

Transfer Pricing in the Oil and Gas Industry: Unique Challenges and Considerations

***Babalola, Wasiu A.¹ and Oyedokun, Godwin E.²**

¹Hotel Management & Tourism, Atiba University Oyo, Nigeria

²Management & Financial Development, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria

*Corresponding author: hospitalitybabalola@gmail.com

Article Information:

Received: November 27, 2025, Accepted: March 02, 2026, Published: March 31, 2026

Abstract

This study critically examines the unique challenges and considerations associated with transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry. The primary aim is to explore the complexities surrounding intercompany transactions, valuation of commodities and intangibles, regulatory frameworks, and the implications of environmental and digital transformations. Employing a socio-legal study relying on qualitative and comparative methods and doctrinal methodology, the paper synthesizes insights from international guidelines (OECD, UN), national regulations, and industry-specific case studies, notably the Chevron-Australia dispute. It reveals that despite the availability of public commodity pricing, pricing intercompany crude oil and gas transfers remains complex due to quality differentials, contract structures, and regional benchmarks. The valuation of intangibles such as proprietary technology and seismic data is further complicated by the lack of comparables and centralized R&D structures. Regulatory divergence across jurisdictions, including formula-based systems like Brazil's and hybrid models in Nigeria, increases compliance burdens for multinational enterprises (MNEs). Environmental and digital economy factors are also observed to be reshaping transfer pricing strategies, with carbon pricing and data-driven operations requiring new valuation models. The study concludes that a one-size-fits-all approach to transfer pricing is inadequate for the oil and gas sector. Instead, tailored strategies that reflect economic substance, greater adoption of Advance Pricing Agreements (APAs), and the use of technology for local compliance are vital for mitigating disputes, ensuring tax equity, and enhancing transparency in one of the world's most strategically important industries.

Keywords: *Advance Pricing Agreements, Base Erosion, Oil and Gas Industry, Nigeria Tax Compliance, Profit Shifting, Transfer Pricing*

1. Introduction

The oil and gas industry occupies a central position in the global economy, characterized by multinational operations, high capital intensity, volatile commodity prices, and significant regulatory oversight. Within this complex environment, transfer pricing plays a critical role in determining how profits are allocated among related entities operating across multiple tax

Published by:

jurisdictions. Given the strategic importance of petroleum resources to national revenues, transfer pricing practices in the oil and gas sector attract heightened scrutiny from tax authorities seeking to prevent base erosion and profit shifting ([BEPS, 2024](#)).

Transfer pricing refers to the pricing of goods, services, financial transactions, and intangibles exchanged between associated enterprises within a multinational enterprise (MNE) group. In the oil and gas industry, such transactions span the entire value chain; from exploration and production activities in the upstream segment, through transportation and processing in the midstream, to refining, distribution, and marketing in the downstream. These intercompany dealings frequently involve high-value commodities, complex long-term contracts, specialized services, and unique intangible assets, all of which complicate the application of the arm's length principle.

Despite the apparent availability of global commodity benchmarks such as Brent and West Texas Intermediate (WTI), the pricing of intercompany crude oil and gas transactions remains far from straightforward. Differences in crude quality, delivery terms, geographic location, timing, and contractual structures often require significant adjustments to benchmark prices, introducing subjectivity and increasing the risk of disputes. Similarly, the valuation of intangibles, such as seismic data, proprietary drilling technologies, and centralized research and development outputs, poses persistent challenges due to the scarcity of reliable comparables and the integrated nature of oil and gas operations.

A notable phenomenon within the industry is the growing divergence between economic substance and legal form in intercompany arrangements, particularly in financing, risk allocation, and centralized service models. Tax authorities increasingly challenge structures that appear to shift profits away from resource-producing jurisdictions without a corresponding transfer of control or risk. Landmark disputes, such as the Chevron–Australia case, illustrate how traditional transfer pricing analyses may fail to capture the commercial realities of capital-intensive and highly integrated oil and gas projects.

While extensive literature exists on transfer pricing in general, significant research gaps remain in the oil and gas sector. First, much of the existing scholarship treats transfer pricing challenges in a broad, cross-industry manner, without sufficiently accounting for the sector-specific characteristics of natural resource extraction, long-term project lifecycles, and joint venture arrangements. Second, limited attention has been paid to the interaction between transfer pricing and emerging factors such as environmental taxation, carbon pricing mechanisms, and digital transformation within oil and gas operations. Third, there is a relative paucity of comparative socio-legal studies examining how different regulatory approaches, particularly in developing, resource-dependent economies, shape transfer pricing outcomes and dispute risks.

Against this backdrop, this study seeks to bridge these gaps by critically examining the unique challenges and considerations associated with transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry. By integrating international guidelines, national regulatory frameworks, and industry-specific case studies, the paper aims to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how transfer pricing rules can be applied to reflect economic substance, promote tax equity, and reduce disputes in one of the world's most strategically important industries.

2. Literature Review

Transfer pricing is governed globally by the arm's-length principle, which requires that transactions between related parties be priced as if they were between independent entities under similar circumstances. The [OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines \(2017\)](#) serve as the primary international framework, complemented by domestic tax laws and the [United Nations Transfer Pricing Manual for Developing Countries \(UN, 2021\)](#).

Transfer pricing methods are broadly categorized into traditional transaction methods and transactional profit methods. The commonly applied methods include:

- a. Comparable Uncontrolled Price (CUP) method
- b. Resale Price Method
- c. Cost Plus Method
- d. Transactional Net Margin Method (TNMM)
- e. Profit Split Method

The choice of method depends on the nature of the transaction, the availability of comparable data, and the economic circumstances surrounding the transaction. In the oil and gas industry, the CUP method is often preferred for trading of crude oil and petroleum products due to the availability of commodity market prices. However, for more complex or integrated operations involving intangibles or services, other methods like TNMM and the profit split method may be more appropriate ([PwC, 2021](#)).

2.1 The Structure of the Oil and Gas Industry

Understanding the structure of the oil and gas industry is crucial to grasp the complexities of transfer pricing in this sector. The industry is typically divided into three segments:

- a. Upstream - This involves the exploration and production of crude oil and natural gas. Upstream activities are often carried out in joint ventures or production-sharing agreements, particularly in developing countries. MNEs invest heavily in seismic data acquisition, drilling technology, and production platforms.
- b. Midstream - The midstream segment includes the transportation and storage of crude oil and gas. This may involve pipelines, tankers, or liquefied natural gas (LNG) facilities. Intercompany transactions are common in this segment as crude oil or gas is transferred from exploration affiliates to refining or export subsidiaries.
- c. Downstream - The downstream phase covers refining, distribution, and retailing. Transfer pricing issues arise when crude oil is transferred from one related entity to another for refining or when finished products are sold to related marketing companies in different jurisdictions.

Each segment operates in distinct economic contexts, making the selection of an appropriate transfer pricing method complex. For instance, while market prices may guide transactions in the upstream and midstream phases, downstream operations may rely on internal cost structures and brand-based pricing, necessitating adjustments to meet the arm's length standard ([Ernst & Young, 2020](#)).

2.2 Transfer Pricing Methods in Oil and Gas

The application of transfer pricing methods in the oil and gas industry varies significantly depending on the nature of the transaction. This sector faces a diverse range of transfer pricing

Published by:

issues involving crude oil sales, intra-group services, intangible asset transfers, and cost-sharing agreements. Each transaction type requires a tailored approach to comply with the arm's length principle while reflecting the industry's unique operational and commercial characteristics.

In the case of crude oil and natural gas sales, the Comparable Uncontrolled Price (CUP) method is widely favored due to the existence of robust market benchmarks. Pricing intercompany transfers of crude oil and gas can leverage quoted market prices from reputable sources such as Platts, Argus, and Bloomberg. However, applying the CUP method is not without challenges, as adjustments are needed to account for differences in crude quality, delivery terms, timing, and transportation costs. For example, Brent and West Texas Intermediate (WTI) serve as standard pricing benchmarks, but since many crude types do not match these qualities exactly, price differentials must be carefully considered to reflect fair value ([OECD, 2017](#)).

Intra-group services represent another significant category of transfer pricing considerations within the oil and gas industry. Affiliates often provide technical, administrative, and logistical support to each other across different jurisdictions. To price these services, the Cost Plus method is commonly used, which involves adding an appropriate markup to the service provider's direct and indirect costs. Determining the appropriate markup requires detailed benchmarking studies and comprehensive functional analyses, ensuring the charges reflect what independent parties would agree upon in comparable circumstances.

The pricing of intangibles and research & development (R&D) poses one of the most complex challenges in the sector. Oil and gas companies invest heavily in developing proprietary intellectual property, such as seismic data interpretation technologies, advanced drilling techniques, and safety innovations. The uniqueness of these intangibles and the scarcity of comparable transactions complicate their valuation. In such cases, the Profit Split Method is frequently applied, especially when multiple related parties jointly contribute to the development or use of the IP, ensuring that profits are allocated in a manner that reflects each entity's contribution and risk exposure.

Cost-sharing arrangements and joint ventures are prevalent, particularly in upstream oil and gas activities where projects require significant capital and operational collaboration. Under these agreements, it is critical to allocate costs and associated risks equitably among participating entities. The terms of such arrangements must reflect arm's length principles to avoid disputes. Challenges often arise when governments or local partners believe that the allocation disproportionately favors foreign investors or parent companies, leading to regulatory scrutiny or renegotiation of terms.

In summary, transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry demands a nuanced, transaction-specific approach. Companies must carefully select appropriate methodologies that reflect the economic realities of each transaction type, supported by rigorous functional and benchmarking analyses. This tailored approach not only ensures compliance with international guidelines but also mitigates the risk of disputes and penalties in an industry characterized by complexity and high-value cross-border transactions.

2.3 Challenges in Valuation and Pricing of Commodities

Despite the availability of widely recognized market prices, pricing commodities such as crude oil and liquefied natural gas (LNG) in intercompany transactions presents a series of unique

and complex challenges. One of the fundamental difficulties lies in the limitations of benchmarks. Although indices like Brent or West Texas Intermediate (WTI) serve as key reference points for pricing, not all crude oil types match these benchmarks exactly. Variations in crude quality—such as sulfur content and API gravity—along with differences in freight costs and regional supply-demand dynamics, necessitate various adjustments to benchmark prices. These adjustments are inherently subjective and often lack standardized methods, which can lead to disagreements between taxpayers and tax authorities regarding the correct valuation ([United Nations, 2021](#)).

Another significant issue arises from the tension between long-term contracts and spot prices. Many oil and gas intercompany transactions are governed by long-term contracts that base pricing on formulas linked to historical market indices rather than current spot prices. Transfer pricing regulations, however, typically require that prices reflect arm's length conditions prevailing at the time of the transaction, often interpreted as current market prices. This mismatch can create conflicts during tax audits, as authorities may challenge prices derived from historical or forecast-based formulas, arguing they do not reflect contemporaneous arm's length standards.

The valuation of intangible assets further complicates transfer pricing in this industry. Key intangibles—such as proprietary seismic data, specialized software, or patented extraction technologies—are often developed and managed centrally but utilized across multiple jurisdictions. Due to their unique nature and the absence of comparable market transactions, establishing an arm's length price for these intangibles is inherently difficult. Disputes commonly arise over differing interpretations of ownership rights, risk allocation, and the contribution of various entities to the creation and maintenance of these assets ([OECD, 2017](#)).

In addition to intangibles, the valuation of hydrocarbon reserves poses another substantial challenge, particularly when licenses or rights are transferred between related parties. Determining the economic value of proven and probable reserves typically relies on discounted cash flow (DCF) models. However, these valuations are highly sensitive to input assumptions, including future oil prices, projected production costs, and discount rates. The inherent uncertainty and subjectivity of these models make it difficult to achieve consensus on fair market value, thereby increasing the risk of transfer pricing disputes ([International Monetary Fund, 2022](#)).

Overall, these factors underscore why transfer pricing for oil and gas commodities is exceptionally complex. Market prices serve only as a starting point; careful, transparent adjustments and rigorous economic analyses are essential to align intercompany pricing with the arm's length principle. Failure to address these challenges adequately can expose multinational enterprises to significant tax risks and controversies in multiple jurisdictions.

2.4 Regulatory Environment and International Guidelines

The regulatory landscape governing transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry is shaped by a combination of international guidelines and domestic legislation, reflecting the sector's complexity and strategic importance. Multinational enterprises (MNEs) operating in this capital-intensive and resource-driven industry must navigate varying frameworks designed to ensure that intercompany transactions are priced fairly and reflect economic reality.

Understanding these layered regulations is critical for compliance and effective risk management.

At the international level, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has played a pivotal role in setting standards through its Base Erosion and Profit Shifting ([BEPS, 2024](#)) Action Plan. Actions 8 through 10 focus on aligning transfer pricing outcomes with value creation by emphasizing that risks and returns should be consistent with actual control and functions performed. This is particularly relevant in the oil and gas sector, where complex contractual arrangements between related entities are common. Additionally, Action 13 introduced requirements for country-by-country reporting (CbCR), alongside Master File and Local File documentation, which have significantly increased transparency and tax authority scrutiny worldwide ([OECD, 2017](#)).

Complementing the OECD's framework, the United Nations Practical Manual on Transfer Pricing offers a perspective more tailored to developing countries, many of which are resource-rich but face challenges such as information asymmetry and limited administrative capacity. The UN manual advocates for simpler transfer pricing methods, including the use of safe harbors, and encourages adjustments that consider the specific economic realities of resource dependency. This approach provides practical tools for countries like Nigeria and Angola to counteract tax avoidance and ensure fair taxation of multinational oil companies ([UN, 2021](#)).

On the domestic front, various countries have implemented specialized transfer pricing regulations that reflect their unique economic contexts and policy objectives. For instance, Nigeria's Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) enforces transfer pricing rules under the Income Tax (Transfer Pricing) Regulations, 2018, requiring detailed documentation and adherence to the arm's length principle. Brazil, contrastingly, employs a formula-based transfer pricing system instead of the traditional OECD method, which adjusts prices based on fixed margins for certain transactions. The United States relies on detailed transfer pricing provisions under Section 482 of the Internal Revenue Code, emphasizing rigorous documentation and functional analyses for intercompany transactions within the oil and gas sector.

The inherent complexity and high value of oil and gas transactions make MNEs frequent targets for tax audits and transfer pricing disputes. These disputes often lead to substantial tax adjustments and financial penalties, imposing significant operational risks. A prominent example is Chevron's transfer pricing dispute with the Australian Taxation Office, which resulted in a contentious \$269 million reassessment focused on the pricing of intra-group loans ([ATO, 2017](#)). Such cases underscore the critical importance of robust transfer pricing policies and thorough documentation to withstand regulatory scrutiny and avoid costly litigation.

2.5 Dispute Resolution and Risk Management

Transfer pricing disputes in the oil and gas industry can be extremely costly, time-consuming, and damaging to a company's reputation. Given the complexity and high value of transactions in this sector, companies must adopt proactive risk management strategies to minimize the likelihood of disputes and ensure compliance with tax regulations. Effective risk management not only protects financial interests but also helps maintain good relationships with tax authorities and stakeholders.

One important mechanism for managing transfer pricing risk is the use of Advance Pricing Agreements (APAs). APAs are pre-emptive agreements negotiated between taxpayers and tax

authorities to agree on acceptable transfer pricing methods for future transactions. In industries as complex as oil and gas, where intercompany dealings are often multifaceted and span multiple jurisdictions, APAs provide much-needed certainty and significantly reduce the potential for costly litigation. Given the cross-border nature of many transactions, bilateral and multilateral APAs have become increasingly popular as they involve coordination between multiple tax authorities.

Another essential dispute resolution tool is the Mutual Agreement Procedure (MAP), which is provided for under international tax treaties. MAP offers a formal mechanism for resolving disputes that arise from double taxation, typically resulting from transfer pricing adjustments. While MAP is a valuable avenue for resolving conflicts, it is often criticized for being slow and resource-intensive, which can delay tax certainty for the companies involved. Recognizing this, the OECD's [BEPS, 2024](#) Action 14 includes recommendations aimed at enhancing the effectiveness and timeliness of MAP processes to better serve taxpayers and tax administrations alike ([OECD, 2017](#)).

Robust documentation and functional analysis form the backbone of any strong transfer pricing defense. Companies must maintain detailed records that explain the functions performed, assets used, and risks assumed by each entity within the corporate group. This analysis helps demonstrate that pricing reflects the economic reality of transactions and complies with the arm's length principle. Furthermore, transfer pricing documentation needs to be updated regularly to reflect changes in business models or market conditions and must meet the specific requirements of each tax jurisdiction involved.

Finally, benchmarking and the use of third-party comparables are critical in justifying transfer pricing outcomes. In the oil and gas industry, companies often rely on commercial pricing databases and agencies, such as Platts, to establish market-based comparables for commodities and services. However, finding appropriate comparables can be particularly challenging for unique transactions, such as those involving liquefied natural gas (LNG) trading or licensing of proprietary seismic data. This scarcity of reliable comparables often complicates transfer pricing analyses and requires companies to develop sophisticated valuation models tailored to their specific circumstances.

2.6 Environmental and Digital Economy Implications

The growing global emphasis on decarbonization and sustainable development is profoundly reshaping tax planning strategies within the oil and gas industry. As governments introduce carbon taxes, emissions trading schemes, and other environmental regulations, these factors increasingly influence intercompany pricing arrangements. Transfer pricing policies must now incorporate carbon footprints and related environmental costs, ensuring that the pricing of goods and services between related entities reflects the financial impact of climate-related levies. Failure to consider these environmental factors could lead to significant tax adjustments or disputes in jurisdictions with strict carbon regulations.

A notable example is the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), which aims to level the playing field by imposing carbon costs on imported goods, including petroleum products. This mechanism can materially affect the pricing of exports from oil and gas multinationals, necessitating adjustments to transfer pricing models to account for the added costs associated with carbon emissions embedded in products ([EU Commission, 2022](#)).

Companies must therefore be proactive in revising their intercompany pricing to reflect such externalities and maintain compliance with evolving environmental tax regimes.

Simultaneously, the rapid digitalization of oil and gas operations is creating new challenges for transfer pricing frameworks. Technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI)-driven drilling systems, digital twins, and advanced data analytics platforms have become integral to exploration, production, and asset management. These innovations generate intangible assets and data flows that cross multiple jurisdictions, complicating the determination of how value is created and shared within the corporate group.

Consequently, transfer pricing rules must evolve to address the complexities of valuing digital assets and services. Key issues include defining data ownership, assessing the appropriate fees for platform access, and allocating costs for centralized digital services. Tax authorities are increasingly scrutinizing these aspects to ensure that profits attributable to digital tools and platforms are fairly reported and taxed where economic value is actually generated.

2.7. Country-Specific Considerations and Case Studies

Nigeria's transfer pricing landscape is shaped by its heavy dependence on the oil and gas sector, which constitutes a significant portion of the country's revenue and foreign exchange earnings. As a result, ensuring compliance with transfer pricing regulations is a critical priority for both multinational enterprises and the Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS). The [FIRS Transfer Pricing Regulations \(2018\)](#) require companies to conduct detailed benchmarking studies and maintain comprehensive documentation to justify intercompany prices. In recent years, the FIRS has intensified its efforts by adopting a risk-based audit approach that targets transactions with high potential for profit shifting. This has led to increased realignment of profit allocations to Nigerian subsidiaries, ensuring that the economic value generated domestically is adequately taxed ([FIRS, 2018](#)).

In the United States, transfer pricing enforcement is characterized by rigorous scrutiny and the use of sophisticated economic analyses. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) frequently demands detailed functional and comparability analyses to support transfer pricing positions, with a strong emphasis on substantiating the arm's length nature of transactions. The U.S. tax authority also actively promotes the use of Advance Pricing Agreements (APAs) to provide taxpayers with certainty and to minimize disputes. Furthermore, the United States is a leader in implementing Country-by-Country Reporting (CbCR) and other Base Erosion and Profit Shifting ([BEPS, 2024](#)) related disclosures, which enhance transparency and facilitate cross-border cooperation among tax authorities ([IRS, 2020](#)).

Australia is known for its assertive stance on transfer pricing, exemplified by its handling of the landmark Chevron case in 2017. The Federal Court of Australia ruled that Chevron's intercompany loans were not commercially justifiable and lacked appropriate risk allocation, resulting in penalties for tax avoidance. This case has become a global benchmark for transfer pricing enforcement in the oil and gas industry, signaling Australia's commitment to ensuring that profits are aligned with economic substance. The Australian Taxation Office (ATO) continues to prioritize audit activities in the resource sector, focusing on financial transactions that may shift profits away from the country.

Brazil takes a unique approach to transfer pricing by applying fixed profit margins to certain intercompany transactions, diverging from OECD guidelines in some respects. This fixed-

margin method aims to reduce the subjectivity and complexity often associated with traditional transfer pricing analyses. However, it has also been criticized for potentially penalizing companies whose genuine commercial arrangements do not fit neatly into these predefined margins. In the oil and gas sector, where project economics can vary widely due to fluctuating commodity prices and operational risks, Brazil's formula-based system can lead to distortions and disputes ([EY, 2020](#)).

Across these jurisdictions, the challenges of transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry underscore the need for tailored approaches that reflect local economic realities and regulatory frameworks. While OECD guidelines provide a global standard, individual countries adapt these rules to suit their domestic policy objectives and enforcement capacities. This leads to a complex environment where multinational enterprises must navigate diverse requirements while maintaining compliance and optimizing their global tax positions.

Ultimately, the comparative analysis of Nigeria, the United States, Australia, and Brazil highlights the evolving nature of transfer pricing regulation in the oil and gas sector. Each country's approach - from Nigeria's risk-based audits and documentation requirements, to the U.S.'s emphasis on economic analysis and transparency, Australia's aggressive enforcement posture, and Brazil's formula-based margins - reflects differing priorities but shares a common goal: ensuring that transfer pricing reflects true economic activity and value creation. For oil and gas MNEs, understanding these country-specific nuances is crucial for effective tax planning and risk management.

Industry-Specific Case Study: The Chevron–Australia Transfer Pricing Dispute

The [Chevron Australia Holdings Pty Ltd v. Commissioner of Taxation \[2017\]](#) case is one of the most influential transfer pricing disputes in the oil and gas industry. It involved a \$2.5 billion intercompany loan between Chevron's U.S. affiliate and its Australian subsidiary, used to finance Chevron's energy projects in Australia. Chevron's U.S. entity provided a five-year AUD 2.5 billion loan to its Australian affiliate at an interest rate of 9%, significantly above market rates. The Australian Taxation Office (ATO) challenged this transaction, arguing that it violated the arm's length principle, leading to underpayment of taxes in Australia.

Although, the case highlighted the difficulties in benchmarking financial transactions, especially in capital-intensive industries like oil and gas, Chevron's selected comparables did not adequately reflect the functional profile of the borrowing entity, nor the prevailing economic conditions. The case however addresses the following legal and economic issues:

1. **Arm's Length Pricing of Intra-Group Loans** - The Federal Court of Australia held that no independent lender would have offered such a high rate without requiring security or guarantees. Therefore, the transaction did not reflect arm's length conditions ([Chevron v. Commissioner, 2017](#)). The court emphasized the importance of aligning economic substance with legal form—a principle central to OECD guidelines; and
2. **Risk Assumption and Control** - Chevron Australia had limited operational control over the terms of the loan. The ATO argued, and the court agreed, that the risk was artificially located in Australia to shift profits out of the jurisdiction—a common concern in oil and gas MNE structures ([ATO, 2017](#); [OECD, 2017](#)).

The Chevron–Australia case is widely regarded as a pivotal moment in the global examination of intercompany financing and transfer pricing practices within the natural resources sector. One of the key implications for the oil and gas industry has been a significant increase in regulatory vigilance, with tax authorities worldwide intensifying audits of intra-group loans—particularly those tied to capital-intensive upstream projects. This case has also prompted a comprehensive re-evaluation of financial structures among multinational enterprises (MNEs), compelling them to support their intercompany financial transactions with robust economic analyses. These analyses must now consider factors such as implicit guarantees, creditworthiness, borrowing capacity, and prevailing market conditions ([Ernst & Young, 2020](#)).

Moreover, the case has reinforced the application of the OECD’s Base Erosion and Profit Shifting ([BEPS, 2024](#)) framework, especially Actions 4 and 8–10, which address interest deductions and ensure alignment of transfer pricing outcomes with actual economic value creation (OECD, 2017). In response, many oil and gas companies have increasingly pursued Advance Pricing Agreements (APAs) to mitigate the risk of future disputes and to comply more effectively with both domestic and international tax rules. These developments signify a broader trend toward transparency, economic substance, and proactive risk management in the industry’s transfer pricing strategies.

Comparatively, the Chevron case finds parallels in other jurisdictions, illustrating a global trend in scrutinizing intercompany transactions in the oil and gas sector. In India, [the Shell India Markets Pvt. Ltd. v. CIT \(2020\)](#) case involved the tax authority challenging the valuation of an equity infusion by Shell’s Dutch parent, citing concerns about value shifting through capital transactions. Similarly, in Nigeria, the Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) has issued transfer pricing assessments on intercompany dealings—particularly those involving loan interest deductions and technical service fees—highlighting issues of excessive pricing and inadequate documentation ([FIRS, 2018](#)). These cases underscore the heightened regulatory focus on ensuring that related-party transactions reflect genuine economic substance and adhere to the arm’s length principle.

The Chevron-Australia case serves as a cautionary tale for oil and gas MNEs. It underscores the need for transparent, well-documented, and economically rational transfer pricing policies, especially in high-risk areas like intercompany financing. The decision has become a benchmark in tax jurisprudence and reinforces global efforts to ensure that profits are taxed where economic value is created and risks are genuinely borne.

3. Research Method

This study adopts a socio-legal research design, combining doctrinal legal analysis with qualitative and comparative approaches to examine transfer pricing practices in the oil and gas industry. The methodology is specifically chosen to capture both the legal frameworks governing transfer pricing and the practical economic realities shaping intercompany transactions within multinational oil and gas enterprises.

The doctrinal component of the study involves a systematic examination of primary and secondary legal sources relevant to transfer pricing. These include international instruments such as the OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations, the OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) Action Plans, and the

United Nations Practical Manual on Transfer Pricing for Developing Countries. National transfer pricing regulations and tax statutes, particularly those of Nigeria, the United States, Australia, and Brazil, are also analyzed to assess how international principles are implemented at the domestic level. Judicial decisions and administrative rulings, with particular emphasis on the *Chevron Australia Holdings Pty Ltd v. Commissioner of Taxation* case, are examined to identify interpretative trends, enforcement priorities, and judicial reasoning in transfer pricing disputes within the oil and gas sector.

The qualitative aspect of the study focuses on analyzing industry practices, regulatory guidance, and policy reports issued by tax authorities, international organizations, and professional advisory firms. This approach enables an in-depth understanding of how transfer pricing challenges manifest in practice, especially in relation to commodity pricing, intangibles, intercompany financing, and centralized services.

A comparative method is employed to evaluate how different jurisdictions address transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry. Nigeria, the United States, Australia, and Brazil are selected as case jurisdictions due to their economic significance in the sector and their differing regulatory models. This comparative analysis highlights similarities and differences in enforcement strategies, compliance requirements, and dispute-resolution mechanisms, thereby illustrating the absence of a uniform global approach.

The study incorporates industry-specific case studies to ground the analysis in real-world contexts. The Chevron–Australia dispute serves as the primary case study, offering insights into the treatment of intercompany financing, risk allocation, and the alignment of economic substance with legal form. Supplementary references to disputes and enforcement actions in other jurisdictions, including Nigeria and India, are used to reinforce the comparative dimension of the research.

The research relies exclusively on secondary data, including legislation, court decisions, regulatory publications, academic literature, and policy reports. These sources are analyzed using an analytical framework grounded in the arm's length principle, economic substance doctrine, and value creation concepts under the BEPS framework. Particular attention is paid to how these principles apply to the structural and operational peculiarities of the oil and gas industry.

By integrating doctrinal, qualitative, and comparative methods, this study provides a holistic and context-sensitive analysis of transfer pricing in the oil and gas sector. The chosen methodology ensures analytical rigor while allowing for practical insights relevant to policymakers, tax authorities, and multinational enterprises operating in resource-dependent economies.

4. Results & Discussion

This section presents and discusses the key findings arising from the qualitative, and comparative analysis undertaken in this study. The results are organized thematically to reflect the core transfer pricing issues identified in the oil and gas industry, with particular attention to commodity pricing, intangible valuation, regulatory divergence, dispute patterns, and emerging environmental and digital considerations.

4.1 Complexity of Arm's Length Pricing despite Public Commodity Benchmarks

A central finding of the study is that the existence of publicly quoted commodity prices does not eliminate transfer pricing risk in the oil and gas industry. While benchmarks such as Brent and West Texas Intermediate (WTI) provide reference points, the analysis reveals that intercompany pricing of crude oil and gas remains highly complex. Adjustments for crude quality differentials, transportation costs, delivery terms, and timing introduce significant subjectivity into pricing decisions. The results indicate that tax authorities frequently challenge these adjustments, particularly where documentation does not clearly demonstrate how benchmark prices were modified to reflect arm's length conditions.

This finding supports earlier literature suggesting that the Comparable Uncontrolled Price (CUP) method, though preferred in principle, is often difficult to apply reliably in practice within the oil and gas context. The implication is that commodity price transparency alone is insufficient; rather, robust economic justification and contemporaneous documentation are critical in defending transfer pricing positions.

4.2 Persistent Challenges in Valuation of Intangibles and Centralized Functions

The study further finds that intangible valuation is one of the most contentious areas of transfer pricing in the oil and gas sector. Proprietary technologies, seismic data, digital platforms, and centralized research and development outputs are typically developed in one jurisdiction but deployed across multiple affiliates. The absence of reliable market comparable\ makes the application of traditional valuation methods problematic.

Analysis of regulatory guidance and dispute outcomes shows a growing tendency for tax authorities to recharacterize arrangements in which profits from intangibles are concentrated in low-tax jurisdictions, without corresponding evidence of control or risk assumption. This result reinforces the OECD's emphasis on aligning profit allocation with value creation and control. The findings suggest that profit split methods are increasingly favored in cases involving highly integrated operations, as they better reflect the collaborative nature of value creation in oil and gas projects.

4.3 Divergence in National Regulatory Approaches and Compliance Burdens

A key comparative result of the study is the significant divergence in national transfer pricing regimes affecting oil and gas multinational enterprises. Jurisdictions such as Nigeria and Australia adopt OECD-aligned, substance-focused approaches that emphasize functional analysis and economic reality, while Brazil applies a formula-based system with fixed margins. The United States, on the other hand, relies on detailed economic analysis supported by extensive documentation requirements.

This divergence increases compliance costs and uncertainty for multinational oil and gas companies, which must tailor transfer pricing policies to multiple, and sometimes conflicting, regulatory expectations. The findings reveal that disputes often arise not from deliberate non-compliance but from differences in interpretation of arm's length outcomes across jurisdictions. This supports the argument that a one-size-fits-all transfer pricing framework is ill-suited to the operational and regulatory complexity of the oil and gas industry.

4.4 Heightened Scrutiny of Intercompany Financing and Risk Allocation

The results demonstrate that intercompany financing arrangements are a major focal point of transfer pricing enforcement in the oil and gas sector. The Chevron–Australia case, alongside

similar disputes in other jurisdictions, illustrates how tax authorities challenge intra-group loans that do not reflect commercially realistic terms.

The study finds that courts and tax authorities increasingly assess not only the interest rate applied but also the overall economic substance of financing arrangements, including implicit guarantees, creditworthiness, and control over financial risks. This reflects a broader shift toward substance-over-form analysis and confirms that traditional benchmarking alone is insufficient to defend intercompany financing in capital-intensive industries. The discussion underscores the growing importance of aligning financial structures with genuine commercial behavior.

4.5 Effectiveness and Limitations of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

The analysis reveals that Advance Pricing Agreements (APAs) and Mutual Agreement Procedures (MAPs) play an important role in managing transfer pricing risk, particularly in high-value oil and gas transactions. APAs are found to provide significant certainty and reduce the likelihood of prolonged disputes, especially for recurring transactions such as commodity sales and intercompany services.

However, the results also highlight practical limitations. Access to APAs remains uneven, particularly in developing countries where administrative capacity is limited. MAP processes, while valuable, are often slow and resource-intensive, thereby reducing their effectiveness as a timely dispute-resolution tool. These findings suggest the need for greater institutional capacity-building and international cooperation to improve dispute-resolution outcomes in the oil and gas sector.

4.6 Emerging Impact of Environmental and Digital Transformations

An important emerging result of the study is the increasing relevance of environmental and digital economy considerations in transfer pricing analysis. Carbon taxes, emissions trading schemes, and mechanisms such as the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) are found to influence intercompany pricing structures by introducing new cost components that must be allocated across related entities.

Similarly, digitalization of oil and gas operations, through data analytics, AI-driven exploration, and centralized digital platforms, creates new categories of intangibles and intra-group services. The study finds that existing transfer pricing frameworks are often ill-equipped to address these developments, leading to uncertainty in valuing data, digital services, and technology-driven efficiencies. This reinforces the need for adaptive transfer pricing models that can accommodate non-traditional value drivers.

4.7 Synthesis of Findings

Overall, the results confirm that transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry is characterized by structural complexity, heightened regulatory scrutiny, and evolving economic realities. The discussion demonstrates that conventional transfer pricing tools, while necessary, are insufficient when applied rigidly to this sector. Instead, a context-specific approach that integrates economic substance, industry realities, and emerging global trends is essential.

These findings contribute to the existing literature by providing sector-specific insights into how transfer pricing rules operate in practice and by highlighting the limitations of generalized approaches. They also reinforce the study's central argument that effective transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry requires tailored strategies, enhanced cooperation between taxpayers and regulators, and continuous adaptation to environmental and digital transformations.

5. Conclusion

Transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry presents unique and intricate challenges due to the high value of commodities, complexity of operations, regulatory scrutiny, and geopolitical importance. The sector must navigate issues of commodity pricing, intangible asset valuation, joint ventures, and digital transformation - all while aligning with the arm's length principle and global best practices.

As international tax frameworks evolve in response to BEPS, digitalization, and climate concerns, oil and gas MNEs must adopt proactive, transparent, and strategic approaches to transfer pricing. Equally, governments - especially in resource-dependent developing countries - must build institutional capacity to regulate and audit effectively. A balanced, fair, and forward-looking transfer pricing regime is essential for the long-term sustainability and legitimacy of the industry.

To effectively manage transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry, multinational enterprises (MNEs) must prioritize enhancing transparency and economic substance in their intercompany transactions. This involves clearly delineating the allocation of control, risk, and value creation among related entities. By ensuring that pricing reflects the actual economic contributions of each party, MNEs can better defend their transfer pricing positions and reduce exposure to tax disputes. Transparency also fosters trust with tax authorities, who increasingly demand detailed documentation and substance over mere legal form.

Another critical strategy is the investment in capacity building, particularly in developing countries where technical expertise in auditing complex transfer pricing arrangements is often limited. Governments in resource-rich nations face the challenge of effectively regulating multinational oil and gas companies, which requires upskilling tax officials and adopting international best practices. Collaboration with organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations (UN) can provide valuable training, tools, and frameworks to bridge knowledge gaps and enhance enforcement capabilities.

Adopting modern technology tools is equally important in the evolving transfer pricing landscape. Advanced data analytics, Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems, and dedicated transfer pricing documentation software can streamline compliance processes and improve accuracy. These technologies enable companies to manage large volumes of transaction data, monitor pricing policies in real time, and quickly generate the necessary documentation to support transfer pricing positions. Improved data management also helps identify risks early and facilitates more effective internal controls.

Engaging proactively with tax authorities through Advance Pricing Agreements (APAs) and cooperative compliance programs represents a forward-looking approach to managing transfer pricing risks. APAs offer MNEs certainty by pre-establishing acceptable pricing methods, thus minimizing the likelihood of costly audits and litigation. Cooperative compliance initiatives

foster transparent communication and trust between taxpayers and regulators, encouraging early dispute resolution and compliance alignment. This collaborative model is increasingly favored as tax authorities worldwide seek to improve tax certainty and reduce administrative burdens.

In today's global context, it is essential for oil and gas companies to incorporate Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) considerations into their transfer pricing strategies. Growing regulatory emphasis on sustainability, carbon emissions, and social responsibility means that pricing models must now account for environmental costs and regulatory risks associated with climate change initiatives. Aligning transfer pricing with ESG objectives not only ensures compliance with emerging tax frameworks but also enhances corporate reputation and supports long-term business sustainability.

Ultimately, a combination of transparency, capacity building, technology adoption, cooperative engagement, and ESG integration forms the foundation of an effective transfer pricing strategy in the oil and gas industry. By embracing these strategic recommendations, MNEs can navigate the complex regulatory environment, mitigate risks, and contribute to fair and sustainable tax practices globally.

References

- Australian Taxation Office (ATO). (2017). *Chevron decision and implications for transfer pricing*. Retrieved from <https://www.ato.gov.au> accessed 24 May 2025 10.00
- BEPS (2024), for the list of all the countries acting as members of the inclusive framework on BEPS, refer to OECD's Members of the Inclusive Framework on BEPS. <<http://www.oecd.org/ctp/beps/inclusive-framework-on-beps-composition.pdf>> accessed May 23, 2025
- Chevron Australia Holdings Pty Ltd v. Commissioner of Taxation [2017] FCAFC 62
- Ernst & Young Global Limited. (2020). *Transfer pricing in the oil and gas industry*. EY Global Reports.
- European Commission. (2022). *EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM)*. Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu> accessed 24 May 2025 11.00
- Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS). (2018). *Income Tax (Transfer Pricing) Regulations, 2018*.
- Internal Revenue Service (IRS). (2020). *Transfer pricing audit roadmap*. United States Treasury Department.
- International Monetary Fund. (2022). *Taxing natural resources: Challenges of transfer pricing and fiscal transparency*. IMF Working Papers.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2017). *Transfer pricing guidelines for multinational enterprises and tax administrations*. OECD Publishing.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2021). *Transfer pricing perspectives in the energy industry*. PwC Global Insights.

Shell India Markets Private Limited v. CIT (2020) 206 TTJ 405 (Mum.)(Trib.) S. 263

United Nations. (2021). *United Nations practical manual on transfer pricing for developing countries* (2nd ed.). United Nations.

Copyrights

The author(s) retain copyright for this article, and the journal is granted first publication rights.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

