

United Kingdom

BEPS Action 8: Hard-to-Value Intangibles

On 4 June 2015 the OECD, as part of its work on the Action Plan to address Base Erosion and Profit Shifting ('BEPS'), released a Discussion Draft in relation to developing an approach to price the transfer of 'hard-to-value intangibles'. The draft contains an updated section of Chapter VI of the *Transfer Pricing Guidelines*.

As with other Discussion Drafts on BEPS Actions, the proposals do not represent a consensus view from the G20/OECD governments involved but are designed to provide preliminary but substantive proposals for public analysis and comment.

Deloitte Comments and Business Next Steps

The draft proposes a number of changes to address issues in relation to hard-to-value intangibles. It falls short of taking the pragmatic approach of requiring a price adjustment clause for all transfers within a multinational group, similar to the existing US 'commensurate with income' concept. Where there is a price adjustment clause in an intercompany contract, it is essential that businesses are provided with symmetry of treatment i.e. that both the upward and downward price adjustments are respected for tax purposes. In particular, such symmetry of treatment should be available without requiring a mutual agreement procedure (MAP) claim in all cases. The Discussion Draft does not make reference to symmetry of treatment, and businesses will be rightly concerned at the potential for a one-sided approach resulting in dispute or double taxation.

The Discussion Draft builds on existing guidance in the OECD's *Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations*. It suggests that the starting point will be the arm's length principle, but that in some cases there will be a need for 'special considerations' (a new term for the first 'special measure' set out in the December 2014 Discussion Draft on risk, recharacterisation and special measures). The 'special considerations' will include adjustments for actual results, using hindsight, where changes from forecasts are not linked to identifiable external factors. There will be challenges in determining when the arm's length principle will continue to apply and when the 'special considerations' should be taken into account. This raises the potential for tax authorities to disagree over the use of special considerations and hindsight. This could be difficult, for example, if evidence of third party behaviour in a specific industry suggests that a price adjustment clause would be unlikely to be concluded between third parties. In addition, the Discussion Draft proposes that special considerations will not apply where tax authorities are able to 'reliably assess' the information available at the time of the transfer. It remains to be seen whether both (or all) tax authorities reviewing the same transaction will share views of whether information can be 'reliably assessed'.

The Discussion Draft sets out some helpful features (see below) of hard-to-value intangibles where 'special considerations' may be required, but these fall short of a definition. In order to allow businesses to comply with the guidance, and to prevent disputes and potential double taxation arising from different tax authority interpretations, it is important that these features are strengthened so that they take the form of a definition.

The Discussion Draft asks some specific questions of business as part of the consultation process, and the first of these acknowledges the uncertainty that these proposals will create. It is essential that businesses and stakeholders comment on this Discussion Draft, despite the extremely tight timetable, to ensure that the G20/OECD

have appropriate feedback. There is a pragmatic solution available for tax authorities and businesses in this area (requirement of a price adjustment clause) but it needs to be clearly defined and consistently applied, with parameters for timetables and guidance on how adjustments should be calculated.

The special considerations proposed do not reflect the arm's length principle, so if they are to be effective amendments to double tax treaties will be required (both to Article 9 of the OECD Model Tax Treaty and bilateral tax treaties, which could be achieved through the proposed Multilateral Instrument under the BEPS project).

Guidance on Transfer Pricing of Highly Uncertain or Hard-to-Value Intangibles

The Discussion Draft proposes an updated section of Chapter VI of the *Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations*. The proposals include revising the section on arm's length pricing when valuation is highly uncertain at the time of the transaction and adding a new section in relation to special considerations for hard-to-value intangibles.

Arm's length pricing when valuation is highly uncertain at the time of the transaction

When valuation of an intangible or rights in an intangible at the time of the transaction is highly uncertain, the Discussion Draft sets out that the arm's length pricing question is to determine what independent enterprises would have done in comparable circumstances 'to take account of the valuation uncertainty'.

The Discussion Draft acknowledges that, depending on the facts and circumstances, there are a number of pricing arrangements that independent parties may agree. In cases where subsequent developments are sufficiently predictable so as to make forecasts reliable, independent parties may use projections of **anticipated benefits** to fix a price ('ex ante' pricing) at the outset of the transaction regardless of the eventual outcome of the benefits. In other cases, independent parties might conclude that pricing based on anticipated benefits alone does not provide adequate protection against the risks posed by the high uncertainty in valuing the intangible. In these cases, independent parties might:

- adopt **shorter term agreements**;
- include **price adjustment clauses** in the agreement;
- adopt payment structures involving **periodic milestone payments** – for example, a royalty rate could be set to increase as the sales of the licensee increase or additional payments could be required at such time as certain development targets are successfully achieved; and/or
- agree a **re-negotiation** of the pricing arrangements if major unforeseen developments occur, changing the fundamental assumptions on which the pricing was determined.

The Discussion Draft identifies difficulties faced by tax authorities in verifying the arm's length basis on which pricing is determined. It suggests that **information asymmetry** between tax authorities and businesses regarding the business and its environment may give rise to a **risk of systematic mispricing**.

Special considerations for hard-to-value intangibles

The Discussion Draft suggests that there may be a need for '**special considerations**' to be adopted when dealing with the transfer of 'hard-to-value' intangibles. Such hard-to-value intangibles would include those where, at the time of their transfer between group companies, (i) **no sufficiently reliable comparables exist**, and (ii) there is **a lack of reliable projections** of future cash flows or income expected to be derived from the transferred intangible, or the **assumptions used in valuing the intangible are highly uncertain**.

The Discussion Draft also sets out features that may indicate that an intangible should be considered hard to value. These include intangibles that:

- are only **partially developed** at the time of their transfer;

- are **not anticipated to be exploited commercially for several years** after the transaction;
- separately are not hard-to-value but which are connected with the development or enhancement of other intangibles which are hard-to-value; and/or
- are anticipated to be exploited in a manner that is **'novel'** at the time of the transfer.

Where there is a transfer of hard-to-value intangibles the Discussion Draft proposes that tax authorities may use **actual results** ('ex post' outcomes) in years subsequent to the transfer to determine whether a **price adjustment** is necessary. This would include assessing whether third parties would have used contingent pricing arrangements.

Where the tax authority is able to confirm **the reliability of the forecast information** on which the pricing has been based, then price adjustments based on actual outcomes should not be made. The Discussion Draft includes a specific exception to the approach suggested, whereby a review of actual outcomes should not affect pricing used by the business if the business provides (i) full details about the forecasts used in the pricing calculation and (ii) satisfactory evidence that any significant difference between the financial forecasts and actual outcomes was due to unforeseeable developments. Examples of unforeseeable developments include the unexpected bankruptcy of a competitor or a natural disaster occurring after the transaction.

The Discussion Draft suggests that these safeguards should ensure that price adjustments will only apply where the difference between expected and actual outcomes cannot be explained by considerations other than inappropriate transfer pricing.

Timetable

Comments are invited by **18 June 2015**. A public consultation meeting will be held on this Discussion Draft together with other transfer pricing topics at the OECD in Paris on 6-7 July 2015. Registration details will be published on the OECD website in due course.

Deloitte EMEA Dbriefs Webcast

Deloitte's Dbriefs webcast programme for Europe, the Middle East and Africa will include a discussion on this Action together with other transfer pricing topics on 17 June 2015 at 12pm (BST). For further details and to register for the webcast please go to <http://deloi.tt/1Q7cm2w> or visit www.emeadbriefs.com.

Contacts

Bill Dodwell

Tel: 020 7007 0848

Email: bdodwell@deloitte.co.uk

Joanne Bentley

Tel: 020 7007 3646

Email: jbentley@deloitte.co.uk

Shaun Austin

Tel: 0121 695 5011

Email: saustin@deloitte.co.uk

Alison Lobb

Tel: 020 7007 0497

Email: alobb@deloitte.co.uk

John Henshall

Tel: 020 7303 2218

Email: jhenshall@deloitte.co.uk

Giles Hillman

Tel: 020 7007 3750

Email: ghillman@deloitte.co.uk

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited ("DTTL"), a UK private company limited by guarantee, and its network of member firms, each of which is a legally separate and independent entity. Please see www.deloitte.co.uk/about for a detailed description of the legal structure of DTTL and its member firms. Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom member firm of DTTL. Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 2 New Street Square, London EC4A 3BZ, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 (0) 20 7936 3000 Fax: +44 (0) 20 7583 1198.

This publication has been written in general terms and therefore cannot be relied on to cover specific situations; application of the principles set out will depend upon the particular circumstances involved and we recommend that you obtain professional advice before acting or refraining from acting on any of the contents of this publication. Deloitte LLP would be pleased to advise readers on how to apply the principles set out in this publication to their specific circumstances. Deloitte LLP accepts no duty of care or liability for any loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any material in this publication.

© 2015 Deloitte LLP. All rights reserved. **Member of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited**