

and, on December 31, 1999, an additional 3,000 M voting shares are transferred to N. The fair market value of the 3,000 shares on December 31, 1999, is \$300,000. Assume that on December 31, 1996, the short-term applicable Federal rate is 4 percent, compounded annually. M and N are calendar year taxpayers.

(ii) *Allocation of interest.* Section 1274 does not apply to the right to receive the additional shares because the right is not a debt instrument for federal income tax purposes. As a result, the transfer of the 3,000 M voting shares to N is a deferred payment subject to section 483 and a portion of the shares is treated as unstated interest under that section. The amount of interest allocable to the shares is equal to the excess of \$300,000 (the fair market value of the shares on December 31, 1999) over \$266,699 (the present value of \$300,000, determined by discounting the payment at the test rate of 4 percent, compounded annually, from December 31, 1999, to December 31, 1996). As a result, the amount of interest allocable to the payment of the shares is \$33,301 (\$300,000-\$266,699). Both M and N take the interest into account in 1999.

(c) *Effective date.* This section applies to sales and exchanges that occur on or after August 13, 1996.

[T.D. 8674, 61 FR 30138, June 14, 1996]

REGULATIONS APPLICABLE FOR TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING ON OR BEFORE APRIL 21, 1993

§ 1.482-1A Allocation of income and deductions among taxpayers.

(a) *Definitions.* When used in this section and in § 1.482-2—

(1) The term “organization” includes any organization of any kind, whether it be a sole proprietorship, a partnership, a trust, an estate, an association, or a corporation (as each is defined or understood in the Internal Revenue Code or the regulations thereunder), irrespective of the place where organized, where operated, or where its trade or business is conducted, and regardless of whether domestic or foreign, whether exempt, whether affiliated, or whether a party to a consolidated return.

(2) The term “trade” or “business” includes any trade or business activity of any kind, regardless of whether or where organized, whether owned individually or otherwise, and regardless of the place where carried on.

(3) The term “controlled” includes any kind of control, direct or indirect,

whether legally enforceable, and however exercisable or exercised. It is the reality of the control which is decisive, not its form or the mode of its exercise. A presumption of control arises if income or deductions have been arbitrarily shifted.

(4) The term “controlled taxpayer” means any one of two or more organizations, trades, or businesses owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the same interests.

(5) The terms “group” and “group of controlled taxpayers” mean the organizations, trades, or businesses owned or controlled by the same interests.

(6) The term “true taxable income” means, in the case of a controlled taxpayer, the taxable income (or, as the case may be, any item or element affecting taxable income) which would have resulted to the controlled taxpayer, had it in the conduct of its affairs (or, as the case may be, in the particular contract, transaction, arrangement, or other act) dealt with the other member or members of the group at arm’s length. It does not mean the income, the deductions, the credits, the allowances, or the item or element of income, deductions, credits, or allowances, resulting to the controlled taxpayer by reason of the particular contract, transaction, or arrangement, the controlled taxpayer, or the interests controlling it, chose to make (even though such contract, transaction, or arrangement be legally binding upon the parties thereto).

(b) *Scope and purpose.* (1) The purpose of section 482 is to place a controlled taxpayer on a tax parity with an uncontrolled taxpayer, by determining, according to the standard of an uncontrolled taxpayer, the true taxable income from the property and business of a controlled taxpayer. The interests controlling a group of controlled taxpayers are assumed to have complete power to cause each controlled taxpayer so to conduct its affairs that its transactions and accounting records truly reflect the taxable income from the property and business of each of the controlled taxpayers. If, however, this has not been done, and the taxable incomes are thereby understated, the district director shall intervene, and,

by making such distributions, apportionments, or allocations as he may deem necessary of gross income, deductions, credits, or allowances, or of any item or element affecting taxable income, between or among the controlled taxpayers constituting the group, shall determine the true taxable income of each controlled taxpayer. The standard to be applied in every case is that of an uncontrolled taxpayer dealing at arm's length with another uncontrolled taxpayer.

(2) Section 482 and this section apply to the case of any controlled taxpayer, whether such taxpayer makes a separate or a consolidated return. If a controlled taxpayer makes a separate return, the determination is of its true separate taxable income. If a controlled taxpayer is a party to a consolidated return, the true consolidated taxable income of the affiliated group and the true separate taxable income of the controlled taxpayer are determined consistently with the principles of a consolidated return.

(3) Section 482 grants no right to a controlled taxpayer to apply its provisions at will, nor does it grant any right to compel the district director to apply such provisions. It is not intended (except in the case of the computation of consolidated taxable income under a consolidated return) to effect in any case such a distribution, apportionment, or allocation of gross income, deductions, credits, or allowances, or any item of gross income, deductions, credits, or allowances, as would produce a result equivalent to a computation of consolidated taxable income under subchapter A, chapter 6 of the Code.

(c) *Application.* Transactions between one controlled taxpayer and another will be subjected to special scrutiny to ascertain whether the common control is being used to reduce, avoid, or escape taxes. In determining the true taxable income of a controlled taxpayer, the district director is not restricted to the case of improper accounting, to the case of a fraudulent, colorable, or sham transaction, or to the case of a device designed to reduce or avoid tax by shifting or distorting income, deductions, credits, or allowances. The authority to determine true

taxable income extends to any case in which either by inadvertence or design the taxable income, in whole or in part, of a controlled taxpayer, is other than it would have been had the taxpayer in the conduct of his affairs been an uncontrolled taxpayer dealing at arm's length with another uncontrolled taxpayer.

(d) *Method of allocation.* (1) The method of allocating, apportioning, or distributing income, deductions, credits, and allowances to be used by the district director in any case, including the form of the adjustments and the character and source of amounts allocated, shall be determined with reference to the substance of the particular transactions or arrangements which result in the avoidance of taxes or the failure to clearly reflect income. The appropriate adjustments may take the form of an increase or decrease in gross income, increase or decrease in deductions (including depreciation), increase or decrease in basis of assets (including inventory), or any other adjustment which may be appropriate under the circumstances. See § 1.482-2 for specific rules relating to methods of allocation in the case of several types of business transactions.

(2) Whenever the district director makes adjustments to the income of one member of a group of controlled taxpayers (such adjustments being referred to in this paragraph as "primary" adjustments) he shall also make appropriate correlative adjustments to the income of any other member of the group involved in the allocation. The correlative adjustment shall actually be made if the U.S. income tax liability of the other member would be affected for any pending taxable year. Thus, if the district director makes an allocation of income, he shall not only increase the income of one member of the group, but shall decrease the income of the other member if such adjustment would have an effect on the U.S. income tax liability of the other member for any pending taxable year. For the purposes of this subparagraph, a "pending taxable year" is any taxable year with respect to which the U.S. income tax return of the other member has been filed by the time the allocation is made, and with respect to

which a credit or refund is not barred by the operation of any law or rule of law. If a correlative adjustment is not actually made because it would have no effect on the U.S. income tax liability of the other member involved in the allocation for any pending taxable year, such adjustment shall nevertheless be deemed to have been made for the purpose of determining the U.S. income tax liability of such member for a later taxable year, or for the purposes of determining the U.S. income tax liability of any person for any taxable year. The district director shall furnish to the taxpayer with respect to which the primary adjustment is made a written statement of the amount and nature of the correlative adjustment which is deemed to have been made. For purposes of this subparagraph, a primary adjustment shall not be considered to have been made (and therefore a correlative adjustment is not required to be made) until the first occurring of the following events with respect to the primary adjustment:

(i) The date of assessment of the tax following execution by the taxpayer of a Form 870 (Waiver of Restrictions on Assessment and Collection of Deficiency in Tax and Acceptance of Overassessment) with respect to such adjustment,

(ii) Acceptance of a Form 870-AD (Offer of Waiver of Restriction on Assessment and Collection Deficiency in Tax and Acceptance of Overassessment),

(iii) Payment of the deficiency,

(iv) Stipulation in the Tax Court of the United States, or

(v) Final determination of tax liability by offer-in-compromise, closing agreement, or court action.

The principles of this subparagraph may be illustrated by the following examples in each of which it is assumed that X and Y are members of the same group of controlled entities and that they regularly compute their incomes on the basis of a calendar year:

Example 1. Assume that in 1968 the district director proposes to adjust X's income for 1966 to reflect an arm's length rental charge for Y's use of X's tangible property in 1966; that X consents to an assessment reflecting such adjustment by executing a Waiver, Form 870; and that an assessment of the tax

with respect to such adjustment is made in 1968. The primary adjustment is therefore considered to have been made in 1968. Assume further that both X and Y are United States corporations and that Y had net operating losses in 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967. Although a correlative adjustment would not have an effect on Y's U.S. income tax liability for any pending taxable year, an adjustment increasing Y's net operating loss for 1966 shall be deemed to have been made for the purposes of determining Y's U.S. income tax liability for 1968 or a later taxable year to which the increased operating loss may be carried. The district director shall notify X in writing of the amount and nature of the adjustment which is deemed to have been made to Y.

Example 2. Assume that X and Y are United States corporations; that X is in the business of rendering engineering services; that in 1968 the district director proposes to adjust X's income for 1966 to reflect an arm's length fee for the rendition of engineering services by X in 1966 relating to the construction of Y's factory; that X consents to an assessment reflecting such adjustment by executing a Waiver, Form 870; and that an assessment of the tax with respect to such adjustment is made in 1968. Assume further that fees for such services would properly constitute a capital expenditure by Y, and that Y does not place the factory in service until 1969. Although a correlative adjustment (increase in basis) would not have an effect on Y's U.S. income tax liability for a pending taxable year, an adjustment increasing the basis of Y's assets for 1966 shall be deemed to have been made in 1968 for the purpose of computing allowable depreciation or gain or loss on disposition for 1969 and any future taxable year. The district director shall notify X in writing of the amount and nature of the adjustment which is deemed to have been made to Y.

Example 3. Assume that X is a U.S. taxpayer and Y is a foreign taxpayer not engaged in a trade or business in the United States; that in 1968 the district director proposes to adjust X's income for 1966 to reflect an arm's length interest charge on a loan made to Y; that X consents to an assessment reflecting such allocation by executing a Waiver, Form 870; and that an assessment of the tax with respect to such adjustment is made in 1968. Although a correlative adjustment would not have an effect on Y's U.S. income tax liability, an adjustment in Y's income for 1966 shall be deemed to have been made in 1968 for the purposes of determining the amount of Y's earnings and profits for 1966 and subsequent years, and of any other effect it may have on any person's U.S. income tax liability for any taxable year. The district director shall notify X in writing of the amount and nature of the allocation which is deemed to have been made to Y.

(3) In making distributions, apportionments, or allocations between two members of a group of controlled entities with respect to particular transactions, the district director shall consider the effect upon such members of an arrangement between them for reimbursement within a reasonable period before or after the taxable year if the taxpayer can establish that such an arrangement in fact existed during the taxable year under consideration. The district director shall also consider the effect of any other nonarm's length transaction between them in the taxable year which, if taken into account, would result in a setoff against any allocation which would otherwise be made, provided the taxpayer is able to establish with reasonable specificity that the transaction was not at arm's length and the amount of the appropriate arm's length charge. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term arm's length refers to the amount which was charged or would have been charged in independent transactions with unrelated parties under the same or similar circumstances considering all the relevant facts and without regard to the rules found in § 1.482-2 by which certain charges are deemed to be equal to arm's length. For example, assume that one member of a group performs services which benefit a second member, which would in itself require an allocation to reflect an arm's length charge for the performance of such services. Assume further that the first member can establish that during the same taxable year the second member engages in other nonarm's length transactions which benefit the first member, such as by selling products to the first member at a discount, or purchasing products from the first member at a premium, or paying royalties to the first member in an excessive amount. In such case, the value of the benefits received by the first member as a result of the other activities will be set-off against the allocation which would otherwise be made. If the effect of the set-off is to change the characterization or source of the income or deductions, or otherwise distort taxable income, in such a manner as to affect the United States tax liability of any member, allocations will be made

to reflect the correct amount of each category of income or deductions. In order to establish that a set-off to the adjustments proposed by the district director is appropriate, the taxpayer must notify the district director of the basis of any claimed set-off at any time before the expiration of the period ending 30 days after the date of a letter by which the district director transmits an examination report notifying the taxpayer of proposed adjustments or before July 16, 1968, whichever is later. The principles of this subparagraph may be illustrated by the following examples, in each of which it is assumed that P and S are calendar year corporations and are both members of the same group of controlled entities:

Example 1. P performs services in 1966 for the benefit of S in connection with S's manufacture and sale of a product. S does not pay P for such services in 1966, but in consideration for such services, agrees in 1966 to pay P a percentage of the amount of sales of the product in 1966 through 1970. In 1966 it appeared this agreement would provide adequate consideration for the services. No allocation will be made with respect to the services performed by P.

Example 2. P renders services to S in connection with the construction of S's factory. An arm's length charge for such services, determined under paragraph (b) of § 1.482-2, would be \$100,000. During the same taxable year P makes available to S a machine to be used in such construction. P bills S \$125,000 for the services, but does not bill for the use of the machine. No allocation will be made with respect to the excessive charge for services or the undercharge for the machine if P can establish that the excessive charge for services was equal to an arm's length charge for the use of the machine, and if the taxable income and income tax liabilities of P and S are not distorted.

Example 3. Assume the same facts as in Example 2, except that, if P had reported \$25,000 as rental income and \$25,000 less service income, it would have been subject to the tax on personal holding companies. Allocations will be made to reflect the correct amounts of rental income and service income.

(4) If the members of a group of controlled taxpayers engage in transactions with one another, the district director may distribute, apportion, or allocate income, deductions, credits, or allowances to reflect the true taxable income of the individual members under the standards set forth in this section and in § 1.482-2 notwithstanding

the fact that the ultimate income anticipated from a series of transactions may not be realized or is realized during a later period. For example, if one member of a controlled group sells a product at less than an arm's length price to a second member of the group in one taxable year and the second member resells the product to an unrelated party in the next taxable year, the district director may make an appropriate allocation to reflect an arm's length price for the sale of the product in the first taxable year, notwithstanding that the second member of the group had not realized any gross income from the resale of the product in the first year. Similarly, if one member of a group lends money to a second member of the group in a taxable year, the district director may make an appropriate allocation to reflect an arm's length charge for interest during such taxable year even if the second member does not realize income during such year. The provisions of this subparagraph apply even if the gross income contemplated from a series of transactions is never, in fact, realized by the other members.

(5) Section 482 may, when necessary to prevent the avoidance of taxes or to clearly reflect income, be applied in circumstances described in sections of the Code (such as section 351) providing for nonrecognition of gain or loss. See, for example, "National Securities Corporation v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue", 137 F. 2d 600 (3d Cir. 1943), cert. denied 320 U.S. 794 (1943).

(6) If payment or reimbursement for the sale, exchange, or use of property, the rendition of services, or the advance of other consideration among members of a group of controlled entities was prevented, or would have been prevented, at the time of the transaction because of currency or other restrictions imposed under the laws of any foreign country, any distributions, apportionments, or allocations which may be made under section 482 with respect to such transactions may be treated as deferrable income or deductions, providing the taxpayer has, for the year to which the distributions, apportionments, or allocations relate, elected to use a method of accounting in which the reporting of deferrable in-

come is deferred until the income ceases to be deferrable income. Under such method of accounting, referred to in this section as the deferred income method of accounting, any payments or reimbursements which were prevented or would have been prevented, and any deductions attributable directly or indirectly to such payments or reimbursements, shall be deferred until they cease to be deferrable under such method of accounting. If such method of accounting has not been elected with respect to the taxable year to which the allocations under section 482 relate, the taxpayer may elect such method with respect to such allocations (but not with respect to other deferrable income) at any time before the first occurring of the following events with respect to the allocations:

(i) Execution by the taxpayer of Form 870 (Waiver of Restrictions on Assessment and Collection of Deficiency in Tax and Acceptance of Over-assessment);

(ii) Expiration of the period ending 30 days after the date of a letter by which the district director transmits an examination report notifying the taxpayer of proposed adjustments reflecting such allocations or before July 16, 1968, whichever is later; or

(iii) Execution of a closing agreement or offer-in-compromise.

The principles of this subparagraph may be illustrated by the following example in which it is assumed that X, a domestic corporation, and Y, a foreign corporation, are members of the same group of controlled entities:

Example. X, which is in the business of rendering a certain type of service to unrelated parties, renders such services for the benefit of Y in 1965. The direct and indirect costs allocable to such services are \$60,000, and an arm's length charge for such services is \$100,000. Assume that the district director proposes to increase X's income by \$100,000, but that the country in which Y is located would have blocked payment in 1965 for such services. If, prior to the first occurring of the events described in subdivisions (i), (ii), or (iii) of this subparagraph, X elects to use the deferred income method of accounting with respect to such allocation, the \$100,000 allocation and the \$60,000 of costs are deferrable

§ 1.482-2A

26 CFR Ch. I (4-1-12 Edition)

until such amounts cease to be deferrable under X's method of accounting.

[T.D. 6595, 27 FR 3598, Apr. 14, 1962, as amended by T.D. 6952, 33 FR 5848, Apr. 16, 1968. Redesignated by T.D. 8470, 58 FR 5271, Jan. 21, 1993]

§ 1.482-2A Determination of taxable income in specific situations.

(a)-(c) For applicable rules, see § 1.482-2T (a) through (c).

(d) *Transfer or use of intangible property*—(1) *In general.* (i) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (4) of this paragraph, where intangible property or an interest therein is transferred, sold, assigned, loaned, or otherwise made available in any manner by one member of a group of controlled entities (referred to in this paragraph as the transferor) to another member of the group (referred to in this paragraph as the transferee) for other than an arm's length consideration, the district director may make appropriate allocations to reflect an arm's length consideration for such property or its use. Subparagraph (2) of this paragraph provides rules for determining the form an amount of an appropriate allocation, subparagraph (3) of this paragraph provides a definition of "intangible property", and subparagraph (4) of this paragraph provides rules with respect to certain cost-sharing arrangements in connection with the development of intangible property. For purposes of this paragraph, an interest in intangible property may take the form of the right to use such property.

(ii)(a) In the absence of a bona fide cost-sharing arrangement (as defined in subparagraph (4) of this paragraph), where one member of a group of related entities undertakes the development of intangible property as a developer within the meaning of (c) of this subdivision, no allocation with respect to such development activity shall be made under the rules of this paragraph or any other paragraph of this section (except as provided in (b) of this subdivision) until such time as any property developed, or any interest therein, is or is deemed to be transferred, sold, assigned, loaned, or otherwise made available in any manner by the developer to a related entity in a transfer subject to the rules of this paragraph.

Where a member of the group other than the developer acquires an interest in the property developed by virtue of obtaining a patent or copyright, or by any other means, the developer shall be deemed to have transferred such interest in such property to the acquiring member in a transaction subject to the rules of this paragraph. For example, if one member of a group (the developer) undertakes to develop a new patentable product and the costs of development are incurred by that entity over a period of 3 years, no allocation with respect to that entity's activity shall be made during such period. The amount of any allocation that may be appropriate at the expiration of such development period when, for example, the patent on the product is transferred, or deemed transferred, to a related entity for other than an arm's length consideration, shall be determined in accordance with the rules of this paragraph.

(b) Where one member of a group renders assistance in the form of loans, services, or the use of tangible or intangible property to a developer in connection with an attempt to develop intangible property, the amount of any allocation that may be appropriate with respect to such assistance shall be determined in accordance with the rules of the appropriate paragraph or paragraphs of this section. Thus, where one entity allows a related entity, which is the developer, to use tangible property, such as laboratory equipment, in connection with the development of intangible property, the amount of any allocation that may be appropriate with respect to such use shall be determined in accordance with the rules of paragraph (c) of this section. In the event that the district director does not exercise his discretion to make allocations with respect to the assistance rendered to the developer, the value of the assistance shall be allowed as a set-off against any allocation that the district director may make under this paragraph as a result of the transfer of the intangible property to the entity rendering the assistance.

(c) The determination as to which member of a group of related entities is a developer and which members of the group are rendering assistance to the

developer in connection with its development activities shall be based upon all the facts and circumstances of the individual case. Of all the facts and circumstances to be taken into account in making this determination, greatest weight shall be given to the relative amounts of all the direct and indirect costs of development and the corresponding risks of development borne by the various members of the group, and the relative values of the use of any intangible property of members of the group which is made available without adequate consideration for use in connection with the development activity, which property is likely to contribute to a substantial extent in the production of intangible property. For this purpose, the risk to be borne with respect to development activity is the possibility that such activity will not result in the production of intangible property or that the intangible property produced will not be of sufficient value to allow for the recovery of the costs of developing it. A member will not be considered to have borne the costs and corresponding risks of development unless such member is committed to bearing such costs in advance of, or contemporaneously with, their incurrence and without regard to the success of the project. Other factors that may be relevant in determining which member of the group is the developer include the location of the development activity, the capabilities of the various members to carry on the project independently, and the degree of control over the project exercised by the various members.

(d) The principles of this subdivision (ii) may be illustrated by the following examples in which it is assumed that X and Y are corporate members of the same group:

Example 1. X, at the request of Y, undertakes to develop a new machine which will function effectively in the climate in which Y's factory is located. Y agrees to bear all the direct and indirect costs of the project whether or not X successfully develops the machine. Assume that X does not make any of its own intangible property available for use in connection with the project. The machine is successfully developed and Y obtains possession of the intangible property necessary to produce such machine. Based on the facts and circumstances as stated, Y

shall be considered to be the developer of the intangible property and, therefore, Y shall not be treated as having obtained the property in a transfer subject to the rules of this paragraph. Any amount which may be allocable with respect to the assistance rendered by X shall be determined in accordance with the rules of (b) of this subdivision.

Example 2. Assume the same facts as in Example 1 except that Y agrees to reimburse X for its costs only in the event that the property is successfully developed. In such case X is the developer and Y is deemed to have received the property in a transfer subject to the rules of this paragraph. Therefore, the district director may make an allocation to reflect an arm's length consideration for such property.

Example 3. In 1967 X undertakes to develop product M in its research and development department. X incurs direct and indirect costs of \$1 million per year in connection with the project in 1967, 1968, and 1969. In connection with the project, X employs the formula for compound N, which it owns, and which is likely to contribute substantially to the success of the project. The value of the use of the formula for compound N in connection with this project is \$750,000. In 1968, 4 chemists employed by Y spend 6 months working on the project in X's laboratory. The salary and other expenses connected with the chemists' employment for that period (\$100,000) are paid by Y, for which no charge is made to X. In 1969, product M is perfected and Y obtains patents thereon. X is considered to be the developer of product M since, among other things, it bore the greatest relative share of the costs and risks incurred in connection with this project and made available intangible property (formula for compound N) which was likely to contribute substantially in the development of product M. Accordingly, no allocation with respect to X's development activity should be made before 1969. The property is deemed to have been transferred to Y at that time by virtue of the fact that Y obtained the patent rights to product M. In such case the district director may make an allocation to reflect an arm's length consideration for such transfer. In the event that the district director makes such an allocation and he has not made or does not make an allocation for 1968 with respect to the services of the chemists in accordance with the principles of paragraph (b) of this section, the value of the assistance shall be allowed as a set-off against the amount of the allocation reflecting an arm's length consideration for the transfer of the intangible property.

(2) *Arm's length consideration.* (i) An arm's length consideration shall be in a form which is consistent with the form which would be adopted in transactions between unrelated parties under the

same circumstances. To the extent appropriate, an arm's length consideration may take any one or more of the following forms:

(a) Royalties based on the transferee's output, sales, profits, or any other measure;

(b) Lump-sum payments; or

(c) Any other form, including reciprocal licensing rights, which might reasonably have been adopted by unrelated parties under the circumstances, provided that the parties can establish that such form was adopted pursuant to an arrangement which in fact existed between them.

However, where the transferee pays nominal or no consideration for the property or interest therein and where the transferor has retained a substantial interest in the property, an allocation shall be presumed not to take the form of a lump-sum payment.

(ii) In determining the amount of an arm's length consideration, the standard to be applied is the amount that would have been paid by an unrelated party for the same intangible property under the same circumstances. Where there have been transfers by the transferor to unrelated parties involving the same or similar intangible property under the same or similar circumstances the amount of the consideration for such transfers shall generally be the best indication of an arm's length consideration.

(iii) Where a sufficiently similar transaction involving an unrelated party cannot be found, the following factors, to the extent appropriate (depending upon the type of intangible property and the form of the transfer), may be considered in arriving at the amount of the arm's length consideration:

(a) The prevailing rates in the same industry or for similar property,

(b) The offers of competing transferors or the bids of competing transferees,

(c) The terms of the transfer, including limitations on the geographic area covered and the exclusive or nonexclusive character of any rights granted,

(d) The uniqueness of the property and the period for which it is likely to remain unique,

(e) The degree and duration of protection afforded to the property under the laws of the relevant countries.

(f) Value of services rendered by the transferor to the transferee in connection with the transfer within the meaning of paragraph (b)(8) of this section,

(g) Prospective profits to be realized or costs to be saved by the transferee through its use or subsequent transfer of the property,

(h) The capital investment and starting up expenses required of the transferee,

(i) The next subdivision is (j),

(j) The availability of substitutes for the property transferred,

(k) The arm's length rates and prices paid by unrelated parties where the property is resold or sublicensed to such parties,

(l) The costs incurred by the transferor in developing the property, and

(m) Any other fact or circumstance which unrelated parties would have been likely to consider in determining the amount of an arm's length consideration for the property.

(3) *Definition of intangible property.* (i) Solely for the purposes of this section, intangible property shall consist of the items described in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph, provided that such items have substantial value independent of the services of individual persons.

(ii) The items referred to in subdivision (i) of this subparagraph are as follows:

(a) Patents, inventions, formulas, processes, designs, patterns, and other similar items;

(b) Copyrights, literary, musical, or artistic compositions, and other similar items;

(c) Trademarks, trade names, brand names, and other similar items;

(d) Franchises, licenses, contracts, and other similar items;

(e) Methods, programs, systems, procedures, campaigns, surveys, studies, forecasts, estimates, customer lists, technical data, and other similar items.

(4) *Sharing of costs and risks.* Where a member of a group of controlled entities acquires an interest in intangible property as a participating party in a bona fide cost sharing arrangement

with respect to the development of such intangible property, the district director shall not make allocations with respect to such acquisition except as may be appropriate to reflect each participant's arm's length share of the costs and risks of developing the property. A bona fide cost sharing arrangement is an agreement, in writing, between two or more members of a group of controlled entities providing for the sharing of the costs and risks of developing intangible property in return for a specified interest in the intangible property that may be produced. In order for the arrangement to qualify as a bona fide arrangement, it must reflect an effort in good faith by the participating members to bear their respective shares of all the costs and risks of development on an arm's length basis. In order for the sharing of costs and risk to be considered on an arm's length basis, the terms and conditions must be comparable to those which would have been adopted by unrelated parties similarly situated had they entered into such an arrangement. If an oral cost sharing arrangement, entered into prior to April 16, 1968, and continued in effect after that date, is otherwise in compliance with the standards prescribed in this subparagraph, it shall constitute a bona fide cost sharing arrangement if it is reduced to writing prior to January 1, 1969.

(e) *Sales of tangible property*—(1) *In general.* (i) Where one member of a group of controlled entities (referred to in this paragraph as the “seller”) sells or otherwise disposes of tangible property to another member of such group (referred to in this paragraph as the “buyer”) at other than an arm's length price (such a sale being referred to in this paragraph as a “controlled sale”), the district director may make appropriate allocations between the seller and the buyer to reflect an arm's length price for such sale or disposition. An arm's length price is the price that an unrelated party would have paid under the same circumstances for the property involved in the controlled sale. Since unrelated parties normally sell products at a profit, an arm's length price normally involves a profit to the seller.

(ii) Subparagraphs (2), (3), and (4) of this paragraph describe three methods of determining an arm's-length price and the standards for applying each method. They are, respectively, the comparable uncontrolled price method, the resale price method, and the cost-plus method. In addition, a special rule is provided in subdivision (v) of this subparagraph for use (notwithstanding any other provision of this subdivision) in determining an arm's-length price for an ore or mineral. If there are comparable uncontrolled sales as defined in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the comparable uncontrolled price method must be utilized because it is the method likely to result in the most accurate estimate of an arm's-length price (for the reason that it is based upon the price actually paid by unrelated parties for the same or similar products). If there are no comparable uncontrolled sales, then the resale price method must be utilized if the standards for its application are met because it is the method likely to result in the next most accurate estimate in such instances (for the reason that, in such instances, the arm's-length price determined under such method is based more directly upon actual arm's-length transactions than is the cost-plus method). A typical situation where the resale price method may be required is where a manufacturer sells products to a related distributor which, without further processing, resells the products in uncontrolled transactions. If all the standards for the mandatory application of the resale price method are not satisfied, then, as provided in subparagraph (3)(iii) of this paragraph, either that method or the cost-plus method may be used, depending upon which method is more feasible and is likely to result in a more accurate estimate of an arm's-length price. A typical situation where the cost-plus method may be appropriate is where a manufacturer sells products to a related entity which performs substantial manufacturing, assembly, or other processing of the product or adds significant value by reason of its utilization of its intangible property prior to resale in uncontrolled transactions.

(iii) Where the standards for applying one of the three methods of pricing described in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph are met, such method must, for the purposes of this paragraph, be utilized unless the taxpayer can establish that, considering all the facts and circumstances, some method of pricing other than those described in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph is clearly more appropriate. Where none of the three methods of pricing described in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph can reasonably be applied under the facts and circumstances as they exist in a particular case, some appropriate method of pricing other than those described in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph, or variations on such methods, can be used.

(iv) The methods of determining arm's length prices described in this section are stated in terms of their application to individual sales of property. However, because of the possibility that a taxpayer may make controlled sales of many different products, or many separate sales of the same product, it may be impractical to analyze every sale for the purposes of determining the arm's length price. It is therefore permissible to determine or verify arm's length prices by applying the appropriate methods of pricing to product lines or other groupings where it is impractical to ascertain an arm's length price for each product or sale. In addition, the district director may determine or verify the arm's length price of all sales to a related entity by employing reasonable statistical sampling techniques.

(v) The price for a mineral product which is sold at the stage at which mining or extraction ends shall be determined under the provisions of §§ 1.613-3 and 1.613-4.

(2) *Comparable uncontrolled price method.* (i) Under the method of pricing described as the "comparable uncontrolled price method", the arm's length price of a controlled sale is equal to the price paid in comparable uncontrolled sales, adjusted as provided in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph.

(ii) "Uncontrolled sales" are sales in which the seller and the buyer are not members of the same controlled group. These include (a) sales made by a mem-

ber of the controlled group to an unrelated party, (b) sales made to a member of the controlled group by an unrelated party, and (c) sales made in which the parties are not members of the controlled group and are not related to each other. However, uncontrolled sales do not include sales at unrealistic prices, as for example where a member makes uncontrolled sales in small quantities at a price designed to justify a nonarm's length price on a large volume of controlled sales. Uncontrolled sales are considered comparable to controlled sales if the physical property and circumstances involved in the uncontrolled sales are identical to the physical property and circumstances involved in the controlled sales, or if such properties and circumstances are so nearly identical that any differences either have no effect on price, or such differences can be reflected by a reasonable number of adjustments to the price of uncontrolled sales. For this purpose, differences can be reflected by adjusting prices only where such differences have a definite and reasonably ascertainable effect on price. If the differences can be reflected by such adjustment, then the price of the uncontrolled sale as adjusted constitutes the comparable uncontrolled sale price. Some of the differences which may affect the price of property are differences in the quality of the product, terms of sale, intangible property associated with the sale, time of sale, and the level of the market and the geographic market in which the sale takes place. Whether and to what extent differences in the various properties and circumstances affect price, and whether differences render sales noncomparable, depends upon the particular circumstances and property involved. The principles of this subdivision may be illustrated by the following examples, in each of which it is assumed that X makes both controlled and uncontrolled sales of the identical property:

Example 1. Assume that the circumstances surrounding the controlled and the uncontrolled sales are identical, except for the fact that the controlled sales price is a delivered price and the uncontrolled sales are made f.o.b. X's factory. Since differences in terms of transportation and insurance generally have a definite and reasonably ascertainable

effect on price, such differences do not normally render the uncontrolled sales noncomparable to the controlled sales.

Example 2. Assume that the circumstances surrounding the controlled and uncontrolled sales are identical, except for the fact that X affixes its valuable trademark in the controlled sales, and does not affix its trademark in uncontrolled sales. Since the effects on price of differences in intangible property associated with the sale of tangible property, such as trademarks, are normally not reasonably ascertainable, such differences would normally render the uncontrolled sales noncomparable.

Example 3. Assume that the circumstances surrounding the controlled and uncontrolled sales are identical, except for the fact that X, a manufacturer of business machines, makes certain minor modifications in the physical properties of the machines to satisfy safety specifications or other specific requirements of a customer in controlled sales, and does not make these modifications in uncontrolled sales. Since minor physical differences in the product generally have a definite and reasonably ascertainable effect on prices, such differences do not normally render the uncontrolled sales noncomparable to the controlled sales.

(iii) Where there are two or more comparable uncontrolled sales susceptible of adjustment as defined in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph, the comparable uncontrolled sale or sales requiring the fewest and simplest adjustments provided in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph should generally be selected. Thus, for example, if a taxpayer makes comparable uncontrolled sales of a particular product which differ from the controlled sale only with respect to the terms of delivery, and makes other comparable uncontrolled sales of the product which differ from the controlled sale with respect to both terms of delivery and terms of payment, the comparable uncontrolled sales differing only with respect to terms of delivery should be selected as the comparable uncontrolled sale.

(iv) One of the circumstances which may affect the price of property is the fact that the seller may desire to make sales at less than a normal profit for the primary purpose of establishing or maintaining a market for his products. Thus, a seller may be willing to reduce the price of a product, for a time, in order to introduce his product into an area or in order to meet competition. However, controlled sales may be

priced in such a manner only if such price would have been charged in an uncontrolled sale under comparable circumstances. Such fact may be demonstrated by showing that the buyer in the controlled sale made corresponding reductions in the resale price to uncontrolled purchasers, or that such buyer engaged in substantially greater sales promotion activities with respect to the product involved in the controlled sale than with respect to other products. For example, assume X, a manufacturer of batteries, commences to sell car batteries to Y, a subsidiary of X, for resale in a new market. In its existing markets X's batteries sell to independent retailers at \$20 per unit, and X sells them to wholesalers at \$17 per unit. Y also sells X's batteries to independent retailers at \$20 per unit. X's batteries are not known in the new market in which Y is operating. In order to engage competitively in the new market Y incurs selling and advertising costs substantially higher than those incurred for its sales of other products. Under these circumstances X may sell to Y, for a time, at less than \$17 to take into account the increased selling and advertising activities of Y in penetrating and establishing the new market. This may be done even though it may result in a transfer price from X to Y which is below X's full costs of manufacturing the product.

(3) *Resale price method.* (i) Under the pricing method described as the "resale price method", the arm's length price of a controlled sale is equal to the applicable resale price (as defined in subdivision (iv) or (v) of this subparagraph), reduced by an appropriate markup, and adjusted as provided in subdivision (ix) of this subparagraph. An appropriate markup is computed by multiplying the applicable resale price by the appropriate markup percentage as defined in subdivision (vi) of this subparagraph. Thus, where one member of a group of controlled entities sells property to another member which resells the property in uncontrolled sales, if the applicable resale price of the property involved in the uncontrolled sale is \$100 and the appropriate markup percentage for resales by the buyer is 20 percent, the arm's length price of the controlled sale is \$80 (\$100

§ 1.482-2A

26 CFR Ch. I (4-1-12 Edition)

minus 20 percent \times \$100), adjusted as provided in subdivision (ix) of this subparagraph.

(ii) The resale price method must be used to compute an arm's length price of a controlled sale if all the following circumstances exist:

(a) There are no comparable uncontrolled sales as defined in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph.

(b) An applicable resale price, as defined in subdivision (iv) or (v) of this subparagraph, is available with respect to resales made within a reasonable time before or after the time of the controlled sale.

(c) The buyer (reseller) has not added more than an insubstantial amount to the value of the property by physically altering the product before resale. For this purpose packaging, repacking, labeling, or minor assembly of property does not constitute physical alteration.

(d) The buyer (reseller) has not added more than an insubstantial amount to the value of the property by the use of intangible property. See § 1.482-2(d)(3) for the definition of intangible property.

(iii) Notwithstanding the fact that one or both of the requirements of subdivision (ii) (c) or (d) of this subparagraph may not be met, the resale price method may be used if such method is more feasible and is likely to result in a more accurate determination of an arm's length price than the use of the cost plus method. Thus, even though one of the requirements of such subdivision is not satisfied, the resale price method may nevertheless be more appropriate than the cost plus method because the computations and evaluations required under the former method may be fewer and easier to make than under the latter method. In general, the resale price method is more appropriate when the functions performed by the seller are more extensive and more difficult to evaluate than the functions performed by the buyer (reseller). The principle of this subdivision may be illustrated by the following examples in each of which it is assumed that corporation X developed a valuable patent covering product M which it manufactures and sells to corporation Y in a controlled sale,

and for which there is no comparable uncontrolled sale:

Example 1. Corporation Y adds a component to product M and resells the assembled product in an uncontrolled sale within a reasonable time after the controlled sale of product M. Assume further that the addition of the component added more than an insubstantial amount to the value of product M, but that Y's function in purchasing the component and assembling the product prior to sale was subject to reasonably precise valuation. Although the controlled sale and resale does not meet the requirements of subdivision (ii)(c) of this subparagraph, the resale price method may be used under the circumstances because that method involves computations and evaluations which are fewer and easier to make than under the cost plus method. This is because X's use of a patent may be more difficult to evaluate in determining an appropriate gross profit percentage under the cost plus method, than is evaluation of Y's assembling function in determining the appropriate markup percentage under the resale price method.

Example 2. Corporation Y resells product M in an uncontrolled sale within a reasonable time after the controlled sale after attaching its valuable trademark to it. Assume further that it can be demonstrated through comparison with other uncontrolled sales of Y that the addition of Y's trademark to a product usually adds 25 percent to the markup on its sales. On the other hand, the effect of X's use of its patent is difficult to evaluate in applying the cost plus method because no reasonable standard of comparison is available. Although the controlled sale and resale does not meet the requirements of subdivision (ii)(d) of this subparagraph, the resale price method may be used because that method involves computations and evaluation which are fewer and easier to make than under the cost plus method. That is because, under the circumstances, X's use of a patent is more difficult to evaluate in determining an appropriate gross profit percentage under the cost plus method, than is evaluation of the use of Y's trademark in determining the appropriate markup percentage under the resale price method.

(iv) For the purposes of this subparagraph the "applicable resale price" is the price at which it is anticipated that property purchased in the controlled sale will be resold by the buyer in an uncontrolled sale. The "applicable resale price" will generally be equal to either the price at which current resales of the same property are being made or the resale price of the particular item of property involved.

(v) Where the property purchased in the controlled sale is resold in another controlled sale, the “applicable resale price” is the price at which such property is finally resold in an uncontrolled sale, providing that the series of sales as a whole meets all the requirements of subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph or that the resale price method is used pursuant to subdivision (iii) of this subparagraph. In such case, the determination of the appropriate markup percentage shall take into account the function or functions performed by all members of the group participating in the series of sales and resales. Thus, if X sells a product to Y in a controlled sale, Y sells the product to Z in a controlled sale, and Z sells the product in an uncontrolled sale, the resale price method must be used if Y and Z together have not added more than an insubstantial amount to the value of the product through physical alteration or the application of intangible property, and the final resale occurs within a reasonable time of the sale from X to Y. In such case, the applicable resale price is the price at which Z sells the product in the uncontrolled sale, and the appropriate markup percentage shall take into account the functions performed by both Y and Z.

(vi) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the appropriate markup percentage is equal to the percentage of gross profit (expressed as a percentage of sales) earned by the buyer (reseller) or another party on the resale of property which is both purchased and resold in an uncontrolled transaction, which resale is most similar to the applicable resale of the property involved in the controlled sale. The following are the most important characteristics to be considered in determining the similarity of resales:

(a) The type of property involved in the sales. For example: machine tools, men’s furnishings, small household appliances.

(b) The functions performed by the reseller with respect to the property. For example: packaging, labeling, delivering, maintenance of inventory, minor assembly, advertising, selling at wholesale, selling at retail, billing, maintenance of accounts receivable, and servicing.

(c) The effect on price of any intangible property utilized by the reseller in connection with the property resold. For example: patents, trademarks, trade names.

(d) The geographic market in which the functions are performed by the reseller.

In general, the similarity to be sought relates to the probable effect upon the markup percentage of any differences in such characteristics between the uncontrolled purchases and resales on the one hand and the controlled purchases and resales on the other hand. Thus, close physical similarity of the property involved in the sales compared is not required under the resale price method since a lack of close physical similarity is not necessarily indicative of dissimilar markup percentages.

(vii) Whenever possible, markup percentages should be derived from uncontrolled purchases and resales of the buyer (reseller) involved in the controlled sale, because similar characteristics are more likely to be found among different resales of property made by the same reseller than among sales made by other resellers. In the absence of resales by the same buyer (reseller) which meet the standards of subdivision (vi) of this subparagraph, evidence of an appropriate markup percentage may be derived from resales by other resellers selling in the same or a similar market in which the controlled buyer (reseller) is selling providing such resellers perform comparable functions. Where the function performed by the reseller is similar to the function performed by a sales agent which does not take title, such sales agent will be considered a reseller for the purpose of determining an appropriate markup percentage under this subparagraph and the commission earned by such sales agent, expressed as a percentage of the sales price of the goods, may constitute the appropriate markup percentage. If the controlled buyer (reseller) is located in a foreign country and information on resales by other resellers in the same foreign market is not available, then markup percentages earned by United States resellers performing comparable functions may be used. In the absence of

data on markup percentages of particular sales or groups of sales, the prevailing markup percentage in the particular industry involved may be appropriate.

(viii) In calculating the markup percentage earned on uncontrolled purchases and resales, and in applying such percentage to the applicable resale price to determine the appropriate markup, the same elements which enter into the computation of the sales price and the costs of goods sold of the property involved in the comparable uncontrolled purchases and resales should enter into such computation in the case of the property involved in the controlled purchases and resales. Thus, if freight-in and packaging expense are elements of the cost of goods sold in comparable uncontrolled purchases, then such elements should also be taken into account in computing the cost of goods sold of the controlled purchase. Similarly, if the comparable markup percentage is based upon net sales (after reduction for returns and allowances) of uncontrolled resellers, such percentage must be applied to net sales of the buyer (reseller).

(ix) In determining an arm's length price appropriate adjustment must be made to reflect any material differences between the uncontrolled purchases and resales used as the basis for the calculation of the appropriate markup percentage and the resales of property involved in the controlled sale. The differences referred to in this subdivision are those differences in functions or circumstances which have a definite and reasonably ascertainable effect on price. The principles of this subdivision may be illustrated by the following example:

Example. Assume that X and Y are members of the same group of controlled entities and that Y purchases electric mixers from X and electric toasters from uncontrolled entities. Y performs substantially similar functions with respect to resales of both the mixers and the toasters, except that it does not warrant the toasters, but does provide a 90-day warranty for the mixers. Y normally earns a gross profit on toasters of 20 percent of gross selling price. The 20-percent gross profit on the resale of toasters is an appropriate markup percentage, but the price of the controlled sale computed with reference

to such rate must be adjusted to reflect the difference in terms (the warranty).

(4) *Cost plus method.* (i) Under the pricing method described as the "cost plus method", the arm's length price of a controlled sale of property shall be computed by adding to the cost of producing such property (as computed in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph), an amount which is equal to such cost multiplied by the appropriate gross profit percentage (as computed in subdivision (iii) of this subparagraph), plus or minus any adjustments as provided in subdivision (v) of this subparagraph.

(ii) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the cost of producing the property involved in the controlled sale, and the costs which enter into the computation of the appropriate gross profit percentage shall be computed in a consistent manner in accordance with sound accounting practices for allocating or apportioning costs, which neither favors nor burdens controlled sales in comparison with uncontrolled sales. Thus, if the costs used in computing the appropriate gross profit percentage are comprised of the full cost of goods sold, including direct and indirect costs, then the cost of producing the property involved in the controlled sales must be comprised of the full cost of goods sold, including direct and indirect costs. On the other hand, if the costs used in computing the appropriate gross profit percentage are comprised only of direct costs, the cost of producing the property involved in the controlled sale must be comprised only of direct costs. The term "cost of producing", as used in this subparagraph, includes the cost of acquiring property which is held for resale.

(iii) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the appropriate gross profit percentage is equal to the gross profit percentage (expressed as a percentage of cost) earned by the seller or another party on the uncontrolled sale or sales of property which are most similar to the controlled sale in question. The following are the most important characteristics to be considered in determining the similarity of the uncontrolled sale or sales:

(a) The type of property involved in the sales. For example: machine tools,

men's furnishings, small household appliances.

(b) The functions performed by the seller with respect to the property sold. For example: contract manufacturing, product assembly, selling activity, processing, servicing, delivering.

(c) The effect of any intangible property used by the seller in connection with the property sold. For example: patents, trademarks, trade names.

(d) The geographic market in which the functions are performed by the seller. In general, the similarity to be sought relates to the probable effect upon the margin of gross profit of any differences in such characteristics between the uncontrolled sales and the controlled sale. Thus, close physical similarity of the property involved in the sales compared is not required under the cost plus method since a lack of close physical similarity is not necessarily indicative of dissimilar profit margins. See subparagraph (2)(iv) of this paragraph, relating to sales made at less than a normal profit for the primary purpose of establishing or maintaining a market.

(iv) Whenever possible, gross profit percentages should be derived from uncontrolled sales made by the seller involved in the controlled sale, because similar characteristics are more likely to be found among sales of property made by the same seller than among sales made by other sellers. In the absence of such sales, evidence of an appropriate gross profit percentage may be derived from similar uncontrolled sales by other sellers whether or not such sellers are members of the controlled group. Where the function performed by the seller is similar to the function performed by a purchasing agent which does not take title, such purchasing agent will be considered a seller for the purpose of determining an appropriate gross profit percentage under this subparagraph and the commission earned by such purchasing agent, expressed as a percentage of the purchase price of the goods, may constitute the appropriate gross profit percentage. In the absence of data on gross profit percentages of particular sales or groups of sales which are similar to the controlled sale, the prevailing gross profit percentages in the

particular industry involved may be appropriate.

(v) Where the most similar sale or sales from which the appropriate gross profit percentage is derived differ in any material respect from the controlled sale, the arm's length price which is computed by applying such percentage must be adjusted to reflect such differences to the extent such differences would warrant an adjustment of price in uncontrolled transactions. The differences referred to in this subdivision are those differences which have a definite and reasonably ascertainable effect on price.

(Sec. 385 and 7805 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (83 Stat. 613 and 68A Stat. 917; 26 U.S.C. 385 and 7805))

[T.D. 6952, 33 FR 5849, Apr. 16, 1968]

EDITORIAL NOTE: For FEDERAL REGISTER citations affecting §1.482-2A, see the List of CFR Sections Affected, which appears in the Finding Aids section of the printed volume and at www.fdsys.gov.

REGULATIONS APPLICABLE ON OR BEFORE
JANUARY 4, 2009.

§1.482-7A Methods to determine taxable income in connection with a cost sharing arrangement.

(a) *In general*—(1) *Scope and application of the rules in this section.* A cost sharing arrangement is an agreement under which the parties agree to share the costs of development of one or more intangibles in proportion to their shares of reasonably anticipated benefits from their individual exploitation of the interests in the intangibles assigned to them under the arrangement. A taxpayer may claim that a cost sharing arrangement is a qualified cost sharing arrangement only if the agreement meets the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section. Consistent with the rules of §1.482-1(d)(3)(ii)(B) (Identifying contractual terms), the district director may apply the rules of this section to any arrangement that in substance constitutes a cost sharing arrangement, notwithstanding a failure to comply with any requirement of this section. A qualified cost sharing arrangement, or an arrangement to which the district director applies the rules of this section, will not be treated as a partnership to which the rules of