

Substance in International Tax Law
DEMPE Approach, Substantial Activity
Requirement and Beneficial Ownership

Florian Navisotschnigg

Wolters Kluwer

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1	
Setting the Scene	1
1.1 The Meaning of Substance in International Tax Law	1
1.2 Central Importance of Intangibles in the OECD BEPS Project	4
1.3 Substance in the OECD BEPS Project	5
1.3.1 Background	5
1.3.2 Substance in the Area of Transfer Pricing: DEMPE Approach (BEPS Action 8)	6
1.3.3 Substance in the Area of Harmful Tax Practices: Substantial Activity Requirement (BEPS Action 5)	8
1.4 Substance Pre-BEPS: Substance in the Area of Tax Treaties - Beneficial Ownership	9
1.5 IP Companies as Today's Business Reality	11
1.6 Scope of the Study	13
CHAPTER 2	
Substance in the Area of Transfer Pricing: DEMPE Approach	17
2.1 Background	17
2.2 Analytical Framework for Transactions Involving Intangibles	19
2.3 Intangibles in the Context of the OECD TPG 2017	20
2.4 Contractual Arrangements and Intangible Ownership	22
2.4.1 Relevance of Contractual Arrangements	22
2.4.2 Relevance of Legal Ownership	23
2.4.3 Economic Ownership and Functional Ownership	26
2.5 Functional Analysis and Substance	28
2.5.1 Introduction	28
2.5.2 Substance Requirements with Regard to Functions	29
2.5.2.1 Important Functions	29
2.5.2.2 Outsourcing	30
2.5.3 Substance Requirements with Regard to Risks	31

Table of Contents

2.5.3.1	New Framework for Risk Allocation	31
2.5.3.2	Control over Risk	32
2.5.3.3	Financial Capacity to Assume the Risk	34
2.5.4	Substance Requirements with Regard to Assets	35
2.5.4.1	Cash Boxes as Targets of the BEPS Project	35
2.5.4.2	Provision of Funding and Control over Operational Risks	36
2.5.4.3	Provision of Funding and Control over Financial Risks	37
2.5.4.4	Mere Provision of Funding	39
2.5.5	Synopsis	39
2.6	Recognition of the Accurately Delineated Transaction	42
2.7	Compatibility of the New Requirements with the Arm's-Length Principle	44
2.8	New Application of the Arm's-Length Principle	47
2.9	Approaches to Determine Substance in Practice: Value Contribution Analysis and RACI Analysis	50
2.10	Preliminary Conclusions	53
CHAPTER 3		
Substance in the Area of Harmful Tax Practices: Substantial Activity Requirement		
		55
3.1	R&D Incentives and Harmful Tax Competition	55
3.2	The Substantial Activity Requirement with Regard to Preferential IP Regimes: Modified Nexus Approach	58
3.2.1	Background	58
3.2.2	Analytical Framework: The Nexus Formula	60
3.2.3	Qualifying Taxpayers	61
3.2.4	IP Assets in the Context of the Modified Nexus Approach	62
3.2.5	Relevance of Legal Ownership	65
3.2.6	Nexus Ratio and Substance	68
3.2.6.1	Introduction	68
3.2.6.2	Qualifying Expenditures	68
3.2.6.3	Outsourcing	71
3.2.6.4	Acquisition of IP	73
3.2.6.5	Uplift	74
3.2.6.6	Overall Expenditures	76
3.2.6.7	Synopsis	79
3.2.7	Overall Income	81
3.2.8	Illustrative Example	84
3.2.9	Tracking	85
3.2.10	Rebuttable Presumption	88
3.3	The Substantial Activity Requirement with Regard to No or Only Nominal Tax Jurisdictions: Core Income Generating Activities	91
3.3.1	Core Income Generating Activities for Preferential Non-IP Regimes as a Starting Point	91

Table of Contents

3.3.2	Core Income Generating Activities for No or Only Nominal Tax Jurisdictions	94
3.3.3	Core Income Generating Activities with Regard to IP Income	95
3.3.4	Exceptional Cases and Rebuttable Presumption	98
3.4	Preliminary Conclusions	100
CHAPTER 4		
	Substance in the Area of Tax Treaties: Beneficial Ownership	103
4.1	Introduction	103
4.2	Historical Evolution	104
4.2.1	1977: Introduction into the OECD MC	104
4.2.1.1	Background	104
4.2.1.2	Content	106
4.2.1.3	Analysis: Normative Meaning of the Concept?	107
4.2.2	1986: OECD Conduit Companies Report	111
4.2.2.1	Background	111
4.2.2.2	Content	111
4.2.2.3	Analysis: New Direction for the Beneficial Ownership Test	112
4.2.3	1995/1997: Update of the OECD MC	113
4.2.3.1	Background	113
4.2.S.2	Content	113
4.2.S.3	Analysis: Beneficial Ownership Tested on a Territorial Level	114
4.2.4	1998: OECD Report on Harmful Tax Competition	116
4.2.4.1	Background	116
4.2.4.2	Content	116
4.2.4.3	Analysis: Beneficial Ownership as a General Anti-avoidance Rule?	116
4.2.5	1999: OECD Partnership Report	119
4.2.5.1	Background	119
4.2.5.2	Content	119
4.2.5.3	Analysis: Beneficial Ownership as an Attribution-of-Income Rule?	119
4.2.6	2003: Update of the Commentary	122
4.2.6.1	Background	122
4.2.6.2	Content	123
4.2.6.3	Analysis: Normative Meaning Added with the 2003 Commentary	124
4.2.7	2010: CIV Report	125
4.2.7.1	Background	125
4.2.7.2	Content	126
4.2.7.3	Analysis: Relevance of the Functions Performed	126
4.2.8	2014: Update of the Commentary - Forwarding Approach	129
4.2.8.1	Background	129

Table of Contents

4.2.8.2	Content	130
4.2.8.3	Analysis: Irrelevance of Substance under the Beneficial Ownership Test	132
4.2.9	2017: Update of the OECD MC and the Commentary - PPT as a New Tool to Tackle Conduit Companies	135
4.2.9.1	Background	135
4.2.9.2	Content	135
4.2.9.3	Analysis: Relevance of Substance under the PPT	136
4.3	Preliminary Conclusions	138
CHAPTER 5		
	Comparison Between DEMPE Approach, Substantial Activity Requirement and Beneficial Ownership	141
5.1	DEMPE Approach and Substantial Activity Requirement	141
5.1.1	DEMPE Approach and Modified Nexus Approach	141
5.1.2	Modified Nexus Approach and Core Income Generating Activities	144
5.2	Beneficial Ownership (Substance Pre-BEPS) Versus Substance in the BEPS Project	146
5.3	Beneficial Ownership and the PPT: Changed Perception on the Relevance of Substance with the BEPS Project	150
5.4	Proposed Solution: Beneficial Ownership Without Normative Meaning and Deletion from the OECD MC	152
5.5	Excursus: New Direction of the OECD with Regard to Substance?	155
5.6	Preliminary Conclusions	157
CHAPTER 6		
	Conclusions	161
	Bibliography	171
	Index	189