

## PRESENTERS



### **Vivian Cheng, Chapman Tripp, Wellington**

Vivian is an experienced tax practitioner who advises on all aspects of New Zealand tax law, with particular expertise in corporate restructuring, mergers and acquisitions, financing transactions and cross border taxation. She has been with Chapman Tripp since 2012 and was previously a Special Counsel at another New Zealand law firm.



### **Patrick McCalman, Deloitte, Wellington**

Patrick is a Tax Partner with Deloitte. Before joining Deloitte in 2010, he led the New Zealand tax functions for ANZ and prior to that Westpac. Patrick's in-house experience brings a depth of experience across a range of tax disciplines, and his mix of corporate and professional services experience brings a balanced understanding to the management of tax issues.

*The statements and conclusions contained in this paper are those of the author(s) only and not those of the New Zealand Law Society. This booklet has been prepared for the purpose of a Continuing Legal Education course. It is not intended to be a comprehensive statement of the law or practice, and should not be relied upon as such. If advice on the law is required, it should be sought on a formal, professional basis.*

# CONTENTS

## RETHINKING COMMITMENT – THE CAPITAL/REVENUE DIVIDE POST-TRUSTPOWER .. 1

INTRODUCTION .....	1
RECAP OF THE FACTS .....	1
HISTORY OF THE DISPUTE .....	2
<i>The Commissioner’s position</i> .....	2
<i>Trustpower’s position</i> .....	3
<i>Adjudication Unit and reassessments</i> .....	3
<i>High Court</i> .....	3
<i>Court of Appeal</i> .....	4
THE SUPREME COURT’S APPROACH.....	4
<i>Unconstrained by the Interpretation Statement</i> .....	4
<i>General permission not at issue</i> .....	5
<i>Commitment approach not helpful to the capital limitation analysis</i> .....	5
<i>General approach that expenditure relating to a possible capital asset is capital in nature</i> .....	6
<i>Trustpower’s expenditure represented tangible progress towards completion of capital projects and is therefore on capital account</i> .....	8
<i>Limited exception to the general approach for preliminary expenditure</i> .....	8
WHERE DOES THE TRUSTPOWER DECISION LEAVE US?.....	8
<i>Interpretation Statement can no longer be relied on</i> .....	9
<i>The test for distinguishing between capital and revenue expenditure</i> .....	9
<i>Where is the capital/revenue boundary now?</i> .....	9
POLICY CONSIDERATIONS .....	11
<i>Is a policy response needed?</i> .....	11
<i>How might a policy response to the issue be framed?</i> .....	11
<i>When should expenditure undertaken in assessing the feasibility of a course of action be deductible as ordinary business expenditure?</i> .....	12
<i>Where such expenditure is capital in nature, how should tax recognise the use of that capital asset and reflect any loss in its value?</i> .....	14
CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	16