



ILLINOIS STATE
BAR ASSOCIATION

CORPORATION, SECURITIES & BUSINESS LAW FORUM

The newsletter of the ISBA's Section on Corporation, Securities & Business Law

Valuing private company stock: Determining fair market value for purposes of §409A

By Alan R. Singleton, SINGLETON@SINGLETON.LAW.PRO

Introduction

Internal Revenue Code §409A requires all non-qualified stock options and stock appreciation rights to have exercise prices set at or above the fair market value of the underlying stock at the time the grant is made. This seems simple enough, on its face requiring minor modifications to your clients' stock option plans. In fact it is simple for companies whose stock is traded on an established securities market, since the stock is valued by market transactions on a daily basis.

But how are private companies to value their stock? These companies are

not supplied with a daily market value, arms length sales of stock to third parties may be few and far between and, particularly for start-up companies, they may experience significant value-changing events on a frequent basis. The challenge presented by §409A for these types of companies is selecting, implementing and paying for a valuation of their stock that will meet the standard of reasonableness set out by the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") in the proposed regulations and subsequent notices.

The requirements of §409A for your clients can be divided into two areas. First, corrective action and reporting with respect to past grants of options with exercise prices below market value. These are important considerations, and should be examined as soon as practicable to determine whether violations have occurred and to mitigate any related penalties.

The focus of this article, however, is on helping your client select the best valuation method to minimize exposure with respect to §409A by ensuring that the method used is at least "reasonable" and ideally one that raises a presumption of reasonableness which the IRS must overcome.

**Get the
electronic
version
of this
newsletter**

See page 8 for details

History of §409A

Section 409A was added to the Internal Revenue Code (the "Code") as part of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004.¹ The section generally applies to non-qualified deferred compensation plans, meaning essentially any plans allowing for the deferral of compensation earned in one year to a later year, with certain exceptions.

At the end of 2004, the IRS issued Notice 2005-1, the first in a series of guidance regarding the application of the new law. Notice 2005-1 provided a basic question and answer introduction to §409A and requested public comment, which led to the publishing of the proposed regulations on September 29, 2005.²

The proposed regulations were followed by Notice 2005-94 (providing relief from reporting requirements for the 2005 year); Notice 2006-4 (providing interim guidance regarding outstanding stock rights); Notice 2006-33 (setting the date for compliance as December 31, 2007); Notice 2006-64 (allowing certain accelerated payments); Notice 2006-79 (extending effective date of final regulations to January 1, 2008); Notice 2006-100 (suspending reporting requirements for 2006); and

IN THIS ISSUE

- Valuing private company stock: Determining fair market value for purposes of §409A1
- Minimizing information asymmetry risk in acquisitions with contingent pay-outs: An accountant's perspective4

Notice 2007-18 (allowing employers to pay taxes due on behalf of employees).

Until the final regulations are effective on January 1, 2008, taxpayers are expected to rely on these notices and the proposed regulations, and "good faith compliance" with this guidance is sufficient to be comply with §409A.

Scope of the law

As mentioned above, §409A applies to certain deferred compensation arrangements that do not meet the requirements for exemption in other sections of the Code.³ According to the proposed regulations, a plan provides for deferred compensation if the service provider (i.e., employee, director or independent contractor) has a legally binding right during a taxable year to compensation that has not been actually or constructively⁴ received in that year, but rather is payable in a later year. However, if the employer has unlimited discretion to reduce or eliminate the compensation after services have been performed, the compensation is not deferred.

Section 409A and the relevant guidance expressly exclude certain types of arrangements from the application of the statute, including qualified retirement plans, vacation benefits, sick leave, death/disability benefits, health insurance and statutory stock options compliant with §422 or §423 of the Code.

Non-statutory stock options are excluded only if: (1) the exercise price is not less than the fair market value of the underlying stock on the date the option is granted; (2) the option is taxable at exercise or transfer; and (3) the option does not contain any additional deferral feature that would allow the compensation to be deferred beyond the date of exercise or disposition.⁵

Stock appreciation rights ("SARs") are also excluded, regardless of whether the rights are paid in cash or in stock, so long as: (1) they are based on a number of shares fixed at the date of the grant; (2) the exercise price is not less than fair market value of the underlying stock at the time of the grant; and (3) there is no additional feature for extending the deferral of compensation beyond the exercise of the SAR.⁶

In short, any statutory or non-statutory stock option and any SAR that is discounted, or "in-the-money" at the time it is granted violates §409A.

Penalties for Violation

The penalties for violation of §409A

are substantial. If a deferred compensation arrangement does not comply with the statute, the participant must: (1) include the deferred amount in income in the year the violation occurs; (2) pay interest on the taxable amount at the standard underpayment rate plus 1 percent, accruing from deferral; and (3) pay a penalty of 20 percent of the compensation included in income.⁷

For private companies and their owners and directors, the consequences of a violation could be problematic. If the IRS were to determine that discounted options had been granted, the client could be responsible for personal income tax on the value of the option, interest since the date of grant, an additional 20 percent penalty, taxes and penalties for the amounts that were not properly withheld by the employer.⁸ All of these amounts would be due immediately and mostly likely during the period when the option may not be exercised to pay the amounts due.

There is some speculation that Notice 2006-4 suggests the IRS will find discounted exercise prices in only two circumstances: (1) when the exercise price was intentionally set below the fair market value of the stock, so as to issue an in the money option from day one; or (2) when the company used a "clearly abusive" procedure to determine the stock's fair market value. The degree to which §409A will be enforced, however, is still unclear, and on their face the penalties apply equally to intentional and inadvertent discounts. A "good faith effort" at valuing the stock is no longer sufficient to rebut a retrospective IRS finding that the company's stock was undervalued and the most responsible course is compliance with the letter of the regulations by implementing one of the valuation methods discussed below.

Valuation Methods

With the substantial penalties for violation, and the requirement that options and rights not be granted to less than their value, the determination by an employer of "What is the fair market value?" is of paramount importance. The IRS has provided guidance regarding the acceptable methods of valuation in certain cases. Any valuation method is considered to be valid for up to 12 months from the date it is performed, but the stock should be revalued before any options are granted if the company has experience any significant "value-changing" event since the last valuation.

First, any options or rights granted

before January 1, 2005, simply require a "good faith attempt" to set the price at not less than the fair market value of the stock on the date of grant.⁹

For grants made after January 1, 2005, "any reasonable valuation plan" may be used, taking into account: (1) the value of the corporation's assets; (2) the value of present and future cash flows; and (3) the value of the stock of similar corporations.¹⁰ If the exercise price in fact equals or exceeds the fair market value of the underlying stock at the time of the grant, then §409A does not apply, regardless of whether the rules for valuation provided in the regulations are applied. However, if an IRS audit (or any other investigation) ever makes a finding that the exercise price was below fair market value, then the company has the burden of proving that the method used to value the stock was reasonable.

This burden, however, can be shifted to the government if the company uses a "presumptively reasonable" method (effectively a safe harbor provision) to value its stock. The regulations provide three of these types of methods, the use of which shifts the burden to the IRS to show that application of the prescribed method was "grossly unreasonable."¹¹

1. Independent Appraisal

The first, and probably strongest, of the presumptive methods is appraisal by an independent professional.¹² Any grant within 12 months of an independent appraisal would almost certainly comply with §409A, barring some value-changing event between valuation and grant. An independent professional valuation would almost entirely eliminate §409A exposure, but it is by far the most costly and time consuming of the three presumptively reasonable methods.

2. Illiquid Startup Company

Obtaining an independent appraisal can be even more costly for young companies that may be rapidly securing new sources of funding, releasing new products and landing new clients, since their value may change several times in the course of the year. Each "value-changing" event would require a new independent appraisal before more options could be granted. The IRS recognizes that the stock of these companies is often very difficult to value, and it has crafted a presumptively reasonable method of valuation available only to "illiquid start-up" companies. Eligible

companies are those with no publicly traded stock that have been conducting business for less than 10 years and do not expect a change in control or IPO within the 12 months following the valuation. To earn the presumption, the valuation must (1) be performed by a person "with significant knowledge and experience or training in performing similar valuations"; (2) be evidenced in a written report; (3) take into account the relevant general valuation factors from the regulations; and (4) the stock must not subject to any put or call right.¹³

This valuation method is a very attractive option for clients who are eligible, especially those who may have a director or other employee with training or experience in securities valuation. The regulations do not expressly require the appraiser to be an independent third party, and it is possible that an insider with relevant accounting, finance or tax training could perform an acceptable valuation.

The method is less costly than contracting for an independent professional appraisal and provides more flexibility than the rigid "one formula" method discussed below, but it still provides a presumption of reasonableness and offers a great deal of protection against any challenge by the IRS.

3. Standard Formula Method

The final presumptive valuation formula provided by the proposed regulations requires the use of the same valuation formula for all compensatory and non-compensatory purposes requiring the valuation of stock. The formula must be evidenced in some binding written agreement, such as a shareholder buy-sell agreement, and the method is not available if stock may be transferred in any other way than by use of the established formula in an agreement. The formula must be used in all "regulatory filings, loan covenants, issuances to and repurchases of stock from persons other than service providers, and other third-party arrangements."¹⁴ Many private technology companies and similar clients may require more flexibility in valuing their stock for different purposes than this method allows, but it is a nearly zero cost option for those clients who are willing to comply with its rigid requirements.

Recommendations and conclusion

The following steps should be taken to ensure compliance with §409A:

1. **Examine past grants to identify potential discounted options and rights.** Take corrective action if necessary in accordance with the proposed regulations.
2. **Amend all plan documents that allow the company to grant discounted options.** The amended plans and related documents should state that the exercise prices of all qualified and nonqualified options and SARs shall be at least equal to the fair market value of the underlying stock.
3. **Recommend adopting one of the presumptively reasonable valuation methods.** Amend the plan documents to identify the method used to determine fair market value and specifically reference the authority for the method in the proposed regulations.

The §409A prohibitions on granting discounts are clear, and amending plans to avoid intentional violations is relatively straightforward. However, the risk of a faulty valuation resulting in an inadvertent violation of the statute is a very real one (and one with significant consequences), especially for private technology companies with few tangible assets and rapidly developing intangible assets. At least until the regulations become final next year, practitioners should be aware of how their private company clients are valuing their stock and keep a watchful eye on the developing interpretation of §409A.

1. P.L. 108-357 (118 Stat. 1418).
2. 50 Fed. Reg. 58930 (Oct. 4, 2005).
3. See IRC §§ 291(g)(5), 457(b), 501(c)(18).
4. Section 451 of the Code states that compensation is constructively received (and taxable) as soon as the earner has a right to the compensation, even if there has been no actual payment. If the right is subject to substantial limitations and restrictions, however, there is no constructive receipt.
5. IRS Prop. Regs. §1.409A-1(b)(5)(i)(A).
6. IRS Prop. Regs. §1.409A-1(b)(5)(i)(B).
7. IRC §409A.
8. If stock option qualifies as deferred compensation, the employer is required to withhold income and employment taxes at the time of vesting and possibly additional amounts as the stock value increases.
9. IRS Notice 2005-1.
10. IRS Prop. Regs. §1.409A-1(b)(5)(iv)(B)(1).
11. IRS Prop. Regs. §1.409A-1(b)(5)(iv)(B)(2).
12. IRS Prop. Regs. §1.409A-1(b)(5)(iv)(B)(2)(i).
13. IRS Prop. Regs. §1.409A-1(b)(5)(iv)(B)(2)(iii).
14. IRS Prop. Regs. §1.409A-1(b)(5)(iv)(B)(2)(ii).

Corporation, Securities & Business Law Forum

Published at least four times per year.

Annual subscription rate for ISBA members: \$20.

To subscribe, visit www.isba.org or call (217)525-1760

OFFICE

Illinois Bar Center
424 S. 2nd Street
Springfield, IL 62701
Phones: (217) 525-1760 OR 800-252-8908

Web site: www.isba.org

Co-Editors

David E. Doyle
10 S. LaSalle St., #3500
Chicago, IL 60603

Alan J. Goldstein
55 E. Monroe St., 40th Floor
Chicago, IL 60603

Managing Editor/Production

Katie Underwood
kunderwood@isba.org

Corporation, Securities & Business Law Section Council

Robert C. Knuepfer, Jr., Chair
William A. Price, Vice Chair
Ethel Spyrtatos, Secretary
Robert J. Wild, Ex-Officio
Scott W. Berends
Zane M. Cohn
Howard Z. Gopman
Philip N. Hablutzel
Edward Jarot, Jr.
William T. Kaplan
Nicholas C. Kefalos
Laura M. Kotelman
Markus May
Tracy J. Nugent
Amy L. Pauls
Edward G. Quinlisk
Donald L. Shriver
Alan R. Singleton
Tanya Solov
Tina G. Stavrou
Michelle L. Thoma-Culver
Derek P. Usman
Walter J. Yurkanin
Naomi H. Schuster, Board Liaison
Selina Shontel Thomas, Staff Liaison

Disclaimer: This newsletter is for subscribers' personal use only; redistribution is prohibited. Copyright Illinois State Bar Association. Statements or expressions of opinion appearing herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Association or Editors, and likewise the publication of any advertisement is not to be construed as an endorsement of the product or service offered unless it is specifically stated in the ad that there is such approval or endorsement. Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Illinois State Bar Association, 424 S. 2nd St., Springfield, IL 62701-1779.

Minimizing information asymmetry risk in acquisitions with contingent pay-outs: An accountant's perspective

By Barry Jay Epstein, Ph.D., CPA and Elizabeth A. Kowalski, MBA, Russell Novak & Company LLP, Chicago IL. bepstein@rnco.com

Information asymmetry exists when one party to a proposed transaction has information that the other does not, thereby conveying some advantage to that party. In most arm's-length transactions, varying degrees of information asymmetry can exist between the buyer and the seller. It is well accepted in economic theory that as information asymmetry decreases, the transaction's value becomes more transparent, which should increase the ultimate negotiated price. Simply put, buyers are more willing to pay when they feel that they have full access to information.

In the case of mergers and acquisitions—and more specifically when acquisitions are largely based on hypothesized future profitability—sellers can oftentimes be at a disadvantage in immediately realizing their high expectations for the future. Buyers, being less confident about profit potential, may demand that significant portions of agreed-upon prices be contingent on future performance. The use of contingent pay-out arrangements, most commonly earn-out agreements, can help mitigate the effects of information asymmetry as, theoretically, the eventual aggregate pay-outs will be brought into line with actual results, not the sellers' rosy scenarios.

While an earn-out agreement can usually alleviate some uncertainty, the biggest concern in devising earn-outs pertains to how future profitability is to be measured. Two commonly used metrics for profitability in earn-out agreements are net income and EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization—a widely employed surrogate for operating cash flow). Almost always, agreements will call for measurements to be made “in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles” (“GAAP”), and often there will be an audit requirement, such that the basis for the earn-out will have to be attested to by an

independent accounting firm.

Most contracting parties believe that, by specifying GAAP (the largely codified body of financial reporting rules mostly established by private sector standard setters, most prominently the FASB), future disputes will be obviated. This is far from the actual case, however. A surprisingly large number of disagreements develop even when GAAP is the agreed-upon metric.

When earn-outs are based on measurements such as net income or EBITDA, a requisite consideration is what exactly goes into (and, equally importantly, stays out of) this figure. While the widespread application of GAAP predicates a certain uniformity among financial statement presentations, there remains a surprising amount of flexibility within acceptable application of these principles. If the earn-out extends for longer than a relatively brief period, it may become increasingly challenging to competently calculate the basis upon which the earn-out payments are to be made.

In order to more fully reduce the information asymmetry between buyers and sellers, a duty lies with sellers to complete a comprehensive due diligence of the buyers' financial statement presentations and the accounting treatments of those business transactions and events that may play a roll in ultimate pay-outs. The reason is simple. Once deals are complete, buyers, while obligated to abide by the terms of the contracts, have the power and likely also the incentive to manipulate financial statement presentations to the sellers' detriment, while still nominally complying with GAAP. By having both parties in possession of more complete understandings of which financial statement elements comprise the ultimate profitability metrics within the framework of properly applied GAAP, possible misunderstandings, disputes and future litigation can usually be mitigated.

This discussion will initially focus on recent developments in accounting standards and trends for the future that may change GAAP reporting requirements. Additionally, acceptable and legitimate changes in financial statement presentation will be discussed. Both of these areas can adversely impact sellers' earn-out contracts; thus both are significant areas for consideration during the due diligence and contract drafting phases of any acquisition or merger featuring contingent pay-out provisions.

Recent and Forthcoming New Financial Reporting Requirements

The dynamic nature of generally accepted accounting principles is necessary to evolve with an ever-changing business environment. Some of these changes can have major effects on financial reporting in general, and on earn-out computations in particular. Thus, even faithful compliance with US GAAP as it existed at a given date (such as the merger transaction date) may not describe currently acceptable practices even a few years hence. The primary objective for parties engaging in acquisitions should be an explicit understanding of current applications of GAAP and how recent and forthcoming changes may affect the contract provisions.

An awareness of pertinent changes in financial reporting requirements can shed light on the possibility for future contention, and the need for a detailed inventory of accounting methods being applied at the time of drafting. Important areas for such attention include the following:

- **Accounting for business combinations and asset impairment:** For many years, there was some flexibility in the accounting treatment of business combinations. A merger could be accounted for as either a purchase (or acquisition) or as a pooling (uniting) of interest, with

very different consequences for the financial statements of the surviving entity. Today, however, virtually all combinations must be accounted for as purchases, with the buyer recording the fair value of the acquired company's net assets.¹ This differs from the pooling treatment of previous years, where the acquiring company recorded the book, or carrying, value of acquired assets on its financial statements. Additionally, under the new Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) standards, the difference between the purchase price and the fair value of the acquired company's net assets, which is known as goodwill, which previously was subject to amortization over a number of years (not to exceed 40 years), must now be recorded on the purchaser's books as an asset subject to an annual assessment of impairment, but not amortization.

This suggests two areas of concern relative to contingent pay-outs. First, since other intangible assets, such as trademarks and customer lists, remain subject to amortization, care must be taken to properly allocate the cost of the intangibles to proper categories, since these affect future earnings in different ways.² Secondly, in periodically testing for impairment, buyers may aggressively determine impairments that will consequently decrease earnings used for contingent pay-outs.³ If the sellers do not have understandings of the estimation involved in both of these processes, it may be easy for buyers to manipulate the purchase price allocations (e.g., to exaggerate periodic amortization charges), and/or to depress earnings via impairments.

- **Reporting the effects of accounting changes:** While financial statements primarily report the effects of current period activities, there are some situations where retrospective adjustments can affect the current year's bottom line. Traditionally, the cumulative effect of any voluntarily made accounting changes (e.g., in depreciation methods) would be reflected fully in the period the change was made.⁴ In 2005, however, a new standard removed this cumulative effect requirement, substituting the necessary restatement of all earlier periods, to report them as if the newly adopted principle had

always been used.⁵ The main caution here, particularly relevant for attorneys drafting contingent pay-outs, is to understand the impact on comparability among reporting periods. For example, if there is no "look back" provision, changes in accounting can now "fall between the cracks"—not being included in any of the earn-out years' computations. While for most purposes the new standards makes data (after restatement) more comparable from one year to the next, the interests of earn-out parties may not be well served.

- **Accounting for guarantees:** A recent pronouncement requires that the fair value of all guarantees made be fully recognized as an obligation of the entity, with corresponding effect on the guarantor's reported expenses.⁶ Previously, guarantees had been relegated to the financial statement footnotes, thus not impacting earn-out computations, with rare exceptions. While the new method is more conservative accounting than in the past, and more accurately reflects economic reality, recognizing an additional liability and expense can have a significant effect on many key financial ratios as well as reported profits. This illustrates why attorneys should consider whether contractual provisions governing contingent pay-outs over a number of years should prohibit or limit the application of newly imposed financial reporting standards.
- **Off-balance sheet transactions:** 'Special purpose entity' has become a well-known phrase in recent years. Enron used special purpose entities for off-balance sheet transactions to fraudulently conceal billions of dollars in liabilities from shareholders. While subsequently exceptionally complex new rules have been issued on this subject, there are still many arcane areas of practice that allow an entity to structure transactions that may not disclose all of the entity's obligations to users of financial statements. The concept of special purpose entities has been replaced in current accounting standards with variable interest entities (VIEs), with many of these being subject to mandatory consolidation into the reporting entity's financial statements.⁷ However, there is continuing debate over the treatment of VIEs and diver-

sity in practice due to innocent misapplication of these requirements. The consolidation of a VIE into a buyer's financial statement, when not previously so recognized, could severely affect an earn-out agreement computation.

- **Related party transactions:** While there haven't been any new accounting standards addressing related party transactions per se, this is a subject of increasing attention in financial reporting.⁸ In fact, the new standard on VIEs changes the definition of related parties when making determinations regarding the existence of VIEs. As there is virtually no means by which to ascertain that related party transactions were conducted on arm's-length terms, the mere existence of such transactions is an invitation to a contractual dispute. As disclosure of related party transactions is required by GAAP, one way of mitigating future disputes regarding this subject would be to preclude the entity from entering into any new related party transactions during the period subject to contingent pay-outs. Alternatively, if these transactions are entered into, the earn-out consideration calculations could be subjected to contractually mandated adjustments to more accurately represent the entity's performance had the entity engaged in a transaction at arm's-length.
- **Distinguishing liabilities from equity:** Although the distinction between debt and equity seems to be straightforward, in practice there are many hybrid financial instruments that can have attributes of both debt and equity. Classification of these instruments will have a direct effect on financial statements and perhaps more noticeably on financial ratios of the company. Various recent GAAP standards have attempted to close what had been loopholes whereby the balance sheet could easily be "dressed up." For example, a major standard was promulgated several years ago, which requires that equity subject to mandatory retirement provisions or containing options giving holders rights to demand redemption can no longer be deemed equity in the balance sheet.⁹ One can imagine the controversial nature of such a standard whereby many companies would

be required to report large sums of equity now as a liability. At the protest of many of these companies, FASB has issued an indefinite postponement of this requirement.¹⁰ Also proposed for new GAAP standards is possible allocation of obligations to conversion features on convertible debt.¹¹ A large fraction of the current professional accounting standards are devoted to the accounting for financial instruments, but as new products are invented by “financial engineers,” accounting standard setters struggle to develop yet more guidance, in a game that is apparently endless. Any further changes could likely impact earn-outs, e.g., by moving certain dividends to interest expense, which would reduce net income subject to contractual pay-outs.

- **Exchanges of nonmonetary assets:** Under new standards, exchanges of nonmonetary assets (e.g., one machine traded for a similar but different one) are required to be recorded at the fair value of the asset, where previously the book value of the item traded was simply carried forward in most instances.¹² While, on the surface, this may seem like only a simple change, the gain or loss now to be recognized on these exchanges will be recorded in net income, and therefore this may affect comparability of financial statements over the years. Additionally, it may offer buyers opportunities to create losses designed to reduce earn-out obligations. Sellers, and their counsel, should be aware of the prevalence of nonmonetary exchanges in a particular company or industry and their possible effects on future financial statements.
- **Forthcoming developments:** The previous paragraphs reviewed examples of recent changes in generally accepted accounting principles. A topic perhaps of greater importance for the attorney seeking edification is the historic agreement between the US standard setter, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), and its international equivalent, the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), which calls for “convergence” between US GAAP and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) within the next few years.¹³ A number of changes to US

GAAP have already been made in order to fulfill FASB’s commitment, in situations where IFRS were found to be superior to US GAAP, and select IFRS have been revised to converge with US GAAP, under IASB’s obligation, where the US standards appeared better. More such changes are likely to occur in the very near term.¹⁴

One example of a standard affected by this convergence process is the accounting treatment of research and development expenditures (“R&D”). Currently, US GAAP requires R&D to be expensed as incurred, whereas IFRS mandates a bifurcated system of expensing research costs and capitalizing development costs. The prospects for further advancement in the area of accounting for R&D, while imminent, could be only the beginning of a series of modifications made in attainment of a more widely applicable, codified system of accounting principles. Any such changes made during the pendency of earn-out arrangements could have impact on the buyers’ ultimate recoveries—yet another argument for a “frozen GAAP” clause in these agreements.

Last, but certainly not least, both FASB and IASB are working on major projects that would fundamentally alter the notion of revenue, and make revenue recognition dependent upon receipt of assets and/or extinguishment of liabilities. Doing so would continue and perhaps culminate the marked shift to a balance sheet orientation in accounting theory over the past thirty years. Making such a change could potentially have enormous impact on income measurement and, if it does, would obviously have major implications for any contractual measures driven by the GAAP-basis financial statements.

Further Considerations for Greater Transparency

While it should be evident from the preceding discussion that changing standards can lead to veracious contention between parties contracting contingent pay-outs, there are additional elements about which to be cognizant in drafting contract provisions. As we’ve demonstrated above, accounting standards are constantly evolving. An element of consideration in drafting a merger agreement will be whether

GAAP measurements of operating results over the defined time horizon are to be based on GAAP as it exists in the periods of measurement, which may well change over even a short three year period, or alternatively will be based on GAAP as it existed when the agreement was executed. As indicated previously, the latter approach, often referred to as “frozen GAAP” attempts to mitigate the risks of consequences unintended by either party at the time of contract as a result of changing standards. While the negative side effects of necessitating the use of two sets of books in this approach may slightly complicate record keeping, the benefits of eliminating unforeseen risks should be enticing to a prudent contractor.

Additionally, another layer of information asymmetry can exist through the allowable variation in GAAP-compliant financial statement presentations. Certain accounting standards allow reporting entities the choice between alternative accounting treatments. Some examples of these are the choice among inventory valuation methods, depreciation methods and computing bad debt reserves for valuing customer receivables. While the reporting entity is allowed to decide which method best applies to its business environment, the opportunistic executive may choose one method over another for its eventual effect on an earn-out agreement. The risk of such manipulative tactics being undertaken by buyers is most often addressed by inserting the requirement that GAAP be “consistently applied” compared to earlier years. Unfortunately, consistent application may inadvertently mean the inclusion of GAAP-deviant methods as well. In some instances, the accounting applied by sellers had not fully complied with GAAP, perhaps due to oversight or error. This risk underscores the need for effective due diligence before acquisitions are finalized, including detailed inventories of accounting methods being applied or misapplied by the sellers. Ideally, buyers will identify all non-GAAP methods used by sellers, and explicitly set forth the prescribed treatments post-transaction.

In similar respect, the discovery of errors and/or misjudgment in estimations after the transaction but before the earn-out period can result in additional complications for the acquired party. Under GAAP, errors are corrected by

restating the earlier periods' financial statements, in contrast to changes in accounting estimates, which are to be handled prospectively. Ideally, earn-out agreements will be explicit as to how such corrections are to be dealt with for computational purposes, regardless of the GAAP requirements.

An accountant's input on the role that close attention to generally accepted accounting principles can play in reducing the risk of litigation can be highly useful, particularly when the parties to a business acquisition or merger are pursuing separate agendas, abetted by information asymmetries extant at the transaction date. Besides the risk that new or alternatively-interpreted GAAP poses, there are other tax or accounting-driven complications that may also arise, many of which are situation-specific. For example, some buyers having complex organizational structures, with subsidiaries chartered in different states, may elect, post-transaction, to engage in legal, but notably aggressive, tax arbitrage practices among subsidiaries (e.g., via transfer pricing or inter-company loans carrying non-market interest rates). As a result, the acquired company may suffer a decreased bottom line, which could affect the sellers' earn-out payments. Unless specifically addressed in the purchase and sale agreement, it could be difficult to later argue that the buyers were not free to engage in such practices, which often do have other, valid business purposes, albeit harmful to the sellers' positions.

Negotiating complex business acquisitions and other transactions may call upon a range of skills, potentially including sophisticated economic analyses, mathematics, statistics, and game theory, in the attempt to cope with individual behaviors in the face of unknown variables. The prepared and educated practitioner can minimize the risk of future misunderstandings and litigation by bringing a complement of skills to bear. Inclusion of GAAP analyses can improve the likelihood of successful outcomes.

About the Authors: Barry Jay Epstein, Ph.D., CPA, is a partner in the Chicago accounting and consulting firm Russell Novak & Company LLP. His practice is largely devoted to litigation consulting. Dr. Epstein also consults with financial statement preparers and lectures on accounting and auditing matters. His litigation work

involves commercial litigation, white collar criminal defense, and accountants' liability. He has consulted and/or testified as an expert witness for plaintiff and defense attorneys in over 80 cases, and has done substantial work for the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Department of Justice, and other agencies. He is co-author of Wiley GAAP and Wiley IFRS, two widely-used reference works for practicing accountants, and the author of other books. Contact Dr. Epstein at BEpstein@rnco.com.

Elizabeth A. Kowalski is a Litigation Accountant at Russell Novak & Company LLP. She holds an MBA from DePaul University and a B.A. in Economics from Illinois Wesleyan University. She previously worked at Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP. Contact Ms. Kowalski at EKowalski@rnco.com.

1. Statements of Financial Accounting Standards Nos. 141 and 142.

2. FAS 142 provides detailed guidance about classes of intangibles that are to be given separate recognition under US GAAP.

3. The US GAAP rules for impairment testing of assets other than goodwill are found in Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 144. These differ in important regards from the impairment testing regime for goodwill, set forth in SFAS No. 142. Both sets of rules rely heavily on easily-disputed assumptions, even slight changes in which can materially alter the resultant computations.

4. The former requirements were set forth in Accounting Principles Board Opinion No. 20.

5. Set forth by Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 154, issued May 2005, and generally effective for 2006 financial statements.

6. FASB Interpretation No. 45.

7. FASB Interpretation No. 46, issued in early 2003, was replaced by FASB Interpretation No. 46[R] later that same year. It has subsequently been clarified by at least six FASB Staff Positions.

8. Statement on Financial Accounting Standards No. 57 addresses related party disclosures to be made in financial statements. The challenge for auditors has long been to uncover such transactions, which are not always acknowledged by management and can be difficult to identify.

9. Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 150.

10. FASB Staff Position FAS 150-3 indefinitely postponed application of Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 150 for redemption provisions associated with equity of privately held companies, unless mandatorily redeemable at fixed dates for fixed amounts or amounts determinable by reference to external indices. The main effect is to lift the requirement that equity subject

to "buy-sell" agreements be classes as debt, a provision that was vehemently opposed. It is not clear when, or if, FASB will return to this topic.

11. Accounting Principles Board Opinion No. 14 addresses accounting for debt with conversion features or detachable warrants. A FASB proposal dating from 2000 would require, if adopted, that conversion features be separately recognized as an element of equity upon issuance of convertible debt. FASB has struggled with this project for years, and plans to issue another preliminary view document in 2007.

12. Formerly, guidance on accounting for exchanges of nonmonetary assets was set forth by Accounting Principles Board Opinion No.29, whereas current reporting requirements are dictated by Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 153.

13. The "Norwalk Agreement" between FASB and IASB was signed in September 2002. Perhaps in response to this, and also to the European Commission's endorsement of IFRS for use by some 7,000 publicly held companies in the EU beginning in 2005, the pace of worldwide adoption of IFRS has accelerated. Currently, some 100 nations either endorse IFRS for at least some financial reporting purposes or base their national GAAP standards, to greater or lesser degree, on IFRS.

14. FASB's technical agenda currently has three projects identified as being for short-term convergence purposes (dealing with earnings per share, income taxes, and research and development costs), and IASB similarly has five such projects in process (income taxes, segment reporting, borrowing costs, joint ventures, and impairment). Readers can monitor developments on these organizations' Web sites, www.fasb.org and www.iasb.org, respectively.

The Illinois State Bar Association is now accepting nominations for the 2007 Elmer Gertz Award

The Elmer Gertz Award is presented annually by the Illinois State Bar Association in coordination with the Blind Services Association of Illinois. The award is designed to honor the often unsung heroes of the legal community who, in the spirit of the late Elmer Gertz, have shown a continued commitment to the preservation and advancement of human rights.

If you would like to nominate an Illinois Attorney whom you believe embodies these call 312-726-8775 to request a nomination form and return it to Selina Thomas at sthomas@isba.org or by mail to 20 South Clark St., Ste. 900, Chicago, Illinois, 60603 before June 1, 2007

Do yourself a favor

Say goodbye to paper and get this newsletter electronically

Why?

You'll get it faster. Opt for the electronic version and bypass the ISBA print shop and post office. We'll send you an e-mail message with a link to the latest issue as soon as it's posted on the Web, which means you'll get it days, even weeks, earlier than you would in print.

You'll save space. Because newsletters are archived on the ISBA Web site, you needn't worry about storing back issues.

You'll help keep section fees low. At \$20/year, section membership is a tremendous value. But paper and postage costs continue to rise. By choosing the electronic over the paper version, you help keep our costs—and yours—down.

How?

Just go to <<http://www.isba.org/newsletters/enewsletters.html>>. Submit an easy-to-complete form and have any newsletter—such as the next issue of *Corporation, Securities & Business Law Forum*—delivered to your inbox.



Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Springfield, Ill.
Permit No. 820

Corporation, Securities & Business Law Forum
Illinois Bar Center
Springfield, Illinois 62701-1779
April 2007
Vol. 52 No. 4