



Trinity College Dublin
Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath
The University of Dublin

Consolidated Foreign Wealth of Nations: Nationality-based measures of international exposure

André Sanchez Pacheco

TEP Working Paper No. 0653

April 2023

Trinity Economics Papers
Department of Economics

Consolidated Foreign Wealth of Nations: Nationality-based measures of international exposure*

André Sanchez Pacheco[†]

Trinity College Dublin & IM-TCD

April 5, 2023

Abstract

This paper presents novel estimates of foreign holdings from a consolidated-by-nationality perspective for a sample of fourteen developed countries over multiple years. It describes the stylized facts that emerge from this new data-set on the international exposure of countries. It shows that aggregate international financial integration is larger from a nationality-based approach relative to the conventional residence-based data. These novel data are used to analyze (1) profit shifting activities and (2) spillovers from U.S. monetary policy shocks. I find evidence suggesting that nationals of relatively high-tax countries may shift assets to low-tax countries in ways not fully captured in residence-based statistics. I also find that a tightening in U.S. monetary policy is associated with a decline in consolidated-by-nationality foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinational enterprises. Such findings highlight the usefulness of this new data-set in international macroeconomics.

Keywords: International financial integration, financial globalisation, consolidated-by-nationality statistics.

JEL: F36, F21, F23.

*I am particularly thankful to my advisor Agustín Bénétrix for his valuable suggestions. I am grateful to the Irish Research Council for the financial support provided.

[†]E-mail: sanchean@tcd.ie; Address: Department of Economics, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.

1 Introduction

How can policymakers assess the exposure its households and firms have to international risk factors? The conventional approach uses data on countries' foreign holdings to sort out these exposures. These data are collected using the residence of economic agents as the key criterion. For any given country, its external assets (liabilities) represent claims (liabilities) its residents have with respect to non-residents. It follows that only cross-border positions are recorded in residence-based statistics. Furthermore, this approach does not consider ties that exist between entities within the same corporate group. The local positions held by the affiliate of a multinational enterprise operating abroad may not be part of the foreign holdings of its home and host countries using this approach.

These two features of the residence-based approach pose a challenge given the increasing importance of multinational enterprises (MNEs). These corporate groups have affiliates operating in multiple countries. The local assets held by these affiliates in host countries represent investments made by an MNE away from its home country. Yet they may only be recorded in foreign balance sheets of host and home countries if there are cross-border transactions involved. If these investments are funded by raising resources with local agents, no exposure would be recorded for both home and host countries.

Decisions made by MNEs can affect employment and production in foreign countries hosting their affiliates. Blomström and Kokko (1998) provide evidence of these spillovers from activities of MNEs. More recently, Avdjiev et al (2020) have shown how monetary policy changes in the home country of multinational banks affect conditions in foreign countries hosting their affiliates. These studies point to the need for developing measures able to more comprehensively capture these international linkages.

The alternative used in this paper is to adopt a consolidated-by-nationality approach when computing foreign assets and liabilities. Under such approach, assets and liabilities held by affiliates operating abroad are consolidated to the parent group. It takes into account local and cross-border positions. These positions are then sorted according to the nationality of the ultimate owners of such investments. The fact that all positions are taken into account and that positions held by the affiliate are consolidated provide a more nuanced view around countries' international exposure.

The recent literature on nationality-based foreign holdings have revealed important stylized facts. Coppola et al (2021) show that China's net foreign assets position is substantially smaller from a nationality-based perspective. Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023) show that the U.S. economy is more financially integrated with the rest of the world when compared to the conventional residence-based data. Despite the recent progress, there is currently no dataset containing information on the entire foreign balance sheet of countries from a consolidated-by-nationality perspective.

In this paper, I construct estimates of foreign assets and liabilities from a consolidated-by-nationality perspective for a group of 14 developed countries. This data contribution contains yearly estimates for the period between 2012 and 2019. It is the first such dataset containing nationality-based estimates of foreign holdings for any group of countries. Then I compare these novel data on foreign holdings with the residence-based ones from Lane and Milesi-Ferretti's *External Wealth of Nations*. A key variable in this analysis is the index of international financial integration (IFI). This variable measures the relative size of a country's foreign balance sheet. For any given country, its IFI is equal to the sum of its foreign assets and liabilities divided by its GDP.

One relevant stylized fact that emerges from the analysis is that on aggregate these fourteen countries present a larger foreign balance sheet from a nationality-based perspective relative to the residence-based one. This result indicates these economies are more internationally finally integrated than previously thought. Such difference is associated with the fact that the consolidated-by-nationality approach takes into account both local and cross-border positions. In contrast, the residence-based approach only considers the latter.

Individually, most but not all countries present a larger consolidated-by-nationality foreign balance sheet. Countries with a sizeable presence of foreign companies engaging in international financial intermediation tend to have a larger residence-based foreign balance sheets. These companies' cross-border holdings inflate their host country's residence-based foreign balance sheet. Meanwhile, these holdings are instead consolidated to their parent country using the nationality approach. Most notably, Ireland stands out as having a substantially larger residence-based balance sheet in line with Sanchez Pacheco (2022). Lane (2019) argues that the presence of these financial intermediaries opaquely the positions held by Irish nationals in the residence-based data. In this sense, the nationality-based approach provides a clearer view on the international exposure these agents have.

These novel data are then used to study two macroeconomic issues. The first one is on profit shifting from high-tax countries to low-tax countries. Wier and Zucman (2022) estimate that around 37% of profits earned by multinational enterprises are shifted to tax havens. Dischinger and Riedel (2011) have shown that multinational firms tend to shift their intangible assets to affiliates located in low-tax countries. I use consolidated-by-nationality estimates of foreign holdings and the existing residence-based data to focus on their relationship with differences in corporate income tax rates.

A key variable in this analysis is the difference between the consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based measures of foreign holdings. Such difference is a proxy of the foreign holdings not captured by the residence-based approach. I find that the difference between these two measures of foreign holdings is negatively correlated with corporate income

tax differentials in a sample of low-tax countries. In contrast, the coefficient estimate is positive when estimated in a sample of high-tax countries. These results provide indirect evidence that nationals from high-tax countries may shift assets and profits to low-tax countries in ways that are not entirely captured by the residence-based approach. This finding is in line with Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023) and points to the relevance of consolidated-by-nationality data when analyzing profit shifting activities.

The second application of these novel data presented in this paper is on assessing spillovers from U.S. monetary policy shocks on multinational enterprises. Bergant et al. (2023) show that a tightening in U.S. financial conditions is associated with a decline in global cross-border M&A activities. In this paper, I analyze the relationship between U.S. monetary policy shocks and foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinational enterprises.

I find that a tightening U.S. monetary policy shock is correlated with a decrease in consolidated-by-nationality foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinationals. This result is robust with respect to alternative estimation methods for these monetary policy shocks. Such result suggests that a tightening in U.S. monetary policy generates spillovers that are associated with multinationals reducing their foreign asset holdings.

More broadly, these two sets of results indicate that consolidated-by-nationality estimates of foreign holdings can be useful in tackling important questions across different topics in international macroeconomics. As noted by Lane (2021), the consolidated approach should complement the existing residence-based data given each approach offers advantages depending on the question at hand.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the differences between the consolidated-by-nationality approach relative to the conventional residence-based one. Section 3 describes how the estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings are constructed as well as the data sources used. Section 4 describes the key stylized facts that emerge when comparing these novel data with conventional residence-based data. Section 5 analyzes the relationship between corporate income tax differentials and foreign holdings. Section 6 studies the association between U.S. monetary policy shocks and consolidated-by-nationality foreign asset holding by non-financial multinational enterprises. Section 7 concludes.

2 Nationality- and residence-based statistics

There are two main data dimensions in which the consolidated-by-nationality approach differs from the residence-based approach. The first one relates to the set of positions that are considered when estimating foreign assets and liabilities. In residence-based statistics,

external holdings are recorded when there is an exposure of a resident economic agent relative to a non-resident economic agent. As a result, the residence-based approach focuses exclusively at cross-border positions. Local positions that represent exposures between resident agents of different nationalities within the same country are not captured by this approach. In contrast, the consolidated-by-nationality approach takes into consideration both local and cross-border positions when estimating foreign holdings.

The second difference relates to how entities within the same corporate group are treated under each approach. In residence-based statistics, an affiliate of a foreign multinational enterprise operating in a given host country is seen as a resident of that country. There is no direct linkage between that entity and the corporate group it belongs to. Cross-border assets and liabilities held by this affiliate will be recorded as external holdings of the host country even if the company is controlled by foreign agents. Meanwhile, the consolidated-by-nationality approach takes the assets and liabilities held by this affiliate and consolidates them to the parent company.

One example can illustrate how these differences impact the measurement of foreign assets and liabilities. Consider an affiliate of a foreign multinational enterprise from country A that is operating in host country B. Through this affiliate, the multinational enterprise wants to buy a factory in country B worth \$5 million. Such investment is entirely financed by taking a loan from a local bank in country B.

Under the consolidated-by-nationality approach, this factory is an asset the foreign MNE owns in country B. Therefore, it would be recorded as a foreign asset of country A and a foreign liability of country B. Meanwhile, the loan taken by the affiliate to finance this investment represents a liability the MNE from country A has relative to a bank from country B. This loan would be recorded as a foreign liability of country A and a foreign liability of country B. In this example, both foreign assets and liabilities of countries A and B rise by \$5 million as a result of this investment.

Meanwhile, no exposure would be recorded under the residence-based approach. This affiliate operating in country B is not seen as a foreign entity. There is no cross-border transactions taking place as the investment made by the foreign MNE is funded locally. Crucially, this international exposure a foreign multinational from country A takes on country B would not be recorded in residence-based statistics. Similarly, the exposure the local bank B has relative to a foreign multinational would also not be recorded.

These two data differences are associated with a set of issues raised in the international finance literature. The first one relates to the identification of the ultimate exposure to financial risks. Under the residence-based approach, the foreign affiliate of country A's MNE is treated as a separate entity. Its local exposure is not captured in external residence-based statistics. As a result, relying exclusively on residence-based data pose a

challenge for policymakers in country A to identify the exposure its multinational enterprises have. In contrast, local and cross-border positions held by this and others affiliates relative to foreign agents would appear in country A's consolidated-by-nationality foreign balance sheet. This feature makes it easier for policymakers to evaluate the ultimate exposure their agents have when using the consolidated data. In this context, Borio (2013) points to the need for constructing consolidated statistics in order to assess the exposure global firms have to different risk factors, countries and sectors.

During the Global Financial Crisis, European banks held a sizeable exposure to U.S. mortgage-backed securities through their U.S. affiliates as noted by McCauley (2018). Such exposure would not be captured by residence-based measures of foreign exposure but would appear in consolidated-based data. The consolidated-by-nationality approach also provides a more detailed view on the banking developments that came after the crisis. Using nationality-based data, McCauley et al. (2019) show that what appears to be a broad-based decline in international lending post-crisis was in fact related to European banks reducing their global footprint. These two studies highlight that the identification of exposure to financial risks can change in important ways when assessed from a consolidated perspective.

A second issue relates to the triple coincidence literature as in Avdjiev et al. (2016) and Avdjiev et al. (2018). In the standard international finance models, the decision-making unit coincides with the GDP area and currency area. In reality, however, multinational enterprises make decisions at the home country that affect production in foreign countries where their affiliates operate in. These affiliates may be spread across different currency areas. As a result, treating each entity separately according to their residence fails to capture this complex decision-making and production structure. In contrast, the consolidated-by-nationality approach provides a more nuanced view on these global corporate structures.

The consolidated-by-nationality offers an advantage relative to the residence-based approach when considering the ultimate exposure to financial risks. It also provides a more detailed view on the global footprint of multinational enterprises. This is particularly useful given their increased relevance over the past decades. However, there are also some relative disadvantages too. Unlike the residence-based approach, there is still no unified manual on how national authorities should collect consolidated-by-nationality data. In this sense, Lane (2021) notes that the consolidated-by-nationality approach should complement rather than replace the existing residence-based framework.

Furthermore, residence-based statistics have proven useful in different applications in international finance. For example, Catão and Milesi-Ferretti (2014) show that residence-based data can be employed to construct informative early warning systems around the

risk of an external crisis. This is particularly helpful for policymakers when considering how to set macroeconomic policy appropriately.

Another important relative disadvantage of the consolidated-by-nationality approach is that there is no data-set containing estimates of foreign holdings from a nationality perspective for multiple countries as in Lane and Milesi-Ferretti’s seminal *External Wealth of Nations* (2001, 2007, 2018). This paper seeks to fill this gap by producing the first data-set on estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings for a group of countries over multiple years. Relative to Coppola et al. (2021), this paper presents estimates for the entire foreign balance sheet of countries while their work focuses on portfolio investment.

3 Data

I construct consolidated-by-nationality estimates of foreign holdings for a group of countries using data from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Research, the International Monetary Fund, the Bank for International Settlements and from Orbis Europe. Foreign assets and liabilities are divided into the similar functional categories as in BIS (2015) and Sanchez Pacheco (2022). More specifically, foreign assets and liabilities are divided into holdings related to the activities of national companies operating abroad; holdings related to activities of foreign companies operating in the country; portfolio investment and official assets. Furthermore, holdings related to these multinational enterprises are divided according to their activities into three sectors: banks, financial non-banks and non-financial companies.

The dataset includes the following countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. For most countries, data is available from 2012 to 2019 while for some the first observation starts later due to data limitations. Data for Ireland are taken from Sanchez Pacheco (2022) while data for the U.S. are taken from Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023).

In section 4, I compare these novel nationality-based data to conventional residence-based holdings. Residence-based estimates of foreign assets and liabilities comes from Lane and Milesi-Ferretti’s seminal *External Wealth of Nations* dataset.

3.1 Bank-related holdings

Consolidated-by-nationality estimates of foreign holdings related to the banking sector are constructed using data from the Bank for International Settlements (BIS). The methodology follows that employed in BIS (2015) also used in Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco

(2023) and Sanchez Pacheco (2022). Bank-related foreign holdings are associated to the activities of both national banks as well as to foreign banks.

For any country i , foreign assets related to its national banks are equal to the claims held by them relative to all counterparts except those with same nationality. Foreign assets of country i related to foreign banks operating in it are given by the local liabilities of such banks relative to country i nationals.

Foreign liabilities of country i related to its national banks are estimated as the local liabilities of these banks operating abroad plus their cross-border liabilities excluding those to related offices. Foreign liabilities related to foreign banks are equal to the total claim of foreign banks on country i nationals.

Figure A.1 in the Appendix shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to national banks for 2019. Figure A.2 shows similar estimates related to the activities of foreign banks for the same year.

3.2 Non-financial MNEs

3.2.1 Foreign MNEs

The holdings associated with foreign MNEs operating in European countries are computed using Orbis Europe. For a given country i , I download financial, employment and ownership data for all entities operating in it that have foreign nationals as their ultimate owners. I also download data on companies; status which indicates whether they are active or have been liquidated. Companies are sorted according to their 4-digit NACE code into two groups: financial non-banks and non-financial multinational enterprises.¹ Companies identified as banks are excluded from the sample as the assets and liabilities related to their sector are computed using BIS data.

The financial data used in this paper are companies' total asset holdings and shareholders' equity. These data may contain reporting gaps. Whenever there is a reporting gap, I follow the same procedure used in Sanchez Pacheco (2022). If a company is active, a reporting gap in period T would be filled with data from period $T - z$ where $z > 0$ is the smallest possible. If a company's status is not listed as active, then a reporting gap in period T would be filled with data from $T - z$ only if there is at least one future period $T + k$, $k > 0$ in which financial information is available. In case there is no financial information available for subsequent periods, it is assumed that this company became inactive in period T . Therefore, its total assets and shareholders' equity will be set to zero for all

¹The NACE codes used to identify financial non-banks are all of those included in group K 'Financial and Insurance' activities excluding the codes 6411 related to central banking and 6419 related to other monetary intermediation.

$t \geq T$. Such decision rule generates inputted data whenever there is a reporting gap in the sample.

Nationality-based foreign liabilities of country i related to foreign non-financial MNEs operating in it are estimated as the sum of these companies' total assets. Meanwhile, nationality-based foreign assets related to these companies are computed as the sum of their total assets minus their shareholders' funds. Given existing data limitations, such calculations imply that the estimates of foreign holdings presented in this paper represent upper bound estimates. More specifically, these calculations imply that the total asset holdings of foreign multinationals operating in country i have country i nationals as counterparts. They also imply that the financing these companies receive other than shareholders' funds comes from country i nationals. As it is possible that these assumptions may not always hold for all companies, the estimates related to the activities foreign multinationals represent upper bounds.

In the case of the United States, the estimates used from Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023) relies on publicly available data from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Figure A.3 shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to foreign non-financial MNEs operating abroad. In 2019, the presence of these companies in the U.K. are associated with USD 8.2tn in U.K. foreign liabilities. That is followed by the U.S. where the activities of such companies are associated with USD 7.6tn in U.S. foreign liabilities.

3.2.2 National MNEs operating abroad

Consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets and liabilities related to national MNEs operating abroad are computed using data from Orbis Europe and the U.S. BEA. These data sources contains information on multinational activities in Europe and the United States. It is possible that a given country has many of its MNEs operating outside of these two regions. This would pose a challenge when computing assets and liabilities related to these companies given this regional coverage limitation. Therefore, I first construct a proxy of how well the two data sources cover the activities of MNEs using the IMF Coordinated Direct Investment Survey.

For country i and year y , I compute the share of outbound FDI position to countries included in these two regions relative to the total outbound FDI made by country i . I exclude non-EU tax haven countries from this analysis.² Then I compute the average of

²For country i , the share is computed as the sum of outbound FDI position to all countries in the Orbis Europe database plus the United states divided by the total outbound FDI postion of that country excluding to non-EU tax havens. The countries included in Orbis Europe are: Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Greenland, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

such share for the period between 2009 and 2020. Figure A.4 shows the average share per country in the sample. A share equal to one would indicate that these two regions receive all the FDI made by country i . Meanwhile, a share equal to zero would indicate that all the FDI made by country i is received by countries outside of Europe and the United States. The highest average share value in our sample comes from Ireland at 95%. The lowest share comes from the U.K. with 78%. Even at this lower bound, the two regions represent the vast majority of the direct investment made by the United Kingdom. While the regional coverage could potentially pose a challenge to this methodology, this does not appear to be the case for the countries included in the dataset given the elevated average coverage share across countries.

Foreign holdings related to affiliates of country i companies operating in Europe are constructed using Orbis Europe. First, I download financial and sectoral data on all companies who have country i as the country of its ultimate owner. I exclude companies located in country i and focus instead on those located elsewhere in the region. Then I apply the same procedure described in the subsection above to fill any reporting gaps that might exist. It is possible that the ultimate owners of some of these companies are not from country i but rather have redomiciled there for tax-related purposes. In this case, Orbis Europe will inaccurately indicate that these affiliates have country i as the country of its ultimate owner. In order to correct for this, I use the Bloomberg Tax Inversion Tracker from Mider (2017) to identify companies that have redomiciled. If an ultimate owner is identified as having redomiciled from country j to country i , the country of its affiliates are changed from j to i in the dataset.

Country i 's consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets related to its companies operating in Europe are computed as the sum of their total asset holdings. Its foreign liabilities related to these entities are calculated as the sum of the difference between their total asset holdings and shareholders' funds.

Holdings related to affiliates of country i operating in the United States are constructed using data from the U.S. BEA. The procedure used follows that presented in Sanchez Pacheco (2022). Country i 's foreign assets related to its companies operating in the U.S. are computed as the total asset holdings of these companies in the U.S. Its foreign liabilities are equal to the difference between the total asset holdings of these companies and the FDI stock made by country i in the U.S. non-financial sector.

Consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets related to country i 's non-financial MNEs are equal to the sum of country i 's foreign assets related to these companies operating in the U.S. plus in Europe. Similarly, its foreign liabilities related to its non-financial MNEs

Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom. The non-EU tax havens are Bermuda, Cayman Islands and Jersey.

are equal to the sum of its foreign liabilities related to these companies operating in these two regions.

Figure A.5 shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to the activities of foreign non-financial MNEs. U.S. MNEs stand out relative to those of other countries in terms of the foreign holdings related to them. In 2019, the activities of U.S. MNEs are associated with USD 20.3tn in U.S. foreign assets and USD 15.4 tn in U.S. foreign liabilities. That is followed by U.K. MNEs whose activities are associated with USD 3.2tn in U.K. foreign assets and USD 1.9tn in foreign liabilities.

3.3 Financial non-bank holdings

3.3.1 Foreign Financial non-banks

Consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets and liabilities related to foreign financial non-banks operating in European countries are computed using Orbis Europe. For a country i , I proceed by focusing on the group of companies whose NACE code is associated with financial non-banking activities as described in subsection 3.2.1. I use the same procedure described in that subsection to fill any reporting gaps that may exist.

Before computing aggregate holdings, an additional step is taken in an attempt to address the potential presence of Special Purpose Entities (SPEs) in the sample. These financial non-bank companies often engage in cross-country financing as documented by Galstyan et al. (2021). Their presence inflate residence-based foreign balance sheet of host country i but virtually no economic to country i nationals or firms. As a result, these companies must be identified and removed when estimating the consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to foreign financial non-banks. The procedure adopted in this paper follows that in Sanchez Pacheco (2022). In particular, a financial non-bank is removed from the sample if it has never reported a number of employees or it has last reported having zero employees.

Once potential SPEs are removed, country i 's consolidated foreign assets related to foreign financial non-banks operating in it are given by the sum of the difference between their total asset holdings and their shareholders' funds. Analogously, country i 's foreign liabilities are given by the sum of these companies total asset holdings.

For the United States, estimates of consolidated foreign assets and liabilities related to foreign financial non-banks come from Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023). These estimates are constructed using publicly available data from the U.S. BEA.

Figure A.6 shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to the activities of foreign financial non-banks. In 2019, the presence of these companies in the U.K. are associated with USD 8.2tn in U.K. foreign liabilities. That is followed by

the U.S. where the activities of such companies are associated with USD 7.6tn in U.S. foreign liabilities.

3.3.2 National Financial non-banks operating abroad

Foreign holdings related to country i 's financial non-banks operating abroad are constructed using data from Orbis Europe and the U.S. BEA. The procedure adopted is akin to that used in section 3.2. We separately estimate the foreign holdings that result from the activities of these companies operating in Europe and the holdings that come from activities in the United States.

For country i 's companies operating in Europe, its foreign holdings related to its financial non-banks are computed using the same procedure as that described in subsection 3.2.2. Accordingly, ultimate owners who are identified as having redomiciled to country i are excluded from the sample. Country i 's consolidated foreign assets related to its financial non-banks operating in Europe are equal to the sum of their total asset holdings. Its foreign liabilities related to these companies are equal to the sum of the difference between their total asset holdings and shareholders' funds.

Figure A.7 shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to the activities of national financial non-banks.

3.4 Portfolio Investment

I rely on data from the International Monetary Fund's Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey when estimating foreign assets and liabilities. Notwithstanding the important contribution by Coppola et al. (2021), relatively little is known regarding the nationality of the ultimate owners of global portfolio investments. As a result, I use the residence-based estimates of portfolio holdings when constructing the consolidated-by-nationality balance sheet of countries. For a given country, its foreign portfolio assets are equal to the total investment assets from the CPIS survey. Its foreign liabilities are equal to the total investment liabilities from the CPIS survey.

In the case of Ireland, I follow Sanchez Pacheco (2022) and use the Irish Central Statistics Office data on portfolio holdings for the part of the economy not related to international financial intermediation (non-IFSC). In the case of the United States, I use data from Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023). U.S. portfolio assets are equal to the total holdings of foreign securities by U.S. residents plus claims on unaffiliated foreigners reported by U.S. non-financial companies. U.S. portfolio liabilities include holdings of U.S. securities by foreign residents, holdings of U.S. currency outside of the country and liabilities to unaffiliated foreigners reported by U.S. non-financial companies.

3.5 Official Assets

Official assets are equal to the official reserve assets from the International Monetary Fund International Reserves and Foreign Currency Liquidity database. In the case of Ireland, official assets comes from the Central Bank of Ireland as described in Sanchez Pacheco (2022). For the United States, official assets are equal to the U.S. reserve assets from its International Investment Position released by the U.S. BEA.

4 Stylized Facts

4.1 Aggregate dynamics

In order to assess broad dynamics, I construct aggregate indices of international financial integration using both the consolidated-by-nationality approach as well as the residence-based one. For any given year, the aggregate index is calculated as the sum of foreign assets and liabilities of selected countries divided by the sum of their GDP. For a specific country, this index of international financial integration (IFI) expresses the relative size of a country's foreign balance sheet as a percentage of GDP. The countries included when computing the aggregate index are the United States, the United Kingdom, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, Greece and Ireland. Denmark is removed from the sample given its nationality-based data starts in 2016. This index is computed for the period between 2013 and 2019 using both approaches.

Figure 1 shows the evolution of this aggregate IFI under the nationality-based and residence-based approach for the period between 2013 and 2019. It reveals that the consolidated-by-nationality aggregate IFI is larger than the residence-based one for all years in this period. Importantly, this stylized fact indicates that these developed economies are more financially integrated with foreign agents than what resident-based measures suggest. Such result is due to the fact that the consolidated-by-nationality approach takes into account both cross-border as well as local positions while the residence-based approach focuses exclusively on the former. As such, an important part of the international exposure of countries is not captured by the residence-based approach.

Figure 2 shows the difference between the nationality-based and residence-based aggregate IFI over time. This figure reveals that the nationality-based IFI is not only larger than the residence-based one but the difference between the two increased between 2013 and 2019. There is an important increase in the difference between 2014 and 2017 while it remained largely unchanged from then to 2019.

4.2 Country-level analysis

Figure 3 shows the index of international financial integration (IFI) under both the nationality-based and residence-based approaches per country for 2019. It reveals that most countries present a larger consolidated-by-nationality IFI relative to their residence-based balance sheet. This result is expected as the consolidated-by-nationality approach takes into account both cross-border and local positions while the residence-based one only considers cross-border positions.

The two exceptions to that are Ireland and Greece. In addition, Switzerland and the Netherlands have a nationality-based foreign balance sheet approximately the same size as their residence-based analogues as of 2019. In general, a country will have a relatively smaller consolidated-by-nationality foreign balance sheet if they are host to proportionally relevant number of foreign-owned entities whose activities involve holding cross-border assets and liabilities. These holdings inflate the size of the host country's residence-based foreign balance sheet. However, they are identified as being foreign-owned under the nationality-based approach. Therefore, these cross-border holdings do not appear in the host country's consolidated-by-nationality foreign balance sheet.

Ireland stands out as having a substantially smaller nationality-based foreign balance sheet relative to its residence-based one. Galstyan (2019) and Sanchez Pacheco (2022) discuss how the vast presence of special purpose entities in Ireland inflate its residence-based balance sheet. These companies have virtually no economic ties to Irish agents and are often involved in international financial intermediation. Their relatively large cross-border holdings enter Ireland's residence-based foreign balance sheet and opaque the positions held by Irish nationals as noted by Lane (2018). In contrast, these holdings do not enter Ireland's consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings.

Figure 4 shows the evolution of the consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based IFI for all countries over the sample period. While the two measures of IFI are positively correlated across countries, the difference between them are not constant over time. Using data from the United States, Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023) show that the time-varying difference between the U.S. consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based IFI is positively correlated with tax differentials between the U.S. and the rest of the world. In the sections 5 and 6, these data on multiple countries are used in a panel setting to study profit shifting and spillovers of U.S. monetary policy shocks respectively.

Figure 5 shows the evolution of consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets and liabilities per country over time. In general, consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets and liabilities move in tandem. However, this needs not always be the case. The difference between foreign assets and liabilities in Greece, Italy and Belgium moved in important ways during the sample period.

5 Tax differentials and foreign holdings

Multinational enterprises have an incentive to shift assets and profits to affiliates located in low-tax countries. Dischinger and Riedel (2011) document that the lower an affiliate’s corporate tax rate is relative to other subsidiaries within the same group, the higher it is the level of intangible assets held by this affiliate. Wier and Zucman (2022) estimate that 37% of profits earned by such companies were booked in tax havens in 2019. That compares to only 2% in the 1970s, according to their estimates. Hebous and Johannesen (2021) also find evidence of profit shifting activities using firm-level data from Germany.

Using data for the United States, Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023) have shown that there is a positive relationship between the difference in consolidated-by-nationality minus residence-based measures of foreign holdings and corporate income tax differentials. Their analysis provide indirect evidence that asset/profit shifting activities by U.S. multinational enterprises may extend beyond what residence-based statistics can capture as local positions are also considered in the consolidated approach.

In this section, I examine whether consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets are associated with corporate income tax differentials using a panel of fourteen developed countries. I proceed by examining the relationship between foreign holdings and corporate income tax differentials. This analysis is done using both the existing residence-based data as well as the novel consolidated-by-nationality data. Then I focus on the difference between the consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based measures of foreign holdings to assess whether these time-varying differences are also associated with tax differentials. As in Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023), such difference is a proxy for the foreign exposure countries have that is not captured by the residence-based approach. The regressions also include control variables that have been documented to such as GDP per capita and trade openness as in Lane and Milesi-Ferretti (2001).

Data on GDP per capita comes from the World Bank and is expressed in thousands of dollars. Trade openness also comes from the World Bank and is measured as a country’s trade in goods and services divided by GDP. The difference in the corporate income tax rate for country i is computed as its statutory corporate income tax rate minus the median statutory tax rate from the set of countries included in the OECD Tax database.

These empirical relationships are examined through panel regressions shown in equation 1. The dependent variables $Y_{i,t}$ used are foreign assets, liabilities and IFI under both the consolidated-by-nationality as well as the residence-based approach. Furthermore, I also estimate this regression using the difference between the nationality-based and the residence-based measures as dependent variables as well. The panel data-set includes observations on fourteen developed countries over the period between 2012 and 2019.

$$Y_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \beta_1 * GDPpc_{i,t} + \beta_2 * Open_{i,t} + \beta_3 * TaxDiff_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

The coefficient α_i captures country i fixed effect. $GDPpc_{i,t}$ is the GDP per capita of country i at time t , $Open_{i,t}$ is country i 's trade in goods and services as a % of GDP at time t . $TaxDiff_{i,t}$ is the difference between country i 's statutory corporate income tax rate at time t minus the median corporate tax rate from the OECD Tax database for the same year.

Table 1 shows the regression results using data for all countries in the sample. The coefficient estimate associated with income per capita is positive and statistically significant at the 5% level for both nationality-based foreign assets, liabilities and IFI. This result is in line with Lane and Milesi-Ferretti (2001) that shows a positive correlation between income per capita and foreign assets in a cross-section analysis using residence-based data.

Importantly, this table shows that the difference between nationality- and residence-based measures are also positively correlated with income per capita. The coefficient estimates in the regressions that use the difference between the two approaches are positive and statistically significant for foreign assets, liabilities and IFI. This result indicates that the time-varying difference between foreign holdings using these two alternative approaches is related to macroeconomic factors rather than being orthogonal to them.

The coefficient estimates associated with corporate income tax differentials are not statistically significant across specifications. Furthermore, the coefficient estimates associated with $TaxDiff$ in the regressions focusing on the difference between nationality- and residence-based measures of foreign assets, liabilities and IFI are negative. At a first glance, this result seems to be at odds with Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023) that show a positive correlation between the difference in U.S. nationality- and residence-based IFI and U.S. corporate income tax differentials.

One possibility for such result is that the sample used in Table 1 includes both high and low-tax countries. Consider a high-tax country A and a low-tax country B. Nationals of country A want to benefit from lower taxes in country B thus they shift holdings to that country. If country A nationals shift assets and profits to low tax country B, there would be a positive relationship between country A's tax rate and its foreign holdings. However, there would be a negative relationship between country B's tax rate and its foreign holdings. Therefore, including both high tax country A and low tax country B in the same sample could result in coefficient estimates that are not statistically significant.

In order to overcome such challenge, I divide the countries into two groups: a relatively high-tax group and a relatively low-tax group. A country i will be in the relatively high-tax group if its statutory corporate income tax rate is greater than the median tax rate from the OECD database for most years in the sample. Conversely, it will be in the

relatively low-tax group if its statutory corporate income tax rate is smaller than the median tax rate for most years in the sample.

This criterion puts the United States, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and Greece into the relatively high tax group. The United Kingdom, Germany, Switzerland, Finland and Ireland are in the relatively low tax group. I then estimate regression 1 focusing on the difference between nationality- and residence-based measures of foreign holdings for these different country sub-samples.

Table 2 shows the regression results for the difference between the nationality- and residence-based foreign assets, liabilities and IFI estimated using these sub-samples. The coefficient estimates associated with *TaxDiff* are negative and statistically significant in the regressions focused on relatively low tax countries. Meanwhile, the coefficient estimates are positive albeit not statistically significant in the regressions focused on relatively high tax countries.

Taken together, these results are consistent with the notion that nationals of relatively high tax countries shift holdings to relatively low tax countries in a way that is not completely captured by conventional residence-based data. A policy implication of such finding is that there could be more asset and profit shifting activities than what policymakers can observe if focused only on the residence-based data. Similarly, tax differentials may generate an even more significant incentive for agents to shift assets than what analysis relying on existing residence-based data suggest.

6 U.S. monetary policy spillovers and non-financial MNEs

The dominant role the U.S. dollar plays in international finance indicates that U.S. monetary policy can generate spillover effects in non-U.S. economic agents. Miranda-Agrippino and Rey (2020) demonstrate how U.S. monetary policy shocks generate co-movements in international financial variables. They also show that a tightening in U.S. monetary policy generates a decline in global capital flows to both banks and non-banks.

Focusing on the banking sector, Avdjiev et al. (2018) show that an easing in U.S. monetary policy increases cross-border bank lending. Similar results analyzing spillovers to cross-border capital flows in the banking sector were found by Bruno and Shin (2015). In this sense, an easing in U.S. monetary policy would be associated with an increase in foreign asset holdings by global banks.

Recent research has also focused on the U.S. monetary policy spillovers to non-bank multinationals. Arbatli-Saxegaard et al. (2022) examine different channels through which U.S. monetary policy shocks affect companies' investments in foreign countries. They find

that U.S. monetary policy shocks have a larger effect on firms that present higher share of debt denominated in foreign currency and on firms that are more leveraged. Following a tightening in U.S. monetary policy, Tietz (2020) find that companies operating in countries with pegged or managed exchange rates face a larger reduction in investment relative to companies operating in floaters. Bergant et al. (2023) document spillover effects from U.S. financial conditions to cross-border merger and acquisition activities. In particular, they find that a 100bps easing U.S. financial conditions is associated with a 10% increase in global cross-border M&A activities.

In this section, I investigate whether U.S. monetary policy shocks are associated with changes in consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets by non-financial multinational enterprises. The novel data on such assets for the sample group of developed countries are used in a panel regression setting.

I proceed by estimating the following panel regression of the change in foreign assets by these companies on a series of U.S. monetary policy shocks identified by Bu, Rogers and Wu (2021) as well as some control variables. Among such variables, I include the real exchange rate, the home country's monetary policy rate and an index of U.S. financial conditions. In the robustness check subsection, I use different series of U.S. monetary policy shocks based on alternative estimation methodologies.

$$\Delta FA_{i,t}^{MNES} = \alpha_i + \beta * USMP_t + \gamma * USFCI_t + \delta \Delta REER_{i,t} + \theta * HomeMP_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t} \quad (2)$$

The dependent variable $\Delta FA_{i,t}^{MNES}$ is computed as the first difference in consolidated-by-nationality foreign asset holdings by country i 's non-financial MNEs as a percentage of GDP between year t and $t - 1$. $USMP_t$ captures changes in U.S. monetary policy. In the baseline specification, it is equal to the sum of the unified U.S. monetary policy shocks estimated by Bu, Rogers and Wu (2021) in year t . An alternative specification is presented in which $USMP_t$ is equal to the average U.S. effective Federal Funds rate for any given year t . $USFCI_t$ is the average U.S. National Financial Conditions Index computed by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. $\Delta REER_{i,t}$ is the percent change in the real exchange rate of country i between years t and $t - 1$. $HomeMP_{i,t}$ represents the average monetary policy rate in country i at year t . α_i captures country fixed effects.³

Table 3 shows the regression results for the baseline specification shown in column (3) as well as alternative specifications. The coefficient estimates associated with $USMP_t$ defined as the unified monetary policy shocks are negative and statistically significant at

³For Euro Area countries, the monetary policy rate is the European Central Banks's deposit rate. For Switzerland, the rate is the Swiss overnight average rate. For Sweden, it is the Swedish effective repo rate. For the U.K., the monetary policy rate is the Bank of England's official bank rate. For Denmark, the policy rate is the Danish repo rate.

the 5% level across specifications. Similarly, the coefficient estimates associated with the U.S. effective Fed Funds Rate is also negative. These results suggest that a tightening shock in U.S. monetary policy is associated with a decrease in foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinational enterprises. Such finding stands even when incorporating U.S. financial conditions in the regression analysis.

Furthermore, these regression results suggest that the home country's monetary policy is not correlated with changes in foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinationals. They also indicate there is a negative correlation between the changes in the real exchange rate of the home country and the change in foreign assets.

Taken together, I interpret these results as indicating that U.S. monetary policy appears to be a relevant factor in the decision-making of non-financial multinationals. Tighter (easier) U.S. monetary policy is associated with an decrease (increase) in consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets by these companies.

6.1 Robustness

It is possible that the negative and statistically significant coefficients associated with U.S. monetary policy shocks may be related to the particular estimation method adopted to compute these shocks. As a robustness check, I use different measures of U.S. monetary policy shocks when estimating equation 2. One such measure is the U.S. monetary policy news shocks from Nakamura and Steinsson (2018). The other set of measures are the target and path policy shocks from Gürkaynak, Sack and Swansson (2005). These updates series are taken from Acosta (2023). For each year, the monetary policy shocks used in the regression are equal to the sum of the respective shocks that took place during that year.

Table 4 shows the regression results for equation 2 using these different measures of policy shocks. These results show that these alternative measures of U.S. monetary policy shocks are also negatively correlated with changes in foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinationals. They indicate that the association between U.S. monetary policy shocks and changes in foreign assets is not related to the specific identification strategy used by Bu, Rogers and Wu (2021). Rather, such negative correlation also emerges once different estimation methodologies are adopted.

In sum, I find evidence that a tightening shock in U.S. monetary policy is associated with a decrease in foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinational enterprises. Such negative correlation is robust with respect to different identification strategies used to determine U.S. monetary policy shocks.

7 Conclusion

Consolidated-by-nationality data on foreign holdings can be particularly helpful for policymakers to identify the ultimate exposure its national economic agents have relative to several risk factors. This approach also provides a more detailed view on the decision-making units as affiliates operating abroad are consolidated to their ultimate parent. In this paper, I construct the first data-set containing nationality-based estimates of foreign holdings for a group of developed economies over time. This data-set should complement the existing residence-based data from the seminal *External Wealth of Nations* project by Lane and Milesi-Ferretti (2001, 2007, 2018).

These novel data reveal that these developed economies are on aggregate more internationally financially integrated to the world than what is shown in the residence-based data. Such difference comes from the fact that all positions are taken into account when constructing consolidated-by-nationality data. In contrast, only cross-border positions are considered in residence-based statistics.

The country-level data reveals that most but not all countries present a larger foreign balance sheet from a consolidated-by-nationality perspective relative to the residence-based approach. In particular, countries with a significant presence of special purpose entities - most notably Ireland - can have a smaller consolidated-by-nationality balance sheet. Such result comes from the fact that the cross-border holdings related to these foreign entities do not enter their host's nationality-based balance sheet but still appears in their residence-based one.

This data-set is used to analyze two separate international macroeconomic issues. The first one is on the profit shifting while the second is on the spillovers from U.S. monetary policy shocks on non-financial multinational enterprises.

For a sample of low-tax countries, I find a negative correlation between corporate income tax differentials and the difference between their consolidated-by-nationality minus residence-based foreign assets. Meanwhile, a positive coefficient estimate emerges in the same panel regression on a sample of high-tax countries. These two results are consistent with the notion that agents in high-tax countries have an incentive to shift assets and profits to low-tax countries. A policy implication that emerges from such findings is that profit shifting activities might extend beyond what is captured by residence-based statistics. This is consistent with the findings by Bénétrix and Sanchez Pacheco (2023) based on U.S. data.

The second application of these novel data is on the analysis of spillovers of U.S. monetary policy shocks on foreign asset holdings by non-financial multinational enterprises. I find a negative correlation between a tightening U.S. monetary policy shock and the change in consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets by these companies. Such

negative correlation is robust with respect to different estimation methodologies of U.S. monetary policy shocks. This result suggests that U.S. monetary policy shocks might generate spillovers that are associated with changes in foreign assets by non-financial multinationals.

These two sets of results highlight the usefulness of these novel consolidated-by-nationality estimates of foreign holdings in addressing different international macroeconomic issues.

References


- [1] Acosta, M. (2023). “The Perceived Causes of Monetary Policy Surprises”. Mimeo.
- [2] Arbatli-Saxegaard, E., Firat, M., Furceri, D. and J. Verrier. (2022) “U.S. Monetary Policy Shock Spillovers: Evidence from Firm-Level Data”. IMF Working Paper No. 2022/191.
- [3] Avdjiev, S., Everett, M., Lane, P. R. and H. S. Shin (2018). “Tracking the international footprints of global firms”. BIS Quarterly Review. March 2018: 47-66.
- [4] Avdjiev, S., McCauley, R. and H. S. Shin (2016). “Breaking free of the triple coincidence in international finance”. *Economic Policy* 31 (87): 409-451.
- [5] Avdjiev, S., Koch, C., McGuire, P. and G. von Peter (2018). “Transmission of monetary policy through global banks: Whose policy matters?”. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 89: 67-82.
- [6] Avdjiev, S., Hardy, B., McGuire, P. and G. von Peter (2020). “Home sweet host: A cross-country perspective on prudential and monetary policy spillovers through global banks”. *Review of International Economics* 29 (1): 20-36.
- [7] Bank for International Settlements. (2015). 85th Annual Report.
- [8] Bank for International Settlements. BIS Consolidated Banking Statistics.
<https://www.bis.org/statistics/consstats.htm>.
- [9] Bénétrix, A. and A. Sanchez Pacheco (2023). “Corporate Taxation and International Financial Integration: U.S. evidence from a consolidated perspective”. *Oxford Open Economics* 2, odac011.
- [10] Bergant, K., Mishra, P. and R. Rajan (2023). “Cross-border Spillovers: How US Financial Conditions affect M&As Around the World”. Working Paper.
- [11] Blomstrom, M., and A. Kokko (1998). “Multinational Corporations and Spillovers”. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 12 (3): 247–277.
- [12] Bloomberg Tax Inversion Tracker.
<https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/tax-inversion-tracker/>
- [13] Borio, C. (2013). “The Great Financial Crisis: Setting priorities for new statistics”. *Journal of Banking Regulation* 14 306-317.

- [14] Bruno, V. and H. S. Shin (2015) “Capital flows and the risk-taking channel of monetary policy”. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 71: 119-132.
- [15] Bu, C., Rogers, J. and W. Wu (2021). “A unified measure of Fed monetary policy shocks”. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 118: 331-349.
- [16] Bureau of Economic Analysis. International Economic Accounts. <https://www.bea.gov/data/economic-accounts/international>. U.S. Department of Commerce.
- [17] Catão, L. and G. M. Milesi-Ferretti (2014). “External liabilities and crises”. *Journal of International Economics* 94: 18-32.
- [18] Central Bank of Ireland. Official External Reserves.
- [19] Central Statistics Office. International Investment Position BPM6. <https://data.cso.ie/table/BPQ23>
- [20] Coppola, A., Maggiori, M., Neiman, B. and J. Schreger. (2021). “Redrawing the Map of Global Capital Flows: The Role of Cross-Border Financing and Tax Havens”. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136 (3): 1499-1556.
- [21] Dischinger, M. and N. Riedel (2011). “Corporate taxes and the location of intangible assets within multinational firms”. *Journal of Public Economics* 95 (7-8): 691-707.
- [22] Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. National Financial Conditions Index.
- [23] Galstyan, V. (2019). “Estimates of Foreign Assets and Liabilities for Ireland”. Central Bank of Ireland Research Technical Paper 2019 (3).
- [24] Galstyan, V., Maqui, E. and P. McQuade (2021). “International debt and special purpose entities: Evidence from Ireland”. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 115: 102398.
- [25] Gürkaynak, R., Sack, B. and E. Swansson (2005). “Do Actions Speak Louder Than Words? The Response of Asset Prices to Monetary Policy Actions and Statements”. *International Journal of Central Banking* 1, May 2005.
- [26] Hebous, S. and N. Johannessen (2021). “At your service! The role of tax havens in international trade with services”. *European Economic Review* 135: 103737.
- [27] International Monetary Fund. Coordinated Direct Investment Survey.
- [28] International Monetary Fund. Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey.

- [29] International Monetary Fund. International Reserves and Foreign Currency Liquidity.
- [30] Lane, P. R. (2019). “Globalisation: A Macro-Financial Perspective - Geary Lecture 2019”. *The Economic and Social Review* 50 (2): 249-263.
- [31] Lane, P. R. (2021). “Maximising the user value of statistics: lessons from globalisation and the pandemic”. Speech at the European Statistical Forum.
- [32] Lane, P. R. and G. M. Milesi-Ferretti (2001). “The external wealth of nations: measures of foreign assets and liabilities for industrial and developing countries”. *Journal of International Economics* 55 (2): 263-294.
- [33] Lane, P. R. and G. M. Milesi-Ferretti (2007). “The External Wealth of Nations Mark II: Revised and Extended Estimates of Foreign Assets and Liabilities, 1970–2004”. *Journal of International Economics* 73 (2): 223–250
- [34] Lane, P. R. and G. M. Milesi-Ferretti (2018). “The External Wealth of Nations Revisited: International Financial Integration in the Aftermath of the Global Financial Crisis”. *IMF Economic Review* 66: 189–222.
- [35] Lane, P. R. and G. M. Milesi-Ferretti. “The External Wealth of Nations Database”. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-external-wealth-of-nations-database/>.
- [36] McCauley, R., Bénétrix, A., McGuire, P. and G. von Peter (2019). “Financial De-globalisation in Banking?” *Journal of International Money and Finance* (94): 116-131
- [37] McCauley, R. (2018). “The 2008 Crisis: Transpacific or Transatlantic?”. *BIS Quarterly Review*. December 2018.
- [38] Mider, Z. (2017) “Tax Inversion”. *Bloomberg Quick Take*. 2 March. <https://www.bloomberg.com/quicktake/tax-inversion>
- [39] Miranda-Agrippino, S. and H. Rey (2020). “U.S. Monetary Policy and the Global Financial Cycle ”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87 (6): 2754-2776.
- [40] Nakamura, E. and J. Steinsson (2018) “High Frequency Identification of Monetary Non-Neutrality: The Information Effect”. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133 (3): 1283-1330.
- [41] Sanchez Pacheco, A. (2022). “A consolidated-by-nationality approach to Irish foreign exposure”. *International Economics* 170: 235-247.
- [42] Tietz, R. (2020). “Dollar borrowing by non-financial firms and the real effects of US monetary policy abroad”. Mimeo.


- [43] Wier, L. and G. Zucman (2022). “Global Profit Shifting, 1975-2019”. UNU-WIDER Working Paper 2022/121.

Figure 1: Aggregate international financial integration - % of GDP




Note: This figure shows the aggregate index of international financial integration under the consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based approach. For a given year, the aggregate index is calculated as the sum of foreign assets and liabilities of selected countries divided by their GDP. It is expressed as a percentage of GDP. The countries included are the United States, the United Kingdom, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, Greece and Ireland. The residence-based measures come from Lane and Milesi-Ferretti's *External Wealth of Nations* database.

Figure 2: Difference between the aggregate nationality- and residence-based IFI




Note: This figure shows the difference between the aggregate index of international financial integration under the consolidated-by-nationality relative to the residence-based approach. It is expressed as a percentage of GDP. The countries included to construct the aggregated are the United States, the United Kingdom, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, Greece and Ireland. The residence-based measures come from Lane and Milesi-Ferretti's *External Wealth of Nations* database.

Figure 3: Consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based IFI - 2019




Note: This figure shows the consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based IFI for all countries in the dataset for 2019. The residence-based measures come from Lane and Milesi-Ferretti's *External Wealth of Nations* database. Data is computed as the sum of foreign assets and liabilities divided by GDP and is expressed as percentage of GDP. Countries located above the 45 degree line presented a larger consolidated-by-nationality foreign balance sheet in 2019 relative to their residence-based foreign balance sheet.

Figure 4: Nationality-based and residence-based IFI



Note: This figure shows the index of international financial integration under both the consolidated-by-nationality and residence-based approaches. It is computed as the sum of a country's foreign assets and liabilities divided by GDP. It is expressed as a percentage of GDP. The residence-based measures come from Lane and Milesi-Ferretti's *External Wealth of Nations* database.

Figure 5: Consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets and liabilities - % of GDP



Note: This figure shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign assets and holdings per country. These holdings are expressed as a percentage of GDP.

Table 1: Regression Results using full sample of countries

	Assets			Liabilities			IFI		
	Nationality	Residence	Difference	Nationality	Residence	Difference	Nationality	Residence	Difference
GDP pc.	2.52** (1.19)	-0.95 (1.05)	3.94*** (1.07)	2.59** (1.12)	-1.34 (0.98)	4.10*** (1.00)	5.11** (2.19)	-2.29 (2.01)	8.04*** (1.94)
Open	-1.31 (1.03)	0.06 (0.94)	-1.50 (0.93)	0.50 (0.97)	0.45 (0.88)	0.06 (0.87)	-0.82 (1.90)	0.51 (1.81)	-1.44 (1.69)
Tax Diff.	0.09 (2.05)	1.27 (1.89)	-0.75 (1.85)	0.09 (1.94)	0.83 (1.77)	-0.32 (1.73)	0.18 (3.78)	2.10 (3.62)	-1.06 (3.35)
R ²	0.19	0.23	0.31	0.44	0.34	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.03
Obs.	105	112	105	105	112	105	105	112	105

Note: * $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table shows regression results of foreign assets, liabilities and IFI under both the consolidated-by-nationality as well as the residence-based approach. Dependent variables as expressed as a percentage of GDP. The independent variables are GDP per capita, trade as a percentage of GDP and the difference between the statutory corporate income tax rate relative to the median of a large set of countries. All regressions include country fixed effects. The number of observations vary due to missing data for some country-year pairs in the *Consolidated Foreign Wealth of Nations* dataset.

Table 2: Regression Results of the difference between nationality- and residence-based measures

	Difference in Assets			Difference in Liabilities			Difference in IFI		
	Full Smpl.	High Tax	Low Tax	Full Smpl.	High Tax	Low Tax	Full Smpl.	High Tax	Low Tax
GDP pc.	3.94*** (1.07)	5.93*** (1.31)	5.00** (1.82)	4.10*** (1.00)	4.14*** (0.84)	6.89*** (1.78)	8.04*** (1.94)	10.07*** (1.93)	11.89*** (3.43)
Open	-1.50 (0.93)	-0.75 (1.23)	-1.82 (1.41)	0.06 (0.87)	-0.42 (0.78)	-0.37 (1.38)	-1.44 (1.69)	-1.18 (1.80)	-2.18 (2.66)
Tax Diff.	-0.75 (1.85)	1.06 (1.45)	-24.04** (9.60)	-0.32 (1.73)	1.77* (0.92)	-35.13*** (9.36)	-1.06 (3.35)	2.83 (2.13)	-59.17*** (18.10)
R ²	0.31	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.50	0.19	0.03	0.41	0.04
Obs.	105	66	39	105	66	39	105	66	39

Note: * $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table shows regression results of the difference in foreign assets, liabilities and IFI between the consolidated-by-nationality approach relative to the residence-based approach. Regressions are estimated using (1) the full sample of countries, (2) a sample of relatively high tax countries and (3) a sample of relatively low tax countries. Relatively high tax countries are the United States, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and Greece. Relatively low tax countries are the United Kingdom, Germany, Switzerland, Finland and Ireland. The independent variables are GDP per capita, trade as a percentage of GDP and the difference between a country's statutory corporate income tax rate and a median of a large sample of countries. All regressions include country fixed effects. The number of observations vary due to missing data for some country-year pairs in the *Consolidated Foreign Wealth of Nations* dataset.

Table 3: Regression Results of the first difference in foreign assets related to national non-financial MNEs (% of GDP)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
U.S. Monetary Policy Shock	-0.579** (0.070)	-0.510** (0.251)	-0.923*** (0.256)	-0.162 (0.107)	-0.249** (0.108)	-0.231** (0.107)	
U.S. FCI			-0.420*** (0.111)			-0.128* (0.070)	-0.142** (0.071)
U.S. Fed Funds Rate						-0.015** (0.006)	-0.012** (0.006)
Real Exchange Rate		-0.011* (0.006)	-0.015** (0.006)		-0.018*** (0.006)		
Home Policy Rate		0.052 (0.122)	0.019 (0.113)		-0.080 (0.118)	0.066 (0.141)	0.134 (0.141)
Country Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R ²	0.07	0.10	0.23	0.03	0.10	0.15	0.09
Obs.	91	91	91	91	91	91	91

Note: * $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table shows regression results of first difference in foreign assets related to national non-financial MNEs as a percentage of GDP. The independent variables are (1) the unified measure of U.S. monetary policy shocks by Bu, Rogers and Wu (2021), (2) the U.S. National Financial Conditions Index from the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, (3) the U.S. Effective Federal Funds Rate, (4) the real exchange rate for the home country from the International Monetary Fund and (5) the monetary policy rate from the home country. For Euro Area countries, the monetary policy rate is the ECB's deposit rate. For Switzerland, the rate is the Swiss overnight average rate. For Sweden, it is the Swedish effective repo rate. For the U.K., the monetary policy rate is the BoE's official bank rate. For Denmark, the policy rate is the Danish repo rate. All regressions include country fixed effects.

Table 4: Regression Results of the first difference in foreign assets related to MNEs using alternative measures of policy shocks


	(1)	(2)	(3)
BRW - Unified Policy shock	-0.923*** (0.256)		
NS - Policy News shock		-1.277** (0.561)	
GSS - Target shock			-0.910* (0.458)
GSS - Path shock			-0.579** (0.265)
US Financial Conditions Index	-0.420*** (0.111)	-0.427*** (0.131)	-0.458*** (0.139)
Real Exchange Rate	-0.011* (0.006)	-0.015** (0.006)	-0.016** (0.006)
Home Monetary Policy	0.019 (0.113)	-0.001 (0.120)	0.033 (0.130)
Country Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
R ²	0.23	0.16	0.17
Obs.	91	91	91

Note: * $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table shows regression results of first difference in foreign assets related to national non-financial MNEs as a percentage of GDP. Three different measures of U.S. monetary policy shocks are used in this analysis. The baseline specification uses the unified monetary policy shocks from Bu, Rogers and Wu (2021). Another specification uses the policy news shock from Nakamura and Steinsson (2018). A third specification uses the target and path U.S. monetary policy shocks from Gürkaynak, Sack and Swansson (2005). The independent variables are (1) a measure of U.S. monetary policy shock, (2) the U.S. National Financial Conditions Index from the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, (3) the U.S. Effective Federal Funds Rate, (4) the real exchange rate for the home country from the International Monetary Fund and (5) the monetary policy rate from the home country. For Euro Area countries, the monetary policy rate is the ECB's deposit rate. For Switzerland, the rate is the Swiss overnight average rate. For Sweden, it is the Swedish effective repo rate. For the U.K., the monetary policy rate is the BoE's official bank rate. For Denmark, the policy rate is the Danish repo rate. All regressions include country fixed effects.


A Appendix

Figure A.1: Consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to national banks




Note: This figure shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to the the activities of national banks. Data is shown for 2019 in billions of US dollars. I rely on data from the Bank for International Settlements to construct these estimates.

Figure A.2: Consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to foreign banks




Note: This figure shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to the the activities of foreign banks. Data is shown for 2019 in billions of US dollars. I rely on data from the Bank for International Settlements to construct these estimates.

Figure A.3: Consolidated foreign holdings related to foreign non-financial MNEs




Note: This figure shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to foreign non-financial multinational enterprises (MNEs). Data is shown for 2019 in billions of US dollars. I rely on data from Orbis Europe and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis to construct these estimates.

Figure A.4: Share of outbound FDI position to covered countries relative to total




Note: This figure shows the ratio of outbound FDI position sent to countries included in Orbis Europe plus the United States relative to the total outbound FDI position for each country in the CFWN database. The percentages reported are the average shares for the period between 2009 and 2020. These percentages are computed using the IMF Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey. We exclude from the calculation positions that have non-EU tax havens as the ultimate recipients are not known. These non-EU tax havens include Bermuda, Cayman Islands and Jersey. In the case of the United States, the U.S. BEA data provides coverage of U.S. MNEs activities in all countries. Therefore, the U.S. average share would be equal to one.

Figure A.5: Consolidated foreign holdings related to national non-financial MNEs




Note: This figure shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to national non-financial multinational enterprises (MNEs). Data is shown for 2019 in billions of US dollars. I rely on data from Orbis Europe and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis to construct these estimates.



Note: This figure shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to foreign financial non-banks. Data is shown for 2019 in billions of US dollars. I rely on data from Orbis Europe and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis to construct these estimates.

Figure A.7: Consolidated foreign holdings related to national financial non-banks



Note: This figure shows estimates of consolidated-by-nationality foreign holdings related to national financial non-banks. Data is shown for 2019 in billions of US dollars. I rely on data from Orbis Europe and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis to construct these estimates.