Collateral Damage:

Navigating the Punitive Reach of Section 8G Beyond its Anti-Avoidance Mandate

I. Introduction: A Legislative Misfire with Systemic Consequences

Within the intricate architecture of South Africa's tax legislation, specific anti-avoidance rules (SAARs) are intended to function as precision instruments, targeting clearly identified and impermissible tax avoidance schemes with minimal disruption to legitimate commercial activity. Section 8G of the Income Tax Act 58 of 1962 (the "Act"), however, stands as a prominent example of a legislative instrument whose considerable breadth has inflicted significant "collateral damage" far beyond its intended anti-avoidance mandate. Introduced to counter schemes designed to artificially inflate a company's Contributed Tax Capital (CTC) and facilitate tax-free distributions to foreign shareholders, its practical application has created profound and often punitive inefficiencies for commercially-driven foreign direct investment and routine intra-group funding transactions.

The core of the issue lies in the provision's ambiguous and expansive terminology, which inadvertently penalises genuine equity injections for organic growth and subsequent acquisitions within established multinational groups. The effect is the re-characterisation of what should be a tax-free return of invested capital into a taxable dividend, creating a material and frequently unexpected tax leakage that undermines the financial viability of inbound investment structures. This legislative overreach has now been officially conceded at the highest levels of policy-making. In a pivotal statement within the 2024/25 Budget Review, National Treasury explicitly acknowledged that section 8G "may affect legitimate corporate finance practices and limit South Africa's attractiveness as an investment destination," signalling a clear intent to consider legislative reform.

This official acknowledgement transforms the advisory landscape. The challenge is no longer merely to navigate a static and punitive rule, but to manage risk within a dynamic environment where the provision is known to be flawed and legislative amendment is imminent. This article presents a definitive analysis of this legislative anomaly. It will dissect the foundational principles of CTC that gave rise to section 8G, provide a forensic examination of the provision's mechanics and its deliberate ambiguities, and illustrate its unintended consequences through practical corporate finance scenarios. Furthermore, it will explore the provision's interaction with the General Anti-Avoidance Rule (GAAR) and other funding constraints, before concluding with an analysis of the path forward and the strategic imperatives for practitioners advising on inbound investment into South Africa. The core proposition is that the flawed design of section 8G necessitates a holistic, forward-looking advisory approach that accounts not only for the letter of the current law but also for the clear direction of future policy reform.

II. The Foundation: Contributed Tax Capital and the Genesis of Section 8G

A robust understanding of section 8G is impossible without a foundational grasp of Contributed Tax Capital (CTC). CTC is not an accounting or company law concept; it is a purely notional amount defined for tax purposes, designed to track the capital invested by shareholders into a company. Its primary function, since the replacement of the Secondary Tax on Companies (STC) with the current Dividends Tax regime on 1 April 2012, is to distinguish between distributions that constitute a return of this invested capital – which should be tax-free to the shareholder – and distributions of profits, which are subject to dividends tax.

CTC is determined separately for each class of shares. For a distribution to be treated as a return of capital, a company's directors must formally resolve to reduce CTC and notify shareholders accordingly; otherwise, any distribution is by default a "dividend" for tax purposes. For shares issued before the CTC regime commenced on 1 January 2011, the opening balance was derived from the company's share capital and share premium accounts, stripped of any capitalised profits. For shares issued on or after that date, CTC is simply the consideration received by the company for their issue. When a shareholder receives a return of capital, the amount reduces the base cost of their shares for Capital Gains Tax (CGT) purposes, with any excess over the base cost triggering an immediate capital gain.

This framework creates divergent preferences among shareholders. Resident companies often prefer to receive dividends, which are typically exempt from tax in their hands, whereas a return of capital would reduce their investment's base cost, potentially increasing a future capital gain. Conversely, non-resident shareholders, individuals, and trusts frequently prefer a return of capital to avoid the immediate 20% dividends tax liability. This tension, combined with a key mechanical feature of the CTC regime, created the perceived avoidance opportunities that prompted legislative intervention. This feature is the "averaging effect": when new shares in an existing class are issued, the new CTC contributed is pooled with the existing CTC for the entire class and averaged across all shares in that class. This mechanism can unintentionally shift CTC entitlement between shareholders, but it also opened the door for arrangements where CTC returns could be disproportionately streamed to non-resident shareholders who value them most.

The legislative response to this perceived mischief reveals a recurring pattern in South African tax policy: a reactive cycle where imperfect rules are introduced, their flaws are identified by the advisory community, and Treasury responds with more complex, and sometimes equally flawed, amendments. This is evident in the history of the provisos to the CTC definition itself, which saw an initial imperfect attempt to enforce pro-rata allocation, followed by a "botched" 2021 proposal that would have unfairly penalised legitimate share buy-backs, before a more refined rule was enacted in late 2022. This history of "catch-up" legislation, where rules are in a constant state of being fixed, provides the direct context for section 8G, which stands as another, far more problematic, product of this systemic approach to policy-making.

III. A Legislative Dissection: The Mechanics and Deliberate Ambiguities of Section 8G

Introduced with effect from 19 July 2017, section 8G was designed as a SAAR with a very specific target. Its explicit purpose, as detailed in the accompanying Explanatory Memorandum, was to prevent the artificial inflation, or "step-up," of a South African holding company's CTC base. The targeted scheme involved a non-resident parent company that already controlled a South African operating company (SA Opco). To create an inflated CTC base, the parent would interpose a new South African holding company (SA Holdco), transferring its SA Opco shares to SA Holdco in exchange for new SA Holdco shares issued at the current, higher market value. This would create a large CTC balance in SA Holdco, allowing future profits from SA Opco to be repatriated as tax-free returns of capital. Section 8G aims to neutralise this by limiting the CTC created in SA Holdco to the historical CTC of the underlying SA Opco shares.

For the provision to apply, a precise set of conditions must be met:

- **The Group Relationship:** Subsection (1) establishes a specific definition of a "group of companies." A "controlling group company" must hold, directly or indirectly, at least 50% of the equity shares or voting rights in each "controlled group company," and must directly hold at least 50% in at least one such controlled company.

- **The Triggering Transaction:** Subsection (2) contains the core trigger. It applies when a resident company (the "issuing company," e.g., SA Holdco) issues shares to a non-resident (the "subscribing company," e.g., Foreign Co). The critical conditions are that the consideration for these new shares consists of shares in another resident company (the "target company," e.g., SA Opco), or is used to acquire shares in that target company. Crucially, the target company must already form part of the same "group of companies" as the non-resident subscribing company *before* the transaction.

- **The Consequence:** When these conditions are met, the CTC created in the issuing company is not the value of the consideration provided. Instead, it is limited to an amount equal to the proportionate share of the target company's own CTC attributable to the shares being acquired, calculated with reference to the date the target first became part of the group.

The provision's damaging overreach stems not from its intended purpose, but from a deliberate legislative drafting choice to use broad, undefined terms, thereby granting the South African Revenue Service (SARS) maximum flexibility. This drafting philosophy, while common in anti-avoidance legislation, creates a fundamental tension between the need for taxpayer certainty and the fiscus's desire for effective enforcement tools. The most problematic terms are:

- **"Acquire":** This is the single most critical source of ambiguity. While it clearly includes the purchase of existing shares, its lack of a statutory definition creates a significant risk that SARS could interpret it to also include the *subscription for new shares* in a company. This broad interpretation is what extends section 8G's reach from a targeted anti-restructuring rule into a punitive tax on genuine equity funding for organic growth within an existing corporate group.

- **"Indirectly":** This word dramatically broadens the provision's scope, empowering SARS to look through multi-layered or complex funding arrangements to determine the ultimate use of funds. For example, cash injected into SA Holdco and then loaned to SA Opco could be seen as an "indirect" use of funds to acquire shares if SA Opco uses the loan proceeds for that purpose, thereby triggering section 8G on the initial equity injection.

This use of broad, ambiguous terms is a microcosm of the philosophy behind the GAAR itself. It effectively creates a situation where a SAAR begins to operate like a mini-GAAR, importing the uncertainty of substance-over-form principles into a specific rule that ought to provide clarity. This creates a legislative paradox: a SAAR is meant to offer more certainty than the GAAR for a specific transaction, but by being drafted so broadly, section 8G generates almost as much uncertainty as the GAAR within its own specific domain, a clear flaw in its legislative design.

IV. From Theory to Practice: The Punitive Impact on Legitimate Corporate Finance

The theoretical risks posed by section 8G's broad wording manifest as tangible and adverse tax consequences in common and legitimate corporate finance scenarios. The following case studies translates the abstract legal risk into a practical demonstration of the provision's "collateral damage" by showing a progression from a safe transaction to a clearly trapped one, and finally to a common transaction made dangerously uncertain.

Scenario A: The "Clean" Initial Acquisition

In this baseline scenario, a non-resident entity, Foreign Co, wishes to make a new investment in South Africa. It incorporates a new, wholly-owned South African subsidiary, SA Holdco, and subscribes for shares in SA Holdco for R100 million in cash. SA Holdco then uses this R100 million to acquire a 60% controlling stake in SA Opco, a South African target company that is, at the time of the acquisition, entirely *unrelated* to Foreign Co.

In this instance, section 8G is not triggered. The critical condition—that SA Opco and Foreign Co form part of the same group of companies *prior* to the transaction—is not met. The acquisition itself establishes the group relationship. Therefore, the CTC created in SA Holdco is the full R100 million of consideration received from Foreign Co. This is the intended and non-punitive outcome for a standard, arm's-length foreign direct investment. SA Holdco has a robust CTC base of R100 million that can be returned to Foreign Co in the future as a tax-free return of capital.

Scenario B: The "Tainted" Subsequent Acquisition of Group Company Shares

Continuing from the first scenario, SA Holdco now operates as the holding company for the 60% stake in SA Opco. A year later, the group decides to consolidate its holding by acquiring the remaining 40% of SA Opco from the minority shareholders for a price of R50 million. To fund this commercially sound consolidation, Foreign Co injects a further R50 million into SA Holdco by subscribing for new shares. For the purposes of this example, assume the proportionate CTC of SA Opco attributable to the 40% minority stake is only R1 million.

Here, section 8G is unequivocally triggered. SA Holdco (the "issuing company") is using consideration (R50 million) received from its non-resident shareholder, Foreign Co, to acquire shares in SA Opco. Crucially, at this point in time, SA Opco and Foreign Co are already part of the same group of companies due to the initial 60% acquisition. The consequence is severe: the CTC created in SA Holdco from this second R50 million injection is *not* R50 million. It is limited by section 8G to the proportionate CTC of the SA Opco shares being acquired, which is a mere R1 million. This means that R49 million of genuine equity funding is effectively re-characterised. Upon a future distribution, this R49 million cannot be returned as a tax-free reduction of CTC and will be treated as a dividend, subject to dividends tax at 20% (unless reduced by a treaty), resulting in a potential tax leakage of R9.8 million.

The legislative architecture of section 8G thus inadvertently creates a "first-mover disadvantage." The initial, commercially sound investment that establishes the group relationship becomes the very act—the "original sin"—that taints all subsequent equity funding for consolidation or growth within that group, regardless of its commercial merit. This creates a perverse incentive to either over-capitalize massively at the outset, which is capital-inefficient, or to use less flexible funding methods for future expansion.

Scenario C: The High-Risk Growth Funding

In this final, highly problematic scenario, Foreign Co wholly owns SA Holdco, which in turn wholly owns SA Opco. SA Opco requires R200 million in funding for a major capital expenditure project, such as building a new factory or expanding its operations. The group decides that the most appropriate way to fund this long-term organic growth is via an equity injection. Foreign Co injects R200 million cash into SA Holdco, which in turn uses the R200 million to *subscribe for new shares* in SA Opco.

This scenario's outcome hinges entirely on the interpretation of the undefined term "acquire." If SARS successfully argues that "acquire" includes the subscription for newly issued shares, then section 8G is triggered. The consideration from Foreign Co is being used by SA Holdco to "acquire" shares in SA Opco, a pre-existing group company. The result would be devastatingly punitive. The R200 million of CTC that should have been created in SA Holdco would be severely restricted, limited by reference to SA Opco's pre-existing CTC base, which might be negligible. This would effectively re-characterise the entire R200 million of growth capital, subjecting it to a potential R40 million dividends tax on future repatriation. This outcome would penalise one of the most routine and commercially essential transactions within any multinational group: the funding of organic growth.

V. A Tangible Diagnostic: Quantifying the Section 8G Risk

Effective tax advice in this complex area requires moving beyond qualitative warnings to a quantitative demonstration of the potential financial leakage. This enables corporate decision-makers to make fully informed choices about their funding and investment structures. The following table serves as a tangible diagnostic tool, crystallising the legislative risk of section 8G into concrete monetary terms by directly translating the abstract legal risk of "CTC limitation" into a quantified "Potential Dividend Tax Leakage". By contrasting the financial outcomes, the table provides an immediate and powerful illustration of the high stakes involved.

This quantitative analysis is invaluable for client communication, risk assessment, and justifying the need to consider alternative, and potentially more complex, structuring arrangements to mitigate the punitive effects of the provision.

Scenario	**Transaction Description**	**Foreign Co Investment**	**SA Holdco CTC Created**	**Potential Tax-Free Repatriation**	**Potential Dividend Tax Leakage (@20%)**
A: Initial Acquisition	Foreign Co funds SA Holdco to buy unrelated SA Opco	R100m	R100m	R100m	R0
B: Subsequent Acquisition	Foreign Co funds SA Holdco to buy remaining shares in now-related SA Opco	R50m	R1m (Limited by s8G)	R1m	R9.8m (on the R49m difference)
C: Growth Funding	Foreign Co funds SA Holdco to subscribe for new shares in related SA Opco	R200m	Severely limited by s8G (e.g., almost R0 if Opco CTC is low)	Almost R0	Approx. R40m (on the R200m difference)

VI. Navigating the Web: Interaction with GAAR and Alternative Funding Constraints

Section 8G does not operate in a legislative vacuum. Its punitive nature forces taxpayers to consider alternative funding structures, which are themselves subject to a complex web of other anti-avoidance provisions. This creates a challenging environment where taxpayers must navigate a narrow and treacherous channel between multiple competing restrictions. A holistic advisory perspective must therefore consider the interplay between section 8G, the GAAR, and the rules governing debt funding.

The Act employs a dual approach to combatting tax avoidance, with SAARs like section 8G targeting specific schemes and the overarching General Anti-Avoidance Rule (GAAR) in sections 80A to 80L serving as a broad, substance-based backstop. This is a critical interaction. Should a taxpayer devise a highly complex and artificial series of transactions to achieve a CTC step-up while technically avoiding the triggers of section 8G, SARS could invoke the GAAR to challenge the arrangement based on a lack of commercial substance. Crucially, the punitive nature of section 8G does not provide a taxpayer with a shield. A taxpayer cannot argue that because the most commercially sensible route is penalised by section 8G, any alternative structure they devise to avoid this penalty automatically has a "bona fide business purpose." Any mitigation strategy must be commercially robust and defensible in its own right.

Constraints on Alternative Funding: The Debt Route

Given the risks associated with equity injections, shareholder debt presents itself as a primary alternative for subsequent funding rounds. However, this route is not a simple safe harbour; it is heavily constrained by its own suite of anti-avoidance rules:

- **Section 23M:** This provision can limit the deductibility of interest paid by a South African borrower on debts owed to a person in a "controlling relationship" who is not subject to South African tax on the interest received. This directly targets inbound shareholder loans.

- **Section 31 (Transfer Pricing):** The interest rate charged on the loan, as well as the quantum of the debt itself, must be consistent with the arm's length principle. SARS can challenge both the interest rate and the amount of debt if they are not what independent parties would have agreed to.
- **Thin Capitalisation:** The arm's length test under section 31 effectively serves as South Africa's thin capitalisation rules. If SARS deems the level of debt to be excessive relative to equity, it can re-characterise the excessive portion of the debt as equity for tax purposes, thereby disallowing the associated interest deductions.

This legislative framework creates a "damned if you do, damned if you don't" scenario. The equity route is severely penalised by section 8G, while the alternative debt route is heavily constrained by sections 23M and 31. There is no easy or safe channel for funding South African operations, making holistic and integrated advice on the interaction of these rules essential.

VII. The Path Forward: Legislative Reform and Strategic Advisory in a Dynamic Environment

The legislative environment surrounding section 8G is not static; it is punitive but dynamic. The government's recent acknowledgements indicate that the provision's significant shortcomings have been recognised and that reform is on the horizon. This presents a strategic dilemma for investors: whether to proceed with transactions now and accept the punitive treatment in the hope of future relief, or to delay investment until legislative clarity is provided, thereby risking commercial opportunities.

The 2024/25 Budget Review's statement that "further refinements be considered to minimise any inadvertent tax consequences" is a direct and unambiguous signal that legislative amendments are on the agenda. This is not an isolated event. National Treasury's cautious approach to other complex CTC amendments, such as the decision to postpone the effective date of new rules on foreign currency-denominated CTC to allow for further stakeholder consultation, lends credibility to the expectation that any reform of section 8G will be undertaken carefully and deliberately. However, it should be noted that the 2025/26 budget was silent on any future proposed amendments to Section 8G.

While concrete proposals have not yet been tabled, the direction of potential reform can be anticipated. Plausible amendments could include:

- The introduction of a **"bona fide commercial purpose" exemption**, which would allow taxpayers to avoid the application of section 8G if they can demonstrate the transaction was not part of a scheme to artificially create CTC.
- An amendment to explicitly **define "acquire"** in a manner that excludes the subscription for new shares for the purpose of funding organic growth or capital expenditure.
- The introduction of a **time-based safe harbour**, where section 8G would not apply to funding transactions that occur more than a specified period after the initial acquisition that created the group relationship.

In this fluid environment, practitioners must adopt a forward-looking advisory approach. Client due diligence must extend beyond the immediate transaction to encompass a 3- to 5-year view of capitalisation and repatriation plans. Most importantly, practitioners must diligently monitor the release of the upcoming 2025 draft tax amendment bills. Based on historical timelines, these are typically published for public comment between July and August, making their release imminent. These bills will be the legislative vehicle for any formal proposals to reform this flawed provision.

VIII. Conclusion: A Call for Holistic Advisory in a Flawed Legislative Landscape

This analysis demonstrates that section 8G of the Income Tax Act, while conceived as a targeted anti-avoidance rule, functions in practice as a blunt instrument with significant and officially acknowledged collateral damage. Its broadly and ambiguously drafted terms create substantial and often unforeseen tax risks for routine and commercially necessary intra-group funding transactions, thereby acting as a material deterrent to foreign direct investment into South Africa.

The key takeaways for tax practitioners, corporate counsel, and policymakers are clear. First, effective advice in this area demands a holistic and long-term view of a client's investment strategy; a narrow, transactional focus is inadequate and exposes both the client and the advisor to significant risk. Second, the potential negative financial impact of section 8G must be clearly quantified to facilitate informed decision-making. Third, section 8G does not operate in isolation but is part of a complex web of restrictions, including the GAAR and rules governing debt funding, that must be navigated concurrently. Finally, while the current legislative environment is punitive, it is also dynamic. The government's acknowledgement of the problem is a welcome development that signals impending reform.

Practitioners and industry bodies must remain at the forefront of this legislative debate, engaging with National Treasury to help shape amendments that achieve the necessary balance between protecting the fiscus from abuse and fostering a stable, predictable, and attractive investment climate. Until such reforms are enacted, navigating the treacherous waters of section 8G will require the highest levels of strategic foresight and technical expertise.

Disclaimer

The above information is intended to provide general guidance with respect to the subject matter. This general guidance should not be relied on as a basis for undertaking any transaction or business decision, but rather the advice of a qualified tax consultant should be obtained based on a taxpayer's individual circumstances. Although our articles are carefully reviewed, we accept no responsibility in the event of any inaccuracy or omission. For further information please refer to the author.

Author

Dr Hendri Herbst
hherbst@renmere.co.za | T +27 83 784 8040

About WTS Renmere

Renmere is an independent tax and transaction advisory firm specializing in corporate and international tax structuring advice, solutions and support. Its diverse team has extensive experience, including as internal and independent external financial, legal and tax counsel.

Renmere provides services across all industries and undertakes assignments throughout South Africa and the rest of Africa. The team operates from offices in Stellenbosch and Johannesburg.

For more information contact us at:

T +27 (10) 900 3159 | renmere.co.za

About WTS Global

With representation in over 100 countries, WTS Global has already grown to a leadership position as a global tax practice offering the full range of tax services and aspires to become the preeminent non-audit tax practice worldwide. WTS Global deliberately refrains from conducting annual audits in order to avoid any conflicts of interest and to be the long-term trusted advisor for its international clients. Clients of WTS Global include multinational companies, international mid-size companies as well as private clients and family offices.

The member firms of WTS Global are carefully selected through stringent quality reviews. They are strong local players in their home market who are united by the ambition of building a truly global practice that develops the tax leaders of the future and anticipates the new digital tax world.

WTS Global effectively combines senior tax expertise from different cultures and backgrounds and offers world-class skills in advisory, in-house, regulatory and digital, coupled with the ability to think like experienced businesspeople in a constantly changing world.

For more information please see: wts.com

wts renmere
Transaction & Tax Advisory