

## Multistate Tax Commission Hears From Economic Firms; Reviews Draft Design for Transfer Pricing Project

October 13, 2014

### Overview

The Multistate Tax Commission's ("MTC") Arm's-length Adjustment Service Advisory Group ("Advisory Group") held a two-day conference in Atlanta, Georgia on October 6 and 7 (the "Conference") to meet with transfer pricing firms and discuss the MTC's project to develop a multistate transfer pricing service. On the first day, seven economic firms specializing in transfer pricing presented to and fielded questions from the Advisory Group. While project facilitator Dan Bucks<sup>1</sup> made clear that these presentations were not part of a procurement process, the state participants' discussions and the project facilitator's preliminary draft design show that some combination of contracted assistance from transfer pricing firms and/or direct employment of economists on the MTC staff is currently being considered. On the second day, the Advisory Group discussed their observations based upon the presentations and a preliminary draft design for an arm's-length adjustment service, which Bucks had prepared in advance of the conference.

The Advisory Group is currently working toward a goal of approving a draft service design by mid-November 2014 for initial review by the MTC Executive Committee in December 2014. The Advisory Group's next scheduled meeting is a teleconference on November 3. In this Alert, we provide background on the MTC transfer pricing project, summarize issues and ideas discussed during the Conference, and suggest additional considerations.

### Background on the MTC Transfer Pricing Project

Many states have the ability to evaluate and potentially challenge intercompany transfer pricing arrangements through arm's-length statutes and regulations similar to IRC § 482, including the treasury regulations thereunder. In addition, states may have statutes providing discretionary authority to adjust income, statutes requiring the add-back of certain intercompany payments, and statutory or judicial economic nexus principles. However, state taxing authorities have had varying levels of success in challenging and litigating transfer pricing arrangements. The MTC transfer pricing project came about in an effort to enable states to pool resources to support arm's-length issues on audit and during litigation. States are considering transfer pricing not only in the context of interstate transactions, but also within international transactions that may already be subject to Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") scrutiny. States have not typically challenged international related party transactions on transfer pricing grounds. However, as international tax structures come under increasing scrutiny from various authorities at the international level (e.g., the Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Project of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, "OECD"), certain states have started to consider taking their own action. For instance, several states have in recent years begun enacting "tax haven" provisions that bring the tax base of a foreign entity doing business in certain overseas jurisdictions into a combined report.<sup>2</sup> Certain states have also increased challenges to US-Foreign intercompany debt structures that otherwise passed IRS muster. Discussions at previous meetings of the Advisory Group indicate that states are now considering using transfer pricing principles to audit international structures.

The Advisory Group held its first in-person meeting on June 2 (see our [June 10 Alert](#)) and a second in-person meeting on July 28 (see our [July 31 Alert](#)). A focus of these meetings and other teleconferences was how the states may obtain cost-effective joint economic expertise. The October Conference was set up, in part, to hear from firms that could provide outside economic expertise.

<sup>1</sup> Dan Bucks was formerly the MTC Executive Director and Montana Director of Revenue.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Alaska Stat. § 43.20.145(a)(5); D.C. Code Ann. § 47-1810.07(a)(2)(F)(i); Mont. Code Ann § 15-31-322(f); Or. Rev. Stat. § 317.715(2); R.I. Stat. 44-11-4.1(d); W. Va. Code § 11-24-13f(a)(7).

Nine jurisdictions have officially committed seed money to the project: Alabama, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, New Jersey and North Carolina. However, attendance at project meetings has not been limited to these states. For example, representatives from other state taxing authorities who have not officially committed, including Connecticut and Pennsylvania, attended the Conference.

### Economics Firm Presentations<sup>3</sup>

On the first day of the conference, the Advisory Group heard presentations from seven economic firms specializing in transfer pricing. These firms were: Chainbridge Software, LLC; Economic Analysis Group; Peters Advisors; NERA Economic Consulting; Economists Incorporated; RoyaltyStat, and WTP Advisors. The firms encompassed a broad spectrum in terms of firm size, background and level of experience with state-specific transfer pricing and related issues, and typical client base (taxpayer or taxing authority). Several of the firms had generally focused on federal transfer pricing issues but indicated that they would be available to support the MTC on state transfer pricing issues.

The firms were asked to frame their discussion around several pre-circulated questions that focused on ways to improve taxpayer compliance, the types of services the firms could provide to the MTC, how the MTC might best integrate economic expertise, and what lessons the states might learn from other taxing authorities.<sup>4</sup>

The firms discussed transfer pricing broadly as well as recommendations as to how the MTC might proceed. All the firms had indicated they could support the MTC or individual states in some way. Rather than summarize each firm's presentation, in this alert we highlight a few themes and ideas that spurred discussion among the participating states.

There was a general theme among the presenters that getting the right information at the right time would be of critical importance for the success of a transfer pricing audit. Several firms suggested requiring detailed disclosure and reporting of intercompany transactions on taxpayers' state tax returns. One suggested putting penalty requirements on such disclosures. Several firms also suggested the possibility of a state-by-state version of the country-by-country reporting being discussed by the OECD. This would include taking those elements, such as the allocation of profits, taxes paid, and indicators of economic activity, at a state-by-state level as opposed to a country-by-country level.<sup>5</sup> Several of the firms also discussed the importance of developing appropriate standard information data requests ("IDRs") or in certain cases tailored IDRs once a transfer pricing audit candidate had been identified. Such requests would include obtaining a taxpayer's complete transfer pricing file and not just a transfer pricing report. Many state taxing authority participants agreed with a need for both tax return disclosures and effective data requests, and that uniformity in those approaches may yield the most effective results.

Several firms discussed how they could use training to equip auditors in gathering information, identifying transfer pricing audit candidates using certain risk indicators, and performing non-economic analysis (e.g., making sure chosen comparables meet the identified criteria). With regard to identifying audit candidates, there was a general view among many of the state taxing authority participants that they may already know which businesses may be the targets of a transfer pricing audit, but they don't currently have the resources or expertise to deal with them. On that point, it was noted that North Carolina has as many as 150 transfer pricing audit candidates within their own queue as of the date of the Conference.

Several firms discussed the tools that states have in addition to IRC § 482-like powers, particularly statutory add-back provisions. One firm went as far as to say that transfer pricing expertise might be most effectively employed in determining the amount of intangible expense indirectly included in the cost of a tangible good (i.e., embedded royalties). The firm used an example of a good sold by a foreign related manufacturer to a U.S. distributor that cost \$7 with an embedded intangible cost of \$2. Auditing the overall price of the good, the firm argued, might yield some change at the margins, for instance reducing the price of \$7 to \$6. However, if the state successfully asserted that the entire \$2 embedded royalty was subject to the addback, the firm argued this would achieve a greater result. While many states may have statutory authority to add-back embedded royalties, the firm indicated

---

<sup>3</sup> Copies of the presentations are available at the project website: <http://www.mtc.gov/The-Commission/Committees/ALAS>.

<sup>4</sup> For a complete list of the questions, see *Draft Issues for October 6 Conference: Item III.B for July 28 Meeting*, Dan Bucks, Project Facilitator (July 25, 2014).

<sup>5</sup> For background on country-by-country reporting see the OECD's *Discussion Draft on Transfer Pricing Reporting and CbC Reporting* (Jan. 30, 2014).

that such amounts may not necessarily be broken out in a transfer pricing study that does not take into account state tax laws.

Several firms suggested that the state taxing authorities should consider adopting regulations that express their legal authority to challenge intercompany transactions (if not explicit in the statute) and what standards the state taxing authorities would use to analyze intercompany transactions. Several state taxing authority participants agreed that this idea warranted further consideration as part of the project.

### **Draft Design for an MTC Arm's-Length Adjustment Service**

On the second day, after debriefing on the presentations from the first day, the Advisory Group discussed a preliminary draft design for an arm's-length adjustment service, which Dan Bucks had prepared in advance of the conference.<sup>6</sup>

The draft provides for a four-year charter period and commitment from the states. It would provide for a mix of hired staff, including hiring one senior economist and several junior economists on the MTC staff, as well as contracts with one or more third-party economic firms. The draft calls for these resources to be used to perform transfer pricing review in the form of either reviewing taxpayer-provided transfer pricing studies or doing its own transfer pricing studies, as well as training "front-line" auditors. This training would include a focus on the basics of transfer pricing, selecting taxpayers for transfer pricing audit, gathering appropriate information, and doing non-economic analysis that can be supplemented by economists. The draft also outlined procedures for information sharing and cooperation among the states and estimates as to the costs of the program.

The preliminary draft is a step towards the Advisory Group's goal of submitting a draft service design to the MTC's Executive Committee in mid-November for its December meetings. The timeline calls for an ultimate goal of submitting a project design for full MTC approval in July 2015, with implementation shortly thereafter if approved.

In discussing the draft design, more than one state taxing authority participant expressed a desire to have flexibility in the operation and staffing of the project. Several also agreed on the need to articulate a business case for the project, including some "rough numbers" on the type of returns any audits might generate (whether that be settlements or increased compliance).

### **Considerations**

While any potential MTC joint effort on transfer pricing is still in the development process, the Conference and earlier meetings have shown that many states have identified a desire to effectively audit and address interstate and international transfer pricing issues. With that in mind, taxpayers may wish to consider:

- Developing state-relevant, exam-ready transfer pricing documentation to the extent such a study has not been previously documented; and
- Conducting a review of any existing transfer pricing studies to determine whether an update is advisable given any changes to the taxpayer's business activities or whether such studies need to be adapted to take into account state laws, such as statutory addbacks, in particular with respect to the pricing of goods that could be perceived as including an embedded royalty, as well as penalty provisions.

### **Contacts**

If you have questions regarding state transfer pricing, the MTC transfer pricing project, or other MTC matters, please contact either of the following multistate tax specialists.

Valerie Dickerson  
Managing Partner, WNT Multistate  
Deloitte Tax LLP, Washington, D.C.  
[vdickerson@deloitte.com](mailto:vdickerson@deloitte.com)  
(202) 220-2693

Michael Paxton  
Manager, WNT Multistate  
Deloitte Tax LLP, Washington, D.C.  
[mpaxton@deloitte.com](mailto:mpaxton@deloitte.com)  
(202) 220-2123

---

<sup>6</sup> See *Draft Design for an MTC Arm's-Length Adjustment Service*, Dan Bucks, Project Facilitator (Oct. 3, 2014).

For questions regarding global transfer pricing matters, please reach out to the following transfer pricing specialist.

Kerwin Chung  
Principal  
Deloitte Tax LLP, Washington, D.C.  
[kechung@deloitte.com](mailto:kechung@deloitte.com)  
(202) 879-3108

**This alert contains general information only and Deloitte is not, by means of this alert, rendering accounting, business, financial, investment, legal, tax, or other professional advice or services. This alert is not a substitute for such professional advice or services, nor should it be used as a basis for any decision or action that may affect your business. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your business, you should consult a qualified professional advisor. Deloitte shall not be responsible for any loss sustained by any person who relies on this alert.**

**About Deloitte**

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, 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.com/about](http://www.deloitte.com/about) for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited and its member firms. Please see [www.deloitte.com/us/about](http://www.deloitte.com/us/about) for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte LLP and its subsidiaries. Certain services may not be available to attest clients under the rules and regulations of public accounting.

Copyright © 2014 Deloitte Development LLC. All rights reserved.  
Member of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited