



Transfer pricing issues in recession years

Robert Ackerman
Americas Leader – Transfer Pricing
Ernst & Young USA

Disclaimer

- ▶ Ernst & Young refers to the global organization of member firms of Ernst & Young Global Limited, each of which is a separate legal entity. Ernst & Young LLP is a client-serving member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited located in the US.
- ▶ This presentation is © 2009 Ernst & Young LLP. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, transmitted or otherwise distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including by photocopying, facsimile transmission, recording, rekeying, or using any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from Ernst & Young LLP. Any reproduction, transmission or distribution of this form or any of the material herein is prohibited and is in violation of US and international law. Ernst & Young LLP expressly disclaims any liability in connection with use of this presentation or its contents by any third party.
- ▶ The views expressed by panelists in this webcast are not necessarily those of Ernst & Young LLP.

Circular 230 disclaimer

Any US tax advice contained herein was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding penalties that may be imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or applicable state or local tax law provisions.

These slides are for educational purposes only and are not intended, and should not be relied upon, as accounting advice.

Today's agenda

- ▶ **In general**
 - ▶ **Business issues caused by economic downturn**
 - ▶ **Transfer pricing: impact of downturn**
- ▶ **Documentation in a down economy**
- ▶ **Reviewing transfer pricing policies**
 - ▶ **Timing**
 - ▶ **Reactive TP tactics**
 - ▶ **Proactive TP tactics**

In general

Business issues caused by economic downturn

- ▶ Profits turn to losses
- ▶ Longer startups
- ▶ Excess inventory
- ▶ Cash flow and debt service constraints
- ▶ Decline in capacity utilization
- ▶ Extraordinary costs
 - ▶ Reductions in force
 - ▶ Plant closures
 - ▶ Bad debts

In general Transfer pricing: impact of downturn

- ▶ **Lowered values for tangible and intangible assets**
- ▶ **Effect of economic crisis on goals of tax and treasury groups and how those goals relate to transfer pricing strategy**
- ▶ **Most transfer pricing systems assume steady conditions such as overall profitability, costs and revenues.**
 - ▶ **In times of recession these stability conditions are not met.**

In general

Transfer pricing: impact of downturn

- ▶ **Missed profitability targets due to:**
 - ▶ **Reduced price to third parties**
 - ▶ **Reduced sales volume**
 - ▶ **Inability to reduce SG&A costs**
 - ▶ **Royalty obligations as a fixed percentage of sales**
 - ▶ **Intercompany services cost allocation**

In general

Transfer pricing: impact of downturn

- ▶ **Transfer pricing (TP) disequilibrium**
 - ▶ Profits for routine activities, while all other affiliates suffer losses
 - ▶ Supply chain structures — paying a manufacturer a fixed markup or return on assets, but principal company has losses
 - ▶ US parent selling to foreign distributors — pricing to retain margin at distributors, but US now has significant losses and needs cash
 - ▶ Royalty structure where payor now experiencing losses
 - ▶ Cost plus service company charging entity that needs cash
 - ▶ Significant group losses but paying cash tax
 - ▶ TP system conflicts with where cash is needed

Documentation in a down economy

- ▶ **Key is to understand effect of economic downturn on both comparables and tested parties — good functional and industry analyses**
- ▶ **Some tested parties not as affected by downturn as others**
- ▶ **Timing of the effect of the downturn differs by industry**

Documentation in a down economy

Comparables selection

- ▶ **Industry comparability**
 - ▶ Comparables from different industries are most likely to differ in terms of susceptibility to recessions
 - ▶ Not all companies in the same industry are similarly affected by the recession (e.g., business outsourcing companies)
 - ▶ When selecting comparables, consider economic measures that may be relevant for the industry under analysis
- ▶ **Comparables data: ensure potential comparable data reflects economic reality**
 - ▶ Update comparables to capture changed economic circumstances
 - ▶ Subset of previous comparables that reflects tested party sensitivity to down economy
 - ▶ Eliminate companies that have not been affected by the economic downturn in the same way or to the same degree
 - ▶ Identify companies with similar sales declines
 - ▶ Re-consider loss companies
 - ▶ Use of 10Q data (esp. for judging prices going forward)
 - ▶ Extend comparables' data to previous economic downturns

Documentation in a down economy

Method selection

- ▶ **Implication of actual pricing versus expectations under the CPM/TNMM**
 - ▶ **Market penetration**
 - ▶ **Subsidy payments**
 - ▶ **Losses at tested parties**
 - ▶ **Loss splits**
 - ▶ **Division of costs between operational and intangible created**
- ▶ **If difficult to find comparable companies similarly affected by the economic downturn, evaluate different TP method or PLI**
 - ▶ **Methods using internal data might reflect the impact of the down economy**
- ▶ **When adopting a new TP method consider exposure for earlier years and implication for post-recessionary years**

Documentation in a down economy

Adjustment to comparables' financial data

- ▶ **Comparability adjustments**
 - ▶ Unforeseen economic event
 - ▶ Market adjustments
 - ▶ Plant capacity
 - ▶ Negative growth
 - ▶ Differences in asset levels (A/R, inventory levels will be up)
 - ▶ Differences in the ratio of fixed costs to total costs
 - ▶ Differences in cost structure
 - ▶ Decline in sales level
 - ▶ High operating leverage
 - ▶ FX movements
- ▶ **Regressions as mechanisms to quantify impact of demand shocks and make adjustments to comparables**
 - ▶ Esp. relevant for non-US data given time lag

Documentation in a down economy

Statistical Measures

- ▶ **Modification to range**
 - ▶ **Using longer time period to capture both up and down economic environment**
 - ▶ **Utilizing historical data for past recessionary periods**
 - ▶ **Use statistical methods other than interquartile to enhance reliability of the range**
 - ▶ **Consider using pooling or simple average vs. weighted average when not enough years' data for each comparable or significant sales decline**
 - ▶ **Consider different PLIs**

Documentation in a down economy

Additional considerations

- ▶ **An entity might rationally accept reduced profit (and potentially losses) if:**
 - ▶ **Expected economic profit is greater than that which can be obtained under the next most attractive option (factoring in exit costs and potential compensation payments), and**
 - ▶ **Expected economic profit is positive over the medium term. A temporary price reduction is then an investment in order to reap increased future profits.**
- ▶ **Keep records of recession impact, having contemporaneous documentation when you have lower profits or changes is key to prevailing in future audits**

Reviewing transfer pricing policies

- ▶ **Review of TP policies might enable multinationals to better balance and support TP results among affiliates.**
- ▶ **Survival in recession often necessitates a change of business strategy.**
- ▶ **OECD TP Guidelines implies that changes in economic conditions or business may make TP arrangements obsolete that previously were at arm's length.**
- ▶ **In the presence of abnormal market circumstances, multinational enterprises should act consistently with what independent companies would do.**

Reviewing transfer pricing policies

Timing

- ▶ APA Program has recognized that TP may be different in a down economy and has formed informal committee to address APA request on it
- ▶ Economic circumstances at the time the TP methodology was set-up are not comparable to the economic circumstances during a recession
- ▶ Old TP methodology might not be at arm's length under current business strategy
- ▶ Changing TP policy with business changes
 - ▶ Existing methods are no longer best method
 - ▶ Changes in functions and risks
 - ▶ Market changes
- ▶ Changing TP policy without business change
 - ▶ Old method becomes outdated
- ▶ Company is especially hard hit by downturn (comparables likely will not show same levels of distress)
- ▶ Need for cash
- ▶ Supply chain structures “underwater”
- ▶ TP systems using fixed returns to remunerate “routine” distributors or manufacturers
- ▶ Downturn planning is an immediate cash issue as well as a documentation issue

Reviewing transfer pricing policies

“Reactive” TP tactics

- ▶ It is reasonable that multinationals may require at least one financial period to react and re-organize their inter-company commercial operations. “Reactive” in that changes are made to a system already in place.
- ▶ **Changes to TP methodology**
 - ▶ Attach transfer prices to indexes
 - ▶ For manufacturers consider using marginal costing or capacity-based costing or incremental pricing approaches
 - ▶ The seller will recover variable costs and reduce the risk of being force to exit the market
 - ▶ The buyer can purchase products at a price that allows it to generate a minimal profit, or reduce losses
 - ▶ For services
 - ▶ Review shareholder activity cost evaluation
 - ▶ Reconsider whether to impose a mark-up
 - ▶ For licensing:
 - ▶ Assess feasibility of royalty
 - ▶ ‘Stair-step’ type royalty structure vs. fixed royalty
 - ▶ Royalty varies with profitability of licensee
 - ▶ Intangibles transfer
 - ▶ Lower intangible values reduce cost of transfer
 - ▶ NOLs may shelter gain on transfer

Reviewing transfer pricing policies

“Reactive” TP tactics

- ▶ Implement year-end adjustment payments
- ▶ Renegotiation of intercompany agreements
 - ▶ Set-up written TP agreements that sustain practices (i.e., clear, unambiguous and with economic logic)
- ▶ Important for certain structures – consider if short-term losses help substantiate long-term benefits
- ▶ Business restructuring to increase supply chain effectiveness or integrate acquired operations
 - ▶ Plant consolidations
 - ▶ Service center consolidations
 - ▶ Lower intangibles values reduce cost of transfer
 - ▶ NOLs may shelter gain on transfer
- ▶ Customs reconciliation program allows refund of

Reviewing transfer pricing policies

“Proactive” TP tactics

- ▶ **Re-evaluate headquarters charges**
 - ▶ Temporary services regulations — tightened definition of stewardship
 - ▶ Requirement in some circumstances to mark up costs
 - ▶ Balancing cash needs with tax risk
- ▶ **Intangibles**
 - ▶ Are intangibles being provided free of charge?
 - ▶ Consider items beyond “typical” intangibles, such as patents and trademarks, and examine others, such as business systems.
 - ▶ Again, balance of cash need and risk

Reviewing transfer pricing policies

“Proactive” TP tactics

- ▶ **Guarantee fees**
- ▶ **Temporary reallocation of risk**
 - ▶ **Prepayments: royalties, services (retainers)**
- ▶ **IP migration**
 - ▶ **Long-term planning rather than addressing immediate cash or tax issues**
 - ▶ **New cost-sharing regulations**
 - ▶ **Low IP market value creates opportunity to transfer to low tax entity at low tax cost — additional benefit if NOLs can absorb all or part of gain**



Thank you

 **ERNST & YOUNG**
Quality In Everything We Do