

Pillar Two and U.S. Multinationals

Cody Kallen

Tax Foundation, University of Wisconsin-Madison

October 12, 2021

Multinational Tax Model

Structure:

- Set of 3,456 CFCs across 72 industries and 48 countries
- 40 representative MNEs across industries

Data (2014):

- IRS SOI tables on Controlled Foreign Corporations
- IRS SOI tables on Corporate Foreign Tax Credits
- BEA tables on majority-owned foreign affiliates
- BEA tables on U.S. parent companies

Multinational Tax Model

Calculations:

- CFCs: Foreign taxes, contributions to parent tax items
- Parent MNEs' various sources of income
- Interest expense and FDII deductions
- Calculate parent taxable income
- Indirect expense allocation
- Foreign tax credits
- Profit-shifting and debt responses

Main results:

- Federal CIT liabilities of U.S. multinationals
- Federal CIT liabilities attributable to CFCs of U.S. multinationals

Pillar Two Provisions Modeled

Based on October 2021 statement

- 15% GILTI rate, remove GILTI FTC haircut
- Country-by-country GILTI calculations, as a top-up tax
 - Alternative: Inclusion & credit approach
- Use OECD substance carve-outs
 - 8% of tangible assets, decreasing over 10 years to 5%
 - 10% of payroll, decreasing over 10 years to 5%

Revenue Results by Provision (\$B)

| Provision | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | Total |
|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Flat 15% GILTI rate | 8.8 | 10.8 | 11.5 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 53.7 |
| Country-by-country top-up tax | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 13.6 |
| Substance carve-outs | -0.2 | -0.3 | -0.2 | -0.2 | -0.1 | -0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Total | 9.8 | 11.7 | 12.5 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 67.4 |

@TaxFoundation

Alternate Revenue Results (\$B)

| Version of Pillar Two | Total, 2023-2032 | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Top-up approach, October version | 67.4 | | |
| Credit approach, October version | 70.5 | | |
| Top-up approach, July version | 70.2 | | |
| Credit approach, July version | 74.2 | | |

Effective Tax Rates on CFC Profits (2023)

| ETR measured on | Current law | Pillar Two | Change |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|--------|
| All CFC profits | 16.8 | 17.2 | 0.4 |
| Prorated CFC profits | 19.3 | 19.8 | 0.5 |
| CFC profits ex. RPDs | 23.8 | 24.2 | 0.4 |

Affected Industries

Largest ETR increases:

- Nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing (7.6pp)
- Transportation and warehousing (4.3pp)
- Computer and electronic product manufacturing (3.1pp)

Largest ETR decreases:

- Machinery manufacturing (-3.6pp)
- Motion picture and sound recording (-3.5pp)
- Fabricated metal product manufacturing (-2.1pp)

Tech industries:

- Computer and electronic product manufacturing (3.1pp)
- Pharmaceutical manufacturing (1.0pp)
- Electrical equipment, appliance and component manufacturing (0.7pp)
- Information other than recording and publishing (0.0pp)

Profit Shifting Effects

| Profit shifting response | 10-year revenue change | Effect of profit shifting |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| None | 62.0 | - |
| 0.8 semi-elasticity | 67.4 | +5.4 |
| Dowd-Landefeld-Moore responses | 75.0 | +13.0 |

Conclusions

- Pillar Two would raise taxes on the foreign profits of U.S. multinationals.
 - Most of the revenue comes from the higher statutory rate.
- Raise the ETRs on CFC profits by ~0.4pp.
- Reduce profit shifting by U.S. multinationals.