

i. Table of Contents

STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY OF WRITTEN THESIS	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
i. Table of Contents	iii
ii. List of Figures.....	vi
iii. List of Abbreviations	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Abstrak.....	ix
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Historical evolution of transfer-pricing regulation	1
1.2 Why DEMPE became necessary – the centrality of intangibles	2
1.3 Continuing Grey Areas and Problem Statement	3
1.4 Research questions	5
1.5 Research objectives.....	5
1.6 Scope and contribution of this thesis.....	6
1.7 Significance of the Study	6
Chapter 2 Literature review	7
2.1 Background and Evolution of Transfer Pricing and Intangibles	7
2.1.1 Origins of the Arm’s Length Principle (ALP)	7
2.1.2 Intangibles in Transfer Pricing Before BEPS.....	8
2.1.3 The BEPS Project and the DEMPE Concept.....	9
2.1.4 Consolidation and Ongoing Critiques	9
2.2 Conceptual Foundations of Transfer Pricing and Intangibles	10
2.2.1 The Arm’s Length Principle in Theory.....	10
2.2.2 Definition and Role of Intangible Assets	10
2.2.3 Valuation Methods for Intangibles	11
2.2.4 The DEMPE Framework as Theoretical Supplement	12
2.3 The DEMPE Framework in Theory	13
2.3.1 Origins and Evolution of DEMPE	13
2.3.2 Development	14

2.3.3 Enhancement	14
2.3.4 Maintenance.....	15
2.3.5 Protection.....	15
2.3.6 Exploitation.....	15
2.3.7 Scholarly Perspectives on DEMPE	16
2.4 Challenges in Applying DEMPE.....	16
2.4.1 Distinguishing Legal and Economic Ownership	16
2.4.2 Valuation of Marketing Intangibles.....	17
2.4.3 Hard-to-Value Intangibles (HTVI)	17
2.4.4 Divergent National Interpretations.....	17
2.5 Effectiveness of OECD BEPS Actions 8–10	18
2.5.1 Achievements of the BEPS Reforms	18
2.5.2 Limitations and Critiques	18
2.5.3 Overall Assessment.....	19
2.6 Documentation and Best Practices for Compliance	19
2.6.1 OECD Three-Tiered Documentation Framework	19
2.6.2 Judicial Expectations and Evidence-based Standards.....	19
2.6.3 Best Practices Identified in Literature	20
2.6.4 Compliance Burdens and Capacity Gaps	20
2.7 Identified Gaps in the Literature	20
Chapter 3 Research methodology.....	22
3.1 Research Methodology	22
3.2 Research Approach	22
3.3 Research Design	23
3.4 Sample and Data Collection	24
3.5 Data Analysis	25
3.6 Reliability and Validity	26
3.7 Ethical Issues.....	27
3.8 Chapter Summary and Link to Analysis	27
Chapter 4 Research analysis	27
4.1 Case A – The Coca-Cola Company & Subsidiaries v. Commissioner <i>U.S. Tax Court, 155 T.C. 10 (Nov. 18 2020)</i>	28
4.1.1 Transaction outline.....	28

4.1.2 DEMPE framework and disputed valuations.....	29
4.1.3 Conclusion Coca-cola.....	33
4.2 Case B – Medtronic Inc. & Consolidated Subsidiaries v. Commissioner (U.S. Tax Court T.C. Memo 2022-84; 8th Cir. dkt. 23-3063, argued 13 May 2025).....	34
4.2.1 Transaction outline.....	34
4.2.2 DEMPE framework and disputed valuations	35
4.2.3 Conclusion Medtronic.....	38
4.3 APAs/MAPs in practice Japan-focused framework and the Refinitiv (UK) case	39
4.3.1 Framework (APA/MAP in brief, aligned to DEMPE).....	39
4.3.2 The live stress test <i>Refinitiv (Thomson Reuters) v HMRC (UK Court of Appeal, 15 Nov 2024)</i>	42
4.3.3 Three-way perspective table (authority, taxpayer, OECD/Japan framework)	43
4.4 Case C – Unilin “Uniclic” (Belgium Court of Appeal, Ghent, 8 June 2021) Case No. 2016/AR/455	44
4.4.1 Transaction outline.....	44
4.4.2 DEMPE framework and disputed valuations.....	45
4.4.3 Conclusion Unilin	49
4.5 Case D – H1 A/S v. Skattestyrelsen Denmark, Østre Landsret (Eastern High Court), SKM2023.628.ØLR (29 Aug 2023)	50
4.5.1 Transaction outline.....	50
4.5.2 DEMPE framework and disputed valuations.....	50
4.5.3 Conclusion Skattestyrelsen Denmark	54
4.6 Case E – Ferragamo France v. Ministre de l’économie France, Cour administrative d’appel (CAA) de Paris, 2e chambre, 30 June 2022, No. 20PA03601.....	55
4.6.1 Transaction outline.....	55
4.6.2 DEMPE framework and disputed valuations	55
4.6.3 Conclusion	58
4.7 Case F – Austrian IP migration to Malta (VwGH, 27 November 2020, Ra 2019/15/0162).....	59
4.7.1 Transaction outline.....	59
4.7.2 DEMPE framework and disputed valuations	60
4.7.3 Conclusion	63
4.8 Cross-case Comparison and Integrated analysis.....	64

4.8.1 Cross-case comparison table	64
4.8.2 Cross-case integration and takeaways	69
4.9 Integrated of findings.....	70
Chapter 5 Discussion, Implications, and Limitations	71
5.1 Discussion	71
5.2 Implications.....	73
5.3 Limitations	74
Chapter 6 Conclusion and Recommendations	75
6.1 Conclusion	75
6.2 What this means for the research questions	76
6.3 Final takeaway	78
iv. Bibliography	xii

ii. List of Figures

Table 1: Coca-cola's transfer pricing dispute	31
Table 2: Medtronic's transfer pricing dispute	36
Table 3: three way MAP framework.....	44
Table 4: Unilin's transfer pricing dispute	47
Table 5: H1 A/S transfer pricing dispute	53
Table 6: Ferragamo's transfer pricing dispute.....	57
Table 7: M Gmbh's transfer pricing dispute.....	62
Table 8: Cross comparison.....	69