

distinguishing between stock-based compensation and other forms of compensation in this context.

One commentator also claimed that the historical administrative practice of the IRS has been not to challenge the failure to take stock-based compensation into account in other transfer pricing contexts in which the determination of cost is relevant. Treasury and the IRS believe that such perceived practices of the IRS with respect to other section 482 contexts are not relevant to determining the appropriate regulatory rule applicable to QCSAs.

As an alternate approach, one commentator suggested that rather than requiring stock-based compensation to be taken into account in the QCSA context, Treasury and the IRS should promulgate a "stock-based compensation safe harbor" applicable to QCSAs. This suggested "safe harbor" has not been adopted in the final regulations. As noted above, Treasury and the IRS believe that in order for the costs incurred by a participant to reasonably reflect its actual economic activity, those costs must be determined on a comprehensive basis and so must take into account all relevant costs, in particular critical elements such as employee compensation. The final regulations therefore require employee compensation to be taken into account, rather than provide for a safe harbor under which such compensation could be ignored.

#### *B. Grant-Date Identification Rule—§ 1.482-7(d)(2)(ii)*

The proposed regulations identify the stock-based compensation to be included in the cost pool based on whether the compensation is related to the intangible development area on the date the option is granted.

One commentator noted that this identification rule is inconsistent with the IRS treatment of stock-based compensation in other tax areas such as sourcing, where IRS rulings trace the compensation to the entire period over which the employee performed the services compensated by the option.

The grant-date identification rule has been retained in the final regulations. As noted in the preamble of the proposed regulations, it is desirable in the QCSA context to select a single date for identification of covered stock-based compensation. The grant of compensation generally is the single economic event most closely associated with the services being compensated.

#### *C. Provision of Specific Methods of Measurement and Timing*

The proposed regulations prescribe two alternative methods for determining the operating expenses attributable to stock-based compensation. The default rule under § 1.482-7(d)(2)(iii)(A) provides that the costs attributable to stock-based compensation generally are included as intangible development costs upon the exercise of the option and measured by the spread between the option strike price and the price of the underlying stock. An elective rule under § 1.482-7(d)(2)(iii)(B) provides that the costs attributable to stock options are taken into account in certain cases in accordance with the "fair value" of the option, as reported for financial accounting purposes either as a charge against income or in footnoted disclosures.

Commentators claimed that parties at arm's length would not use either of the alternatives prescribed in the proposed regulations because they would produce results that are too speculative or not sufficiently related to the employee services that are compensated. One commentator suggested that the final regulations should not limit taxpayers to the two prescribed measurement methods but rather should codify the current IRS administrative practice of permitting any reasonable method. In the commentator's view, a standard based on any reasonable method should permit the intrinsic-value method, which measures the difference between strike price and underlying stock value at date of grant, exclusive of time value. However, the commentator suggested that if Treasury and the IRS consider an element of time value indispensable, an alternative would be to require the use of the "minimum value" method, which accounts for the time value of stock options by assuming the underlying stock will grow at the risk-free interest rate.

These suggestions were not adopted. Treasury and the IRS believe that it is appropriate for regulations to prescribe guidance in this context that is consistent with the arm's length standard and that also is objective and administrable. As long as the measurement method is determined at or before grant date, either of the prescribed measurement methods can be expected to result in an appropriate allocation of costs among QCSA participants and therefore would be consistent with the arm's length standard. The results under the default measurement rule are consistent with what would occur under an arm's length agreement at or before the grant date to

take stock-based compensation into account at the date of exercise when more facts are known and therefore to share the risks associated with such compensation between the date of grant and the date of exercise. The results under the elective measurement rule are consistent with what would occur under an alternative arm's length agreement at or before the grant date to determine the value of the compensation up front and take such compensation into account at that time. With respect to the specific methods proposed by commentators, Treasury and the IRS believe that "intrinsic value" ignores significant elements of the economic value of stock-based compensation and "minimum value" ignores the important variable of volatility that enters into the economic pricing models used for financial reporting purposes.

The prescribed measurement methods are objective and administrable because they rely on valuations or measurements of stock-based compensation prepared for other purposes. The prescribed measurement methods do not require or permit valuations of stock-based compensation specifically for QCSA purposes. A standard under which the validity of the taxpayer's method would have to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis would be unduly difficult to administer and potentially could lead to significant disputes.

#### *D. General Rule of Measurement—§ 1.482-7(d)(2)(iii)(A)*

Under the default measurement rule, the amount taken into account for QCSA purposes generally is the amount allowable as a federal income tax deduction on exercise of the stock-based compensation. This amount generally is the "spread" between the option price and the fair market value of the underlying stock at the date of exercise.

One commentator suggested that this method would be improved if the amount taken into account for QCSA purposes were limited to the portion of the spread that accrued between date of grant and full vesting, as further prorated to reflect only the time during which the employee was engaged in cost-shared activities.

This suggestion has not been adopted in the final regulations. Treasury and the IRS believe that the grant-date identification rule already limits in an appropriate way the stock-based compensation taken into account. The purpose of the default measurement rule is to measure the amount attributable to stock-based compensation that must be taken into account under the grant-date identification rule. Accordingly, the default measurement rule does not