clear procedures and effective implementation. Second, revenue performance should be assessed through both the amount collected and the predictability and distribution of fiscal resources, particularly where state governments have significant expenditure responsibilities. Third, compliance optimization requires an appropriate balance between enforcement, taxpayer assistance, and administrative accessibility.

The study also proposes that performance management can support this process by connecting institutional objectives with measurable indicators and corrective action. However, the effectiveness of this approach depends on the selection of balanced indicators and the willingness of institutions to use performance information to address operational weaknesses.

The paper's contribution is an integrated conceptual framework connecting tax-system design, administrative capacity, compliance outcomes, and fiscal performance. Its limitations are equally important: the supplied references do not provide sufficient standardized empirical evidence to establish causal effects or quantify the success of GST implementation. The findings should therefore be understood as analytical propositions rather than verified estimates of economic impact.

Future research should test the framework using state-level revenue data, taxpayer compliance records, administrative performance measures, and surveys of businesses. Such evidence would help determine which administrative interventions reduce compliance burdens, improve revenue predictability, and strengthen the practical efficiency of GST. Ultimately, sustainable tax administration requires not only a coherent tax structure but also transparent governance, proportionate compliance requirements, and continuous institutional improvement.

REFERENCES

1. Aguines, Herman (2009) Performance Management, International Journal of Productivity & Performance

Management, 54,468-481

2. Good s and service tax retrieved from http://www.investopedia.com/terms/v/valueaddedtax.asp
3. GST not to impact state's revenues: ArunJaitley updated on 5th of May 2015 20:17pm by NDTV PROFITpartnered with NSE. retrieved from: http://profit.ndtv.com/news/economy/article-gst-notto-impact-states-revenues-arun-jaitley-760748
4. MBA RENDEZVOUS empowering MBA aspirants on Monday 22nd December 2014 retrieved from http://www.mbarendezvous.com/generalawareness/gst-and-implications/
5. Ranjit Singh Deol; 2013; A paper on Goods and service tax: effect on state government revenue. retrieved from: http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/jyinger/classes/PAI735/studentpapers/2013/Deol.pdf
6. State finance ministers; First discussion paper on goods and service tax. November 10th 2009; retrieved from: http://www.empcom.gov.in/WriteReadData/UserFiles/file/Discussion%20Paper/first_dis.pdf
7. Tejas: S.Krishnamurthy's interview adjunct faculty ; Goods and service tax: ushering in a new tax regime; retrieved from: http://tejas.iimb.ac.in/interviews/27.php