

## OECD Release on Intangibles: Many Issues Unanswered

On 16 September, the OECD issued revisions to Chapter VI of the transfer pricing guidelines, Special Considerations for Intangibles, as part of the release of base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) deliverables. This release is a work in progress, as several important sections remain in draft form and will only be finalised as part of the 2015 BEPS deliverables. However, the release provides important guidance in the many areas that are final; and for those that are not, it provides insight into the likely direction of future guidance.

### Definition of intangibles

The OECD has adopted a broad definition of intangibles in the revised guidance to preclude arguments that valuable items fall outside the scope of the definition. The expansive approach adopted by the OECD is similar to that of many countries.

The revised guidance defines an intangible as something (i) that is not a physical asset or a financial asset, (ii) that is capable of being owned or controlled for use in commercial activities and (iii) whose use or transfer would be compensated had it occurred in a transaction between independent parties in comparable circumstances.

In identifying intangibles for transfer pricing purposes, the OECD focuses on what would be agreed upon between unrelated parties in a comparable transaction. The broad definition is not dependent on accounting or legal definitions or characterisations and is not dependent on or intended to be used for any other tax purposes. The OECD notes that a transfer pricing analysis should carefully consider whether an intangible exists and whether an intangible has been used or transferred. For example: not all research and development expenditures produce or enhance an intangible, and not all marketing activities result in the creation or enhancement of an intangible.

The availability and extent of legal, contractual or other forms of protection is not a necessary condition for an item to be characterised as an intangible for transfer pricing purposes, although it may affect the value of an item and the returns that should be attributed to it. Likewise, separate transferability is not a necessary condition for an item to be characterised as an intangible for transfer pricing purposes.

The OECD discusses several items that are characterised as intangibles for transfer pricing purposes, and some that are not:

<b>Intangibles for TP purposes</b>	Patents
	Know-how and trade secrets
	Trademarks, trade names and brands
	Rights under contracts and government licences, including contractual commitment to make a workforce available
	Licences and similar limited rights in intangibles
	Goodwill and ongoing concern value
<b>Not Intangibles for TP purposes (not owned or controlled by a single associated enterprise)</b>	Group synergies
	Market specific characteristics (e.g. local consumer purchasing power and location savings)
	Assembled workforce

The guidance provides (i) that in conducting a transfer pricing analysis, it is important to identify the relevant intangibles with specificity and (ii) that vaguely specified or undifferentiated intangibles are insufficient for that purpose. The functional analysis should identify the relevant intangibles at issue, the manner in which they contribute to the creation of value in the transactions under review, and the manner in which they interact with other intangibles, with tangible assets and with business operations to create value.

## Rights to returns for the development and exploitation of intangibles

Section B of the revised guidance addresses the difficult question of how to allocate profits attributable to an intangible when ownership of the intangible is separated, in whole or in part, from activity that relates to the development, enhancement, maintenance, protection or exploitation of that intangible. This may be the most important part of the revised guidance on intangibles; and it remains the most controversial, because it has the potential to require significant changes to practice under the current guidelines. However, the strong point in this section is its directive to apply the arm's-length principle in accordance with Chapters I to III of the transfer pricing guidelines.

Section B is not in final form, because some aspects of the guidance might be revised following consideration of risk, hard-to-value intangibles and special procedures, which will take place in the next round of BEPS work. The revised guidance is scheduled to be delivered in September 2015, although early drafts – at least with respect to risk and capital – are expected before the end of 2014.

The guidance in Section B recognises that payment for use of an intangible should be made to the party with legal ownership of that intangible. However, when another party has participated in activity leading to the development, enhancement, maintenance, protection or exploitation of an intangible, a separate transaction dealing with that activity must also be considered. There is therefore no intention to divert the income stream arising from use of the intangible away from the legal owner, but instead to recognise that the legal owner has a transfer pricing obligation to pay for those activities that it does not perform. Hence, the transfer pricing questions related to payment to the legal owner for use of an intangible are not affected by the subsequent transfer pricing question of how much the legal owner should pay to parties that have participated in the development, enhancement, maintenance or protection of those intangibles.

In discussing the issues concerning (i) the separation of ownership from activity leading to the development, enhancement, maintenance, protection or exploitation of intangibles, (ii) the determination of the party whose profitability is to be tested and (iii) what profit ultimately is allocated to the owner and to those undertaking those activities, the guidance states that the results should be driven by a functional analysis of the functions performed, assets used and risks assumed by all group members, in accordance with Chapters I to III of the transfer pricing guidelines. The guidance is clear that the legal owner of the intellectual property might not earn any functional profit from simply owning the intangible, after compensating other members of the group for those activities.

The guidance states that contracts may be used to describe the roles, responsibilities and rights of associated enterprises and may serve as a reference point for identifying and analysing controlled transactions. Thus, associated enterprises are encouraged to express their intent in contracts. However, the guidance is clear that if the actual assumption or control of risk and the actual functions leading to the development, enhancement, maintenance, protection or exploitation of intangibles differ from those stipulated in the contractual agreement, it is the actual position that must be reviewed.

The guidelines contain a clear statement that the legal owner itself does not need to carry out all the functions related to the development, enhancement, maintenance and protection of those intangibles. The guidance recognises that independent parties sometimes engage others to perform these functions, and under the arm's-length principle; therefore, related parties could act in a similar manner. If such outsourced activity is to be considered a "service" and priced accordingly, the guidance is clear that someone in the group, other than the service provider, should exercise control over the performance of the outsourced activity. In this situation, an entity would be deemed to exercise control if it has the ability to understand the function being performed, to determine whether the function is being performed adequately and to be the final decision-maker regarding important aspects of the function. The guidance is clear that when the legal owner does not adequately control the outsourced activities, the party that in practice controls the outsourced activity (whether the party performing the outsourced activity or another) should also be appropriately compensated.

The guidance states that, in determining the prices to be paid for functions performed, some "important functions" will have, in appropriate circumstances, "special significance" because they usually make a significant contribution to intangible value. The list provided is not all-inclusive but merely illustrative. In some situations, any of the listed items might not have special significance; in others, something not listed might. The list includes:

- Design and control of research and marketing programmes
- Direction of and establishing priorities for creative undertakings, including determining the course of "blue-sky" research
- Control over strategic decisions regarding intangible development programmes
- Management and control of budgets
- Important decisions regarding defence and protection of intangibles
- Ongoing quality control over functions performed by independent or associated enterprises that may have a material effect on the value of the intangible

In practice, as between unrelated parties, any of these activities might be performed by another party whose specialised knowledge makes it sensible, from a business point of view, to rely on the other parties' judgement. Transfer pricing practitioners need to investigate and identify the activities of "significant importance" and show the arm's-length nature of the actual arrangements. The guidance cautions that the reliability of one-sided transfer pricing methods will be substantially reduced if parties performing a significant portion of the important functions are treated as tested parties. Failure to perform or control the significant functions is likely to leave the legal owner with only a small return on the other functions it performs. If these significant functions would not

have been outsourced by unrelated parties, the transfer pricing consequence might be that comparables cannot be found, which leads either to the application of profit split methods or, in appropriate cases, to the recharacterisation of the transaction.

The release adds new guidance on when the transfer pricing analysis should be performed. The release states that compensation must be determined based on anticipated or *ex-ante* information. This could raise practical considerations, because in many cases the individuals responsible for transfer pricing analysis will not be aware of all of the intangible-creating activity and, even if they are aware, the *ex-ante* internal analysis many companies prepare in deciding to create intangibles may not be adequate to perform all of the required analysis.

## Valuation of intangibles

In selecting a transfer pricing method to value intangibles, the guidance makes it increasingly likely that the method to be applied as the most appropriate will be the transactional profit split and the use of discounted cashflow techniques by requiring consideration of both parties' realistic alternatives. In particular, the draft specifies the difficulties, in many circumstances, of finding suitable comparables for the use of the comparable uncontrolled price (CUP) method.

## Realistically available options

The guidance strongly emphasises that the comparability analysis with respect to intangibles transactions must consider the options realistically available to *each* of the parties to the transaction, and that a *one-sided* comparability analysis is insufficient. The guidance further provides that the specific business circumstances of one of the parties should not be used to support an outcome contrary to the realistically available options of the other party. The guidance includes an example that states that a transferor of intangibles would not accept a price that is less advantageous than its other realistically available options merely because it lacks the resources to effectively exploit the transferred rights. A second example states that a transferee should not be expected to accept a price that would make it impossible to anticipate earning a profit using the acquired rights in the intangible in its business.

The guidance takes the position that an intercompany price for a transaction in intangibles can be identified that is consistent with the realistically available options of each of the parties and is consistent with the assumption that taxpayers seek to optimise their allocation of resources. The guidance cautions that in situations where there is no overlap in the prices acceptable to both parties, given their realistically available options, it may be necessary to consider whether the actual transaction should be disregarded, the parties' allocation of risk should not be recognised, or whether the conditions of the transaction should otherwise be adjusted. Similarly, if it is asserted that either the current use of an intangible or a proposed realistically available option does not optimise resource allocations, it may be necessary to consider whether such assertions are consistent with the facts and circumstances of the case.

## Comparability analysis

The supplemental guidance states that it is essential to evaluate the unique features of the intangibles in conducting a comparability analysis. This is particularly important when the CUP method is applied, but it is also relevant in applying other methods that rely on comparables. Important factors in determining comparability include the actual and potential profitability of potential comparables in comparison to the transferred comparable, and whether the transferred comparable can be used as a platform to shorten the development time of future generations of the product. The guidance questions whether comparable information drawn from public or private databases is sufficiently detailed to satisfy the guidance's comparability standards.

The guidance provides that if amounts attributable to comparability adjustments represent a large percentage of the compensation for the intangible, the computation of the adjustment may not be reliable, and the intangibles being compared may in fact not be sufficiently comparable to support a valid transfer pricing analysis. The guidance effectively sets a high comparability bar in applying the CUP method to value intangibles transfers, and the OECD explicitly notes that the identification of reliable comparables involving intangibles may be difficult or impossible in many cases.

## Transfer pricing methods

The selection of the most appropriate transfer pricing method should be based on a functional analysis that provides a clear understanding of the MNE's global business processes and how the transferred intangibles interact with other functions, assets and risks that comprise the global business. The functional analysis should identify all factors that contribute to value creation, which may include risks borne, specific market characteristics, location, business strategies and MNE group synergies, among others. The transfer pricing method selected, and any adjustments incorporated in that method based on the comparability analysis, should take into account all of the relevant factors materially contributing to the creation of value, not only intangibles and routine functions.

The OECD states that, depending on the specific facts, any of the five OECD transfer pricing methods may constitute the most appropriate transfer pricing method for the transfer of intangibles. Nevertheless, the OECD goes on to caution that one-sided methods (including the resale price method and the transactional net margin method [TNMM]) are generally not reliable methods for intangibles transactions, in part because they can assume that all of the residual profit is allocated to the owner of the intangible. The OECD further notes that transfer pricing methods that seek to estimate the value of intangibles based on the cost of intangible development are generally discouraged, because there rarely is any correlation between the cost of developing intangibles and their value or transfer price once developed. Consequently, the guidance concludes that the transfer pricing methods most likely to prove useful in matters involving transfers of one or more intangibles are the CUP method and the transactional profit split method, and that valuation techniques can be useful tools.

As described above, the OECD guidance sets a high bar on comparability, which in practice likely will make the CUP method difficult to apply (except in cases where there is a recent acquisition from an unrelated party or a suitable internal CUP).

The guidance suggests that profit splits may be a reliable method for valuing developed intangibles in the absence of CUPs. The discussion of the profit split method is not in final form, presumably because additional guidance on the transactional profit split method will be provided as part of Action 10 on high-risk transactions due September 2015. Hopefully, the additional guidance will provide guidance on how the legal owner should share losses with entities that perform the important functions that would have permitted those entities to earn additional returns, had the intangible been profitable.

The OECD further provides that it may be possible to use valuation techniques, including income-based methods such as discounted cashflow, to estimate the arm's-length price of intangibles. New guidance on the application of the discounted cashflow method is provided. In applying a valuation technique, it is essential to consider the assumptions that underlie the analysis. In particular, the OECD notes that the following issues should be considered:

- Accuracy of financial projections
- Assumptions regarding growth rates
- Discount rates
- Useful life of intangibles and terminal values
- Assumptions regarding taxes
- Form of payment

## Potential considerations with respect to risk and capital

Current OECD guidance on the allocation of risk focuses on whether the party assuming the risk has control over the risk and financial capacity to assume the risk. Current rules focus on economic substance of any purported allocation of risk (see Paragraphs 9.22-9.32 of the OECD transfer pricing guidelines).

Proposed guidance contained in Section B recognises that funding of the development, enhancement, protection or exploitation of intangibles and the associated business risk are often integrally related, but it requires them to be analysed separately because the allocation of risk can be affected by contract. The release recognises that returns attributable to funding risk depend on the stage of development of the intangible, the control over intangible-related risks and the ability to absorb losses. The proposed guidance specifically recognises the need to reward the party that funds the intangible; but, if the functional analysis shows no functions, risks or assets other than funding and the funding risk, that party is entitled only to a risk-adjusted return on capital.

BEPS Action 9 requires the OECD to develop rules to prevent base erosion and profit-shifting by transferring risks among, or allocating excessive capital to, group members. As part of Action 9, the OECD is discussing new guidance for the allocation of risk and the associated returns to capital. The OECD is discussing whether related taxpayers can contractually allocate risk within a multinational group. Some commentators have argued that the true bearers of risk within a multinational group are the shareholders, not any individual entity.

As part of Action 9, the OECD is addressing whether an allocation of risk between members reflects economic substance, since most entities in the same business line arguably share the risks associated with that business line. In other words, a proper functional analysis will show that the risks of developing, manufacturing and marketing successful products are borne by the R&D centre, the manufacturer and the distributor. The OECD has also discussed whether there is a "natural" location for certain types of risk-taking, at the location of the people involved in the risk-taking behaviour. For example, the R&D group performing the R&D activity might be the natural place to allocate the R&D risk. The distributor performing marketing functions might be the natural place to allocate marketing risk. This line of reasoning, which heavily focuses on people functions, is consistent with the OECD's direction that transfer pricing outcomes should reflect where value is created.

If the OECD were to follow this approach in relation to structured business models (perhaps with central entrepreneurs), it could significantly reduce the situations in which ex-post benchmarked returns may be used to test transfer prices, because the risk position of potential comparables is unlikely to match that of a group member. In addition, it could significantly change the profitability of entities as they move away from

benchmarked returns (for example, manufacturing, sales or services) and lead to more frequent use of the transactional profit split method.

## Potential considerations with respect to hard-to-value intangibles

Chapter VI guidance may be further affected by the output from BEPS Action 10, which considers the transfer pricing of high-risk transactions, and by further consideration of “special measures”, such as recharacterisation, both of which are due to be completed in September 2015.

Tax authorities have expressed concern that some intangibles are hard to value using traditional methods and techniques, either because the intangible is unique in nature, the transaction would not happen between unrelated parties, or because the income stream that the intangible might generate is highly speculative at the time of the transaction. The OECD’s Working Party 6 (which deals with multinational enterprises and transfer pricing) is expected to consider options to enhance transfer pricing guidance to address all of these situations, and because their review will be far-reaching, the discussion likely will consider areas where it is necessary to look at alternatives to the arm’s-length principle in specific circumstances.

The release has added new sections on the impact of unanticipated *ex-post* returns, stating that it must be determined whether the unanticipated returns were actually unanticipated. If the returns are unanticipated, those returns should generally be earned by the entity or entities that have the control and management of the relevant risks and actually bear the risk. Additional guidance in this area is expected as part of Action 10 on high-risk transactions – in particular, additional guidance on when results reasonably should have been anticipated, which may permit tax authorities to make adjustments to transactions and when they will be considered unanticipated.

It is possible that Working Party 6 could conclude that the arm’s-length principle cannot provide tax authorities with a solution in all circumstances and that a non-arm’s-length approach may be the only option in some cases. Changing OECD guidance to “deem” certain outcomes as non-arm’s length may cause significant problems for tax legislation in a number of countries that specifically require arm’s-length outcomes. In addition, such a solution would be inconsistent with the business profits article of most current multinational tax treaties, which incorporates the arm’s-length principle, although presumably this could be changed as part of a multilateral instrument contemplated by BEPS Action 15.

Similar problems may arise with a broadening of the circumstances in which an actual transaction may be recharacterised and an entity taxed based on a fictional transaction. Current OECD rules permit tax authorities to disregard a transaction only in two circumstances, namely (i) when the economic substance of the transaction is different from its form and (ii) when the terms of the transaction in their totality differ from those adopted by independent parties behaving in a commercially rational manner and the actual structure practically impedes the determination of an appropriate transfer price. The current guidance therefore provides very specific and limited circumstances in which recharacterisation can be applied, and the OECD has announced that it is considering whether to clarify how/when it would be appropriate to use recharacterisation to prevent base erosion and profit-shifting.

A significant drawback of recharacterisation is that (save in the most straightforward cases) there is no single obvious transaction to recharacterise the transaction to, and no standard against which to, create a recharacterised transaction so that both parties (and their respective tax authorities) would agree. As it is highly unlikely that the two parties to the transaction, or their tax authorities, would recharacterise a transaction to precisely the same fictional transaction, such a broadened rule is very likely to lead to significant uncertainty, potential double taxation, and increases in the number of requests for mutual assistance.

## Effective date

The OECD has not recommended a specific effective date for the changes to Chapter I. The effective date of the changes will depend on the domestic law of the adopting states. Some states have not enacted specific transfer pricing rules, and they generally follow the OECD's transfer pricing guidelines. For those countries, the changes to Chapter I will be automatically incorporated into domestic law when final. Conversely, those countries that do have specific transfer pricing legislation, rules or guidance will have to either enact new legislation adopting the rules or formally amend their existing rules or guidance.

Whether the changes to Chapter I will apply prospectively or retroactively will also be determined under local law. It is possible that final agreements at the conclusion of the BEPS project in 2015 could include effective dates for the new OECD guidelines to apply.

## Conclusion

The OECD has undertaken the difficult task of providing additional guidance on the valuation of intangibles for transfer pricing purposes. Although some of the important guidance is not final, the direction of the final guidance is clear – the mere legal ownership of intangibles is unlikely to result in the legal owner receiving significant intangible returns. Companies that have entered into contracts for the development, enhancement, maintenance, protection and exploitation of intangibles should consider reviewing those contracts in light of the new and proposed guidance.

The forthcoming guidance could have a significant impact on companies' transfer pricing practices. Companies should closely monitor the forthcoming guidance and actively participate in future consultations with, and present evidence of any concerns to, both the OECD and their tax authorities.

## Authors:

**John Henshall** (London)

Partner

Deloitte United Kingdom

**Arindam Mitra** (Tokyo)

Executive Officer

Deloitte Japan

**Keith Reams** (Sacramento)

Principal

Deloitte Tax LLP

**Richard Schmidtke** (Munich)

Partner

Deloitte Germany

**Alan Shapiro** (Tokyo)

Senior Advisor

Deloitte Japan

**John Wells** (Dallas)

Principal

Deloitte Tax LLP

Local contacts:

Director Head Transfer Pricing (JHB)



**Billy Joubert**  
Tel/Direct: +27 (0)11 806 5352  
Fax: +27 (0) 86 522 2908  
Email: [bjoubert@deloitte.co.za](mailto:bjoubert@deloitte.co.za)

Associate Director(JHB)



**Carla van der Merwe**  
Tel/Direct: +27 (0)11 806 5230  
Fax: +27 (0)11 388 3051  
Email: [cavandermerwe@deloitte.co.za](mailto:cavandermerwe@deloitte.co.za)

Associate Director(JHB)



**Steven Breslin**  
Direct: +27 (0)11 806 5772 Fax:  
+27 (0)11 806 5333  
Email: [stbreslin@deloitte.co.za](mailto:stbreslin@deloitte.co.za)

Associate Director (WC)



**Philip Fouche**  
Tel/Direct: +27 (0) 21 427 5488 Fax:  
+27 (0) 21 413 2826  
Email: [pfouche@deloitte.co.za](mailto:pfouche@deloitte.co.za)

Senior Manager(JHB)



**Chantel Venter**  
Tel/Direct: +27 (0)11 806 5000  
Fax: +27 (0) 11 806 5304  
Email: [cventer@deloitte.co.za](mailto:cventer@deloitte.co.za)

Lead Director – Cross Boarder Taxes (JHB)



**Amo Bosman**  
Tel/Direct: +27 (0)11 209 8404 mobile +27  
(0) 11 806 5304  
Email: [ambosman@deloitte.co.za](mailto:ambosman@deloitte.co.za)

Transfer Pricing Leader (WC)



**Karen Miller**  
Direct: +27 (21)427 5484  
Main: +27 (21)427 5300  
Fax: +27 (21)441 1057  
Email: [karmiller@deloitte.co.za](mailto:karmiller@deloitte.co.za)

Senior Manager (JHB)



**Dan Zaidman**  
Tel/Direct: +27 (0)11 209 8744  
Fax: +27 (0)11 388 3180  
Email: [dzaidman@deloitte.co.za](mailto:dzaidman@deloitte.co.za)