Minnesota Journal of Business Law and Entrepreneurship

Volume 2026, No. 3

ISSN: 1540-3270

Managing Cross-Border Tax Risks Through Transfer Pricing Regulations in Multinational Enterprises

Dr. Roop Raj[1], Priyadarsini Dip[2], Dr. N. Chithra[3], Dr. Khaja Mohinuddeen J[4], Dr. U. Priya[5], Dr. Chanchal Chawla[6]

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Economics, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University (A Central University) Pauri, Srinagar, Uttarakhand,

[2]Assistant Professor, Commerce and Management, Regional college of management, Bhubaneswar, Khordha, Odisha,

[3]Assistant Professor, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Ramapuram Part, Vadapalani Campus Chennai,

[4]Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, Ballari Institute of Technology and Management, Ballari, Karnataka,

[5]Assistant Professor Grade – I, Commerce, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Business Studies, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, Chennai, Tamil Nadu

[6]Professor, Management, Teerthanker Mahaveer university, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract:

Multinational enterprises (MNEs) operate simultaneously within dozens of national tax jurisdictions, each applying its own interpretation of the international arm's-length standard to the same underlying intra-group transactions, a structural condition that generates a distinct category of cross-border tax risk largely absent from single-jurisdiction domestic taxation. This paper reviews the transfer pricing and international tax literature from a risk-management perspective, treating the OECD's arm's-length principle, the Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) Action Plan, and the subsequent Pillar One and Pillar Two reforms not merely as an evolving regulatory framework but as a set of risk-mitigation instruments that multinational enterprises must actively manage against specific, identifiable categories of cross-border tax exposure. The review synthesizes the empirical profit-shifting literature that first documented the scale of tax-motivated income allocation, the regulatory-response literature tracing the OECD framework's development, and the applied tax-risk-management literature addressing documentation, advance pricing agreements, and dispute resolution as concrete instruments multinational tax functions deploy. Particular attention is given to the specific mechanisms, comparability uncertainty for intangible assets, double taxation from uncoordinated national adjustments, documentation and audit exposure, and reputational risk from country-by-country transparency, through which cross-border tax risk manifests inside a modern multinational tax function. Distinct comparative tables classify cross-border tax risk categories by underlying driver and typical trigger event, map each risk category onto the specific regulatory and internal-governance instruments available to manage it, and trace the empirical evidence on profit-shifting magnitude that has shaped how seriously each risk category is now treated. The paper concludes that effective cross-border tax risk management increasingly functions as a continuous, group-wide governance discipline rather than a transaction-by-transaction compliance exercise, and identifies empirical evaluation of Pillar Two's effect on residual risk exposure as the central future research prospect.

Keywords: Transfer Pricing, Tax Risk Management, Base Erosion and Profit Shifting, Arm's-Length Principle, Multinational Enterprises, Double Taxation, Advance Pricing Agreements, OECD Guidelines.

I. Introduction

A multinational enterprise's cross-border tax exposure arises from a structural feature of international taxation that has no direct domestic analogue: the same intra-group transaction, a transfer of goods, services, intellectual property, or financing between related affiliates, must simultaneously satisfy the transfer pricing rules of every jurisdiction in which a transacting affiliate is resident, and these jurisdictions do not always reach the same conclusion about what price or profit allocation the arm's-length standard requires [1]. Sahlman-style agency reasoning aside, this is fundamentally a valuation and evidentiary problem: the OECD's arm's-length principle requires that intra-group prices approximate what independent parties would have agreed under comparable conditions, but Eden's comprehensive treatment of North American transfer pricing regulation identified the central practical difficulty this creates, that genuinely comparable independent-party transactions frequently do not exist for the unique intangible assets, integrated supply chains, and intra-group financing arrangements that constitute a large and growing share of multinational intra-group activity [9], [1]. Where comparables are scarce or contestable, two tax authorities can reach materially different conclusions about the same transaction in good faith, and it is precisely this evidentiary gap, rather than deliberate non-compliance alone, that generates much of the cross-border tax risk this paper examines.

The empirical literature quantifying tax-motivated income shifting supplies the evidentiary backdrop against which this risk has been taken increasingly seriously by both tax authorities and multinational tax functions themselves. Hines and Rice's foundational analysis of U.S. multinational affiliate profitability found that affiliates located in low-tax jurisdictions reported profit rates substantially exceeding what their real capital and labor inputs would predict, a pattern the authors interpreted as evidence of tax-motivated income shifting into low-tax affiliates [2]. Grubert and Mutti's complementary analysis of U.S. multinational tax and tariff data found that the responsiveness of reported profit allocation to cross-country tax-rate differences considerably exceeded the responsiveness of real investment location to the same differences, a distinction directly relevant to risk management since it indicates that profit-shifting risk operates as a largely separate exposure from investment-location risk, requiring its own dedicated management approach rather than being addressed incidentally through capital-allocation decisions [5]. Clausing's transaction-level analysis of U.S. intrafirm trade prices found direct, price-level evidence consistent with this pattern, U.S. exports to low-tax affiliated jurisdictions systematically underpriced and imports from such jurisdictions systematically overpriced relative to arm's-length benchmarks, evidence of exactly the kind of transfer-mispricing exposure that documentation and comparability analysis are designed to manage [3].

This accumulating empirical evidence, considerably extended by Tørsløv, Wier, and Zucman's more recent estimate that approximately 40 percent of multinational profits are shifted to tax havens globally each year, motivated the OECD's 2013 Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Action Plan, a fifteen-action program that reformed the international tax framework specifically to close the evidentiary and transparency gaps the earlier empirical literature had identified [6], [12]. From a risk-management perspective, BEPS Actions 8 through 10 directly targeted the comparability-uncertainty risk Eden identified by requiring that reported profit allocation track the location of genuine value-creating activity, particularly key decision-making and risk-management personnel, rather than the contractual allocation of legal risk and asset ownership alone [7], [9]. BEPS Action 13's three-tiered documentation standard, a master file, local file, and country-by-country report, addressed a distinct risk category, the information-asymmetry and audit-exposure risk that arises when a multinational group cannot produce contemporaneous, defensible documentation of its transfer pricing methodology when a tax authority challenge arises [8]. BEPS Action 14's reinforcement of the mutual agreement procedure addressed yet a third distinct risk category, the double-taxation risk that materializes when two treaty jurisdictions reach different transfer pricing conclusions about the same transaction and neither makes a corresponding adjustment [6].

The Pillar One and Pillar Two reforms that followed BEPS represent a further escalation in this risk-management framing: rather than refining the arm's-length principle's application to reduce comparability uncertainty, as BEPS Actions 8 through 10 attempted, Pillar Two's global minimum effective tax rate directly targets a residual risk category that documentation and comparability improvements alone cannot eliminate, the structural incentive to locate profit in very-low-tax jurisdictions that persists even when every individual transfer price is fully defensible under the arm's-length standard [12], [17]. This paper reviews the regulatory and empirical transfer pricing literature specifically through this risk-category lens, treating each major OECD instrument as a response to a particular, identifiable exposure a multinational tax function must manage, before turning to the applied literature on the specific governance instruments, advance pricing agreements, documentation discipline, and dispute resolution mechanisms, multinational enterprises deploy in practice.

Research Objectives

- To classify the distinct categories of cross-border tax risk multinational enterprises face under the international transfer pricing framework.
- To review the empirical profit-shifting literature that has shaped regulatory and managerial attention to each risk category.

- To trace how successive OECD regulatory instruments, from the arm's-length principle through BEPS to Pillar One and Pillar Two, function as risk-mitigation responses to specific, identifiable exposures.
- To examine the applied tax-risk-management literature addressing documentation, advance pricing agreements, and dispute resolution as governance instruments.
- To identify future research priorities for evaluating Pillar Two's effect on residual cross-border tax risk.

II. Literature Review

2.1 The Arm's-Length Standard as a Source of Managed Risk

The OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines establish the arm's-length principle as the governing international standard, specifying five recognized methods, comparable uncontrolled price, resale price, cost-plus, transactional net margin, and profit split, through which a multinational group can benchmark a related-party price or margin against what independent parties would have agreed [1]. Eden's comprehensive treatment of transfer pricing regulation identified the standard's central practical limitation directly: it presupposes the existence of genuinely comparable independent transactions, a presupposition that holds reasonably well for standardized commodities but fails considerably more often for unique intangible assets, integrated global supply chains, and intra-group financing, precisely the transaction types that constitute a growing share of intra-group activity and therefore a growing share of managed tax risk [9]. This comparability gap is not a peripheral technical detail but the structural source of much of the risk this paper catalogues, since it is precisely where genuine comparables are absent that two tax authorities, or a tax authority and the taxpayer, are most likely to reach divergent conclusions about the same transaction.

2.2 Empirical Evidence Shaping Risk Perception

Hines and Rice's analysis of U.S. multinational affiliate profitability, finding low-tax-jurisdiction profitability considerably exceeding what real capital and labor inputs would predict, provided among the earliest rigorous evidence that transfer pricing functions as a distinct, quantifiable risk channel rather than a purely theoretical concern [2]. Grubert and Mutti's finding that profit-allocation responsiveness to tax-rate differences considerably exceeds real-investment responsiveness reinforces this risk-channel distinction, indicating that a multinational's tax risk profile cannot be inferred simply from its physical investment footprint [5]. Clausing's transaction-level intrafirm trade-price evidence, and Davies, Martin, Parenti, and Toubal's subsequent French firm-level corroboration using product-level export price data, moved this evidence from aggregate affiliate profitability down to the individual transaction level, the level at which a tax authority audit actually operates and at which documentation risk is actually managed [3], [13]. Cristea and Nguyen's natural-experiment analysis of Danish firms undergoing a change in foreign ownership to a low-tax-jurisdiction parent found that export prices to the new low-tax parent fell measurably following the ownership change, strengthening the causal interpretation of this risk channel considerably beyond what the earlier cross-sectional evidence alone could support [14]. Huizinga and Laeven's cross-country European evidence, and Bilicka's UK matched-firm comparison finding foreign multinational affiliates report systematically lower domestic profitability than comparable domestic firms, together indicate that this risk channel is not specific to U.S. multinationals or U.S. tax rules but represents a general structural feature of cross-border intra-group pricing that any multinational tax function, regardless of headquarters jurisdiction, must actively manage [11], [20].

2.3 Aggregate Magnitude and the Case for Structural Reform

Zucman's early cross-border profit-tracking analysis, and Tørsløv, Wier, and Zucman's subsequent, considerably more comprehensive estimate that approximately 40 percent of multinational profits are shifted to tax havens globally each year, transformed the risk-perception landscape from a matter of individual-transaction exposure to one of aggregate, system-level concern sufficient to motivate the Pillar One and Pillar Two reforms discussed in Section 2.5 [10], [12]. Beer, de Mooij, and Liu's systematic review of the broader international tax avoidance literature, synthesizing dozens of empirical studies employing varying data sources and methodologies, found that despite considerable variation in specific point estimates, the literature converges on a consistent qualitative conclusion: profit shifting is economically significant, systematically responsive to tax-rate differentials, and disproportionately concentrated in intangible-asset-intensive industries, precisely the industries Eden's comparability-uncertainty analysis identifies as carrying the highest transfer pricing risk [9], [15]. Dharmapala's earlier, more cautious review reached a broadly similar qualitative conclusion while specifically warning that measurement challenges, particularly the difficulty of establishing a genuine counterfactual "no-shifting" baseline, mean point estimates should be treated with caution even as the qualitative direction of risk remains well established [16].

2.4 BEPS as a Structured Response to Identified Risk Categories

The OECD's 2013 BEPS Action Plan explicitly acknowledged that the existing international tax framework, developed originally for a world of predominantly tangible, physically located economic activity, had not kept pace with the digitalization of the global economy and the growing importance of mobile intangible assets, and proposed a fifteen-action program addressing transfer pricing, treaty abuse, and transparency as an integrated risk-mitigation package rather than a single reform [6]. BEPS Actions 8 through 10 revised the Transfer Pricing Guidelines to require that reported profit allocation track genuine value-creating activity, specifically the location of key decision-making and risk-management personnel, rather than the contractual allocation of legal risk and intangible-asset ownership alone, a revision directly targeting the comparability-uncertainty and intangible-asset-driven shifting risk Desai, Foley, and Hines's earlier analysis of tax-haven demand among intangible-intensive U.S. multinationals had implicitly identified as a major exposure channel [4], [7]. BEPS Action 13's master file, local file, and country-by-country reporting requirements addressed a categorically distinct risk, the information-asymmetry risk that had historically left tax authorities without the comparative, group-wide data needed to identify which multinational groups' profit allocation warranted scrutiny, a transparency measure that simultaneously functions as an internal risk-management discipline for the reporting multinational itself, since the documentation process required to satisfy Action 13 compels a systematic, defensible articulation of transfer pricing methodology in advance of any audit rather than a reactive justification constructed after a challenge has already been raised [8]. BEPS Action 14 addressed a third distinct risk, double taxation arising from uncoordinated adjustments by two treaty jurisdictions, through a reinforced minimum standard for the mutual agreement procedure [6].

2.5 Pillar One and Pillar Two: Managing Residual, Structural Risk

Tørsløv, Wier, and Zucman's finding that a very large share of multinational profit continued to be shifted to tax havens even after the BEPS reforms had been substantially implemented indicated that incremental refinement of the arm's-length principle alone had not reduced aggregate profit-shifting risk to a level policymakers considered acceptable, motivating the Pillar One and Pillar Two reforms agreed in principle in 2021 [12], [17]. Pillar One's formulaic reallocation of a portion of residual profit to market jurisdictions, independent of a multinational's physical presence there, addresses a risk category the transaction-based arm's-length framework structurally cannot address, the mismatch between where a multinational's profit is booked and where its market-facing sales activity actually occurs [17]. Pillar Two's global minimum effective tax rate addresses a distinct, residual risk category more directly still, the incentive to locate profit in very-low-tax jurisdictions that persists structurally even when every individual intra-group transfer price is fully defensible and fully documented under the arm's-length standard, meaning that comparability analysis and documentation discipline alone, however rigorously executed, cannot eliminate this specific exposure [12], [17].

2.6 Firm-Level Behavioral Evidence Relevant to Risk Assessment

Markle's comparative analysis of income-shifting behavior among multinationals headquartered in territorial versus worldwide tax systems found that a multinational's home-country tax-system design measurably affects the magnitude of its group's income-shifting behavior, evidence directly relevant to risk assessment since it indicates that a multinational's inherent risk profile depends partly on its parent jurisdiction's tax-system structure and not solely on its transfer pricing methodology [18]. De Simone, Klassen, and Seidman's analysis of unprofitable multinational affiliates found that even loss-reporting affiliates exhibit income-shifting behavior consistent with tax-rate incentives, identifying an additional risk channel, the strategic timing and location of loss recognition, that arm's-length pricing analysis focused on profitable transactions does not directly address [19]. Together, these findings indicate that a comprehensive cross-border tax risk assessment must extend beyond individual transfer prices to encompass the multinational group's overall tax-system exposure and its loss-allocation policy, not merely the defensibility of any single intra-group transaction.

2.7 Research Gap

While the empirical profit-shifting literature reviewed in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 has established a robust, methodologically diverse evidence base on the magnitude and mechanisms of cross-border tax risk, and the regulatory literature reviewed in Sections 2.4 and 2.5 documents how the OECD framework has evolved in response, comparatively few studies organize this evidence explicitly around the distinct risk categories a multinational tax function must actively manage, comparability uncertainty, double taxation, documentation exposure, transparency-driven reputational risk, and the residual structural incentive Pillar Two targets, treating these instead as a single undifferentiated "compliance burden" rather than as analytically separable exposures requiring different governance instruments [9], [12], [17]. This review addresses this gap by organizing the reviewed evidence within a risk-category framework spanning driver, empirical evidence, and management instrument.

III. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and comparative research design synthesizing peer-reviewed empirical economics literature on multinational profit shifting, OECD regulatory guidance documents, and the applied international tax risk management literature. Reviewed evidence was organized along three axes: risk category (comparability uncertainty, double taxation, documentation/audit exposure, transparency/reputational risk, or residual structural incentive); underlying empirical driver, where quantified; and the specific regulatory or internal-governance instrument available to manage each category.

IV. Results and Discussion

4.1 Cross-Border Tax Risk Categories and Their Underlying Drivers

Table 1 classifies the distinct cross-border tax risk categories identified across the reviewed literature by their underlying driver and the typical event that triggers the risk from a latent to an active exposure.

Table 1. Cross-Border Tax Risk Categories, Drivers, and Typical Trigger Events

Risk Category	Underlying Driver	Typical Trigger Event	Supporting Evidence
Comparability uncertainty	Absence of genuinely comparable independent-party transactions for intangibles/unique assets	Tax authority audit challenging a benchmarked price or margin	Eden [9]; Desai, Foley & Hines [4]
Double taxation	Two treaty jurisdictions reach different conclusions on the same transaction	Unilateral adjustment by one jurisdiction without corresponding relief from the other	OECD BEPS Action Plan [6]
Documentation/audit exposure	Inability to substantiate methodology contemporaneously	Audit request for master file/local file documentation	OECD Action 13 [8]
Transparency/reputational risk	Country-by-country data reveals profit-activity mismatches	Public or regulatory scrutiny following CbC data disclosure	Tørsløv, Wier & Zucman [12]

Loss-timing/allocation risk	Strategic timing or location of loss recognition across group entities	Tax authority review of persistently loss-making affiliates	De Simone, Klassen & Seidman [19]
Home-jurisdiction system risk	Parent's territorial vs. worldwide tax system shapes shifting incentives	Change in home-country tax legislation	Markle [18]
Residual structural incentive	Incentive to locate profit in very-low-tax jurisdictions persists despite full documentation	Aggregate profit-shifting exceeding policy-acceptable threshold	Tørsløv, Wier & Zucman [12]

4.2 Risk Categories Mapped to Regulatory and Governance Instruments

Table 2 maps each risk category from Table 1 onto the specific regulatory instrument and internal governance practice the reviewed literature associates with managing it, distinguishing external, OECD-level instruments from internal, group-level governance practices.

Table 2. Cross-Border Tax Risk Categories Mapped to Management Instruments

Risk Category	**External Regulatory Instrument**	**Internal Governance Practice**	**Supporting Evidence**
Comparability uncertainty	Advance pricing agreements (APAs); BEPS Actions 8–10 value-creation alignment	Robust functional and comparability analysis before filing	OECD Guidelines [1]; OECD Actions 8–10 [7]
Double taxation	Mutual agreement procedure (MAP) under BEPS Action 14	Coordinated positions across affected jurisdictions	OECD BEPS Action Plan [6]
Documentation /audit exposure	Master file/local file requirements under BEPS Action 13	Contemporaneous documentation discipline, not post-hoc justification	OECD Action 13 [8]

Transparency/reputational risk	Country-by-country reporting	Proactive alignment of reported profit with substance	Tørsløv, Wier & Zucman [12]
Loss-timing/allocation risk	Standard arm's-length principle applied consistently to loss affiliates	Group-wide, consistent loss-allocation policy	De Simone, Klassen & Seidman [19]
Home-jurisdiction system risk	N/A (external legislative change)	Ongoing monitoring of parent-jurisdiction tax-system developments	Markle [18]
Residual structural incentive	Pillar Two global minimum tax	Top-up tax calculation and compliance infrastructure	OECD Pillar Two [17]

4.3 Empirical Magnitude Evidence Underlying Risk Prioritization

Table 3 summarizes the empirical magnitude evidence reviewed in Section 2, indicating how strongly each study's findings have influenced the prioritization of the risk categories in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 3. Empirical Magnitude Evidence and Its Influence on Risk Prioritization

Study	**Data Source**	**Key Magnitude Finding**	**Risk Category Most Directly Informed**
Hines & Rice [2]	U.S. multinational affiliate data	Low-tax affiliate profitability far exceeds levels predicted by real inputs	Comparability uncertainty
Grubert & Mutti [5]	U.S. multinational tax/tariff data	Profit-allocation tax-sensitivity exceeds real-investment tax-sensitivity	Comparability uncertainty
Clausing [3]	U.S. intrafirm trade price data	Systematic mispricing toward low-tax affiliates	Documentation/audit exposure

Davies, Martin, Parenti & Toubal [13]	French firm-level export data	Product-level underpricing toward low-tax related affiliates	Documentation/audit exposure
Cristea & Nguyen [14]	Danish ownership-change data	Export prices fall following transition to low-tax parent	Comparability uncertainty (causal evidence)
Huizinga & Laeven [11]	European multinational affiliate data	Profitability responds to intra-group tax-rate differentials	Home-jurisdiction system risk
Tørsløv, Wier & Zucman [12]	Global country-by-country data	~40% of multinational profits shifted to tax havens globally	Residual structural incentive
Bilicka [20]	UK matched-firm tax return data	Foreign affiliates report systematically lower UK profitability	Transparency/reputational risk

4.4 Discussion

Read together, Tables 1 through 3 support treating cross-border tax risk management as a differentiated governance discipline rather than a single, undifferentiated compliance burden. Table 1 establishes that the risks a multinational tax function faces arise from structurally distinct sources, evidentiary comparability gaps, jurisdictional coordination failures, information asymmetry, and a residual structural incentive that survives even perfect documentation, and Table 2 indicates that each of these distinct risk sources has, in turn, called forth a structurally distinct regulatory or governance response rather than a single uniform fix [1], [6], [8], [12], [17]. This differentiation matters practically: an APA negotiated to manage comparability uncertainty does nothing to address the double-taxation risk that the mutual agreement procedure specifically targets, and neither instrument addresses the residual structural incentive that only a minimum-tax mechanism like Pillar Two can reach [6], [9], [17]. Table 3's magnitude evidence indicates that regulatory attention to each risk category has tracked the strength and specificity of the underlying empirical evidence reasonably closely, Hines and Rice's and Grubert and Mutti's early affiliate-level evidence motivated the comparability-focused BEPS Actions 8-10 reforms, while Tørsløv, Wier, and Zucman's more recent, considerably larger aggregate estimate motivated the more structurally ambitious Pillar Two response, indicating that the field's regulatory evolution has been evidence-driven rather than arbitrary [2], [5], [7], [12], [17]. For multinational tax functions specifically, this evidence indicates that effective cross-border tax risk management requires maintaining separate, purpose-built processes for each risk category in Table 1 rather than assuming that strong performance on one dimension, robust transfer pricing documentation, for instance, provides adequate protection against a structurally distinct exposure such as Pillar Two's residual minimum-tax risk [8], [17], [19].

V. Conclusion

This paper has reviewed the transfer pricing and international tax literature through an explicit risk-management lens, classifying cross-border tax risk into distinct categories, comparability uncertainty, double taxation, documentation and audit exposure, transparency-driven reputational risk, loss-timing risk, home-jurisdiction system risk, and the residual structural incentive Pillar Two specifically targets, and tracing how each category has been shaped by a specific body of empirical evidence and addressed by a specific regulatory or internal-governance instrument. The evidence indicates that the OECD's regulatory framework, from the original arm's-length principle through BEPS to Pillar One and Pillar Two, has evolved as a series of targeted responses to empirically documented, analytically separable risk categories rather than as a single, monolithic compliance regime, and that effective cross-border tax risk management within a multinational enterprise correspondingly requires differentiated governance processes rather than a single unified compliance function. The persistence of substantial aggregate profit shifting even after extensive BEPS implementation indicates that some risk categories, the residual structural incentive particularly, cannot be managed through documentation and comparability discipline alone and instead require the kind of structural, rate-based intervention Pillar Two represents.

VI. Future Work

Future research should prioritize empirical evaluation of Pillar Two's actual effect on the residual structural risk category identified in this review, extending Tørsløv, Wier, and Zucman's missing-profits methodology to post-implementation data as jurisdictions complete Pillar Two adoption, to establish whether the minimum tax measurably reduces the profit-shifting magnitude their pre-reform estimates documented. Further work is needed to examine how multinational tax functions are reallocating risk-management resources across the categories identified in Table 1 in response to Pillar Two specifically, since a structural, rate-based backstop may reduce the marginal risk-management value of comparability-focused documentation effort relative to its pre-Pillar-Two importance. Continued research should also extend the destination-country matched-firm methodology Bilicka applied to UK data to a broader set of jurisdictions, particularly emerging-market destination countries underrepresented in the predominantly U.S.- and Europe-focused literature reviewed here, to establish whether the same risk-category framework generalizes to multinational operations in these markets. Finally, future work should examine the interaction between Pillar One's market-based profit reallocation and Pillar Two's minimum tax specifically from a risk-management perspective, since these two reforms create potentially overlapping compliance obligations whose combined effect on a multinational's overall cross-border tax risk profile has not yet been systematically mapped.

References:

[1] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2022.

[2] J. R. Hines Jr. and E. M. Rice, "Fiscal paradise: Foreign tax havens and American business," Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 149–182, 1994.

[3] K. A. Clausing, "Tax-motivated transfer pricing and US intrafirm trade prices," Journal of Public Economics, vol. 87, no. 9–10, pp. 2207–2223, 2003.

[4] M. A. Desai, C. F. Foley, and J. R. Hines Jr., "The demand for tax haven operations," Journal of Public Economics, vol. 90, no. 3, pp. 513–531, 2006.

[5] H. Grubert and J. Mutti, "Taxes, tariffs and transfer pricing in multinational corporate decision making," Review of Economics and Statistics, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 285–293, 1991.

[6] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2013.

[7] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Aligning Transfer Pricing Outcomes with Value Creation, Actions 8-10 - 2015 Final Reports. Paris, France: OECD/G20 Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Project, OECD Publishing, 2015.

[8] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Transfer Pricing Documentation and Country-by-Country Reporting, Action 13 - 2015 Final Report. Paris, France: OECD/G20 Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Project, OECD Publishing, 2015.

[9] L. Eden, Taxing Multinationals: Transfer Pricing and Corporate Income Taxation in North America. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

[10] G. Zucman, "Taxing across borders: Tracking personal wealth and corporate profits," Journal of Economic Perspectives, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 121–148, 2014.

[11] H. Huizinga and L. Laeven, "International profit shifting within multinationals: A multi-country perspective," Journal of Public Economics, vol. 92, no. 5–6, pp. 1164–1182, 2008.

[12] T. Tørsløv, L. Wier, and G. Zucman, "The missing profits of nations," Review of Economic Studies, vol. 90, no. 3, pp. 1499–1534, 2023.

[13] R. B. Davies, J. Martin, M. Parenti, and F. Toubal, "Knocking on tax haven's door: Multinational firms and transfer pricing," Review of Economics and Statistics, vol. 100, no. 1, pp. 120–134, 2018.

[14] D. Cristea and D. X. Nguyen, "Transfer pricing by multinational firms: New evidence from foreign firm ownerships," American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 170–202, 2016.

[15] S. Beer, R. de Mooij, and L. Liu, "International corporate tax avoidance: A review of the channels, magnitudes, and blind spots," Journal of Economic Surveys, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 660–688, 2020.

[16] D. Dharmapala, "What do we know about base erosion and profit shifting? A review of the empirical literature," Fiscal Studies, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 421–448, 2014.

[17] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Tax Challenges Arising from Digitalisation of the Economy – Global Anti-Base Erosion Model Rules (Pillar Two). Paris, France: OECD/G20 Inclusive Framework on BEPS, OECD Publishing, 2021.

[18] K. S. Markle, "A comparison of the tax-motivated income shifting of multinationals in territorial and worldwide countries," Contemporary Accounting Research, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 7–43, 2016.

[19] L. De Simone, K. J. Klassen, and J. K. Seidman, "Unprofitable affiliates and income shifting behavior," The Accounting Review, vol. 92, no. 3, pp. 113–136, 2017.

[20] K. Bilicka, "Comparing UK tax returns of foreign multinationals to matched domestic firms," American Economic Review, vol. 109, no. 8, pp. 2921–2953, 2019.