The Returns to High-Powered Entrepreneurship

Eduardo Azevedo Florian Scheuer Kent Smetters

UPenn UZH UPenn

August 23, 2022

The role of capital gains at the top

Net capital gains (% of AGI) in the US in 2016 in U.S. \$



Entrepreneurship and taxes

- Entrepreneurs face lots of risk
 - \rightarrow Under-entry?
- Additional dilution due to tax liability and lack of liquidity \rightarrow Loss of control
- But: tax only applies in case of success
 → Low marginal utility

This paper:

What are the returns to high-powered entrepreneurship?
 How are they affected by tax policy?

Plan

1 Data and evidence

- Success rates
- Exit values
- Lifetimes
- Dilution

2 Effects of tax regimes in calibrated model

Universe of US-based, VC-backed companies

Combining sources from Pitchbook, PrivCo, Capital IQ, SEC filings

- founded between 1970 and 2020
- exit values
- all funding rounds
- founders
- cap tables from S-1 filings (IPOs)

| Exit type | # |
|----------------------|--------|
| IPO | 2630 |
| Merger/acquisition | 19,553 |
| Shutdown (confirmed) | 21,106 |
| Shutdown (inferred) | 11,337 |
| Ongoing | 52,344 |

Company exit values



Dilution

| Deal | Premoney | Invested | Postmoney | Founder Share |
|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| | Valuation | Capital | Valuation | |
| | | | | 100% |
| Angel | \$1m | \$1m | \$2m | 50% |
| Series A | \$4m | \$2m | \$6m | 33% |
| Series B | \$9m | \$3m | \$12m | 25% |
| Acquisition | | | \$20m | |

 \rightarrow Exit value going to founders: \$5m

Complications

- (convertible) debt deals
- down rounds
- preferences
- employee stock

Example — Whatsapp

| Date | Deal | Invested | Postmoney | Founder Share |
|------|-------------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| | | Capital | Valuation | |
| 2010 | Seed | \$0.26m | | 80% |
| 2011 | Early VC | \$8m | \$40m | 60% |
| 2013 | Later VC | \$53m | \$1630m | 58% |
| 2014 | Acquisition | | \$17bn | |

Example — Dropbox

| Date | Deal | Invested | Postmoney | Founder Share |
|------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| | | Capital | Valuation | |
| 2007 | Incubator | \$15k | | 80% |
| 2007 | Seed | \$1.25m | \$4.75m | 59% |
| 2008 | Early VC | \$6m | \$25m | 45% |
| 2011 | Early VC | \$250m | \$4bn | 42% |
| 2014 | Later VC | \$350m | \$10bn | 41% |
| 2017 | Later VC | N/A | N/A | 41% |
| 2018 | IPO | | \$7.5bn | |

Example — Theranos

| Date | Deal | Invested Postmoney | | Founder Share |
|------|-------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | Capital | Valuation | |
| 2005 | Early VC | \$7m | \$27m | 59% |
| 2006 | Early VC | \$9m | \$46m | 46% |
| 2006 | Later VC | \$32m | \$159m | 37% |
| 2010 | Later VC | \$45m | \$1.1bn | 35% |
| 2013 | Later VC | \$84m | \$1.3bn | 33% |
| 2014 | Later VC | \$633m | \$9.1bn | 31% |
| 2017 | Debt | \$100m | | 31% |
| 2018 | Liquidation | | | |

Dilution



Ownership across founders (IPOs)

09

Founder1 Founder2 Founder3 Founder4 Founder5 Founder6

Founder5



Average fraction of total founders' shares held by each founder at exit

Founder2 Founder3 Founder4

0%

Founder1

0%

Founder1

Founder2

Founder3

Founder4

Payoffs to founders



Pareto tail



Payoff distribution over time



Model

Preferences

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}R^{-t}u(c_t)$$

with $R \equiv 1 + r$

Entrepreneur in startup initially:

- startup wage $w_s < w_m$ market wage
- probability of exit π
- random payoff x (after tax) in case of exit
- save (not borrow) at rate R

$$a_{t+1} = Ra_t + w - c_t$$

Bellman equation

$$V_s(a) = \max_{c,a'} u(c) + \frac{\pi \mathbb{E}[V_m(a'+x)] + (1-\pi)V_s(a')}{R}$$
s.t.
$$a' = Ra + w_s - c$$
$$a' \ge 0$$

where

$$V_m(a)=rac{R}{r}u(ra+w_m)$$

Calibration

| Parameter | | Value |
|---|----------|--------|
| Interest rate | r | 5% |
| Startup wage (pre-ta×) | Ws | \$150k |
| Exit probability per year | π | 5% |
| Success probability | р | 28% |
| Mean exit value per founder cond'l on success | т | \$26m |
| Pareto coefficient | α | 1.2 |
| Top long-term capital gains tax | t | 20% |

- CRRA preferences
- no borrowing

Critical wage gap $\Delta^* \equiv w_m - w_s$

| | | Initial assets | | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--|--|
| | | \$100k | 100k \$1m \$5m | | | | |
| | 0 | \$325k | \$325k | \$325k | \$325k | | |
| σ | 1 | \$51k | \$61k | \$83k | \$119k | | |
| | 2 | \$20k | \$26k | \$39k | \$65k | | |

Accrual-based capital gains tax

| Deal | Premoney | Invested | Postmoney | Founder Share |
|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| | Valuation | Capital | Valuation | |
| | | | | 100% |
| Series A | \$1m | \$1m | \$2m | 50% |
| IPO | \$10m | | | |

 \rightarrow After-tax payoff to founders (1 - $t)\times$ \$5m=\$4m

| Deal | Capital Gains | Taxes Due | Founder Share |
|----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | | 100% |
| Series A | \$1m | \$0.2m | 40% |
| IPO | \$3.2m | \$0.64m | |

 \rightarrow After-tax payoff to founders \$4m-\$0.64m=\$3.36m

Dilution with accrual-based CGT



Δ^* with accrual-based CGT

| | | Initial assets | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| | | \$100k | \$1m | \$5m | \$20m | | |
| | 0 | \$325k <mark>\$197</mark> k | \$325k <mark>\$197</mark> k | \$325k <mark>\$197</mark> k | \$325k \$197k | | |
| σ | 1 | \$51k <mark>\$41</mark> k | \$61k <mark>\$49</mark> k | \$83k <mark>\$65</mark> k | \$119k <mark>\$89k</mark> | | |
| | 2 | \$20k <mark>\$18k</mark> | \$26k <mark>\$23k</mark> | \$39k <mark>\$33k</mark> | \$65k <mark>\$51</mark> k | | |

Equivalent realization-based CGT rate

| | | Initial assets | | | | | |
|----------|---|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| | | \$100k \$1m \$5m \$20m | | | | | |
| | 0 | 52% | 52% | 52% | 52% | | |
| σ | 1 | 46% | 46% | 46% | 47% | | |
| | 2 | 44% | 44% | 45% | 45% | | |

Dilution with Warren/Sanders wealth tax



Dilution with Warren/Sanders wealth tax



Δ^* with Warren/Sanders wealth tax

| | | Initial assets | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | \$100k | \$1m | \$5m | \$20m | |
| | 0 | \$325k <mark>\$310</mark> k | \$325k <mark>\$310</mark> k | \$325k <mark>\$310</mark> k | \$325k <mark>\$310k</mark> | |
| σ | 1 | \$51k <mark>\$51</mark> k | \$61k <mark>\$61</mark> k | \$83k <mark>\$82</mark> k | \$119k <mark>\$118k</mark> | |
| | 2 | \$20k <mark>\$20k</mark> | \$26k <mark>\$26k</mark> | \$39k <mark>\$39k</mark> | \$65k <mark>\$65k</mark> | |

Equivalent realization-based CGT rate

| | | Initial assets | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------|------|------|-------|--|
| | | \$100k | \$1m | \$5m | \$20m | |
| | 0 | 24% | 24% | 24% | 24% | |
| σ | 1 | 21% | 21% | 21% | 21% | |
| | 2 | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | |

Risk aversion and progressivity

| | | | Alternative tax regimes | | | | | |
|---|----------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| _ | | | accrual-based CGT no threshold | accrual-based CGT threshold | wealth tax no threshold | wealth tax threshold | | |
| σ | | 0 | 52% | 35% | 60% | 24% | | |
| | σ | 1 | 46% | 23% | 63% | 21% | | |
| | | 2 | 44% | 21% | 65% | 20% | | |

Laffer curve

- $w_m \sim$ Pareto with coefficient lpha = 1.5
- $\sigma = 2$
- *a*₀ =\$1m



Conclusion

● Evidence on returns to high-powered entrepreneurship → Power Law

- 2 Response to taxes in calibrated model
- \rightarrow Tax regime matters more than rate!
- Left out so far:
 - decision to raise capital
 - decision to seek an exit

Externalities

- Y(t) private value created by entrepreneurs
- *e* externality (percentage)
- Optimal tax

$$egin{array}{l} \max_t & (t+e)Y(t) \ \Rightarrow t^* = rac{1-earepsilon_{Y,1-t}}{1+arepsilon_{Y,1-t}} \end{array}$$

Richer heterogeneity

Gabaix-Landier (2008)

$$p(n) = \bar{p}(1 - n^{2/3})$$
 and $w(n) = w n^{-2/3}$

where $n \sim U(0,1)$ is the "rank" in the ability distribution

