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M&A and Buy-Out Market

M&A transaction volumes still on the rise
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M&A and Buy-Out Market

Optimism from Dealmakers continues

How will deal volume change in the next 6 months?

- Decrease 16%
- Increase or Flat 84%

Is it a buyer’s or seller’s market?

- Buyers 13%
- Sellers 75%
- Not sure 12%

Source: Association for Corporate Growth/Thomson Mid-Year Survey of Dealmakers
M&A and Buy-Out Market
Financial Sponsors account for a growing fraction of total deals

M&A and Buy-Out Market
Valuations are at record highs but...

Source: CapitalIQ, Mirus analysis
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Source: CapitalIQ, Mirus analysis.
Financing Environment
Significantly higher leverage has become the norm for buy-outs

Average Debt Multiples of Highly Leveraged Loans

- Debt Multiples
- Bank Debt / EBITDA
- Non-Bank Debt / EBITDA

Source: Standard & Poor's LCD

International Markets
Cross border deals are rising with no end in sight
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Source: CapitalIQ, Minus analysis
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Will M&A Continue its Pace?

Reasons for Pessimism
- Slow down in stock market gains in ’07 as compared to previous three years
- Signs of a weakening economy
- Fear that the credit crisis in sub-prime loans will impair corporate and PEG borrowing power

Reasons for Optimism
- General stability in markets and economy despite signs of weakness
- Record capital continue to flow to private equity groups
- Despite a tightening on terms and covenants, lending is still widely available
- Strong corporate balance sheets and cash positions
- Most industries are only partially through consolidation
- Increasing activity from foreign buyers

Valuations are currently coming down from their lofty peak in early 2007. This will continue, but we expect valuations to remain higher than historical averages throughout next year.

Volumes will reduce somewhat in 2008, but stay at historically high levels.

Some additional major event will have to happen to trigger a major downturn in U.S. M&A activity and valuation. Keep your eyes on the economy.
Why Incentives?

- Align objectives with owners
- Maximize price
- Increase management security/comfort
  - Reduce risk of key management defections
  - Reduce risk of breach of confidentiality
- Ensure continuity
- Potential to shift cost to buyer with advance planning

Equity

- Stock vs. incentive units
- Tax ramifications
  - Stock: potential for capital gains
  - Incentive units = ordinary income
- Control issues
  - Stock:
    - Fiduciary obligations to new stockholders
    - Right to vote
  - Incentive units = bonus
Change of Control Agreement

- Severance
  - How long
  - Payment schedule/tie to non-compete
- Acceleration of equity vesting
- Continuation of benefits
  - Health
  - Life
  - Other
- Definition of "change of control event"

Success Bonus

- Trigger
  - Closing of sale
- Amount
  - Tied to valuation
- Payout
- Timing
The Pros & Cons of Bid Auctions

- What is a bid auction?
- Most effectively packages company
- Maximizes value through broadest exposure & competitive situation
- Creates “level playing field” for all bidders
- Negative: puts company “on the block” with potential adverse impact on vendors, customers and employee morale
- Additional negative: allows competitors to learn selling company’s secrets

The Beginning of the Public Sale Process: Selecting an Investment Banker

- Understanding the requirements
- Learning about conflicts of interest
- Finding the right people: chemistry, commitment, expertise and availability
- Fee considerations: formulas and negotiating room
- The key value of a banker: access to the obvious and not so obvious potential buyers
Putting Together the “Book”

- Requires major effort to get it right
- Must involve key management to properly portray business and vision
- The easiest part of an investment banker’s job

Alternatives to the Bid Process

- The targeted approach through an intermediary
- Finding your own buyer
- The negative: valuation problems (may not be the key issue for the sale)
- Another negative: still could leak out
How to Find the Right Company to Buy: The Buyer’s Perspective

- Bid auctions are generally the least desirable from the buyer’s standpoint
- Brokers and other intermediaries prefer repeat buyers, such as funds (possible small size exception)
- The best approach: networking
  - Lawyers, accountants, consultants
  - Industry associations
- The targeted approach: find the right company and make an offer

Contract Terms: Current Trends

Overview

- The emergence of mega buyout funds and inexpensive and readily committed debt that led to the surge of private equity acquisitions of large private and public companies is a relatively recent phenomena.
- Until recently a strategic buyer could pay more for a company – both because of they could benefit from the synergies and because they often had a lower cost of capital.
- And the need for a private equity firm to obtain debt financing from a third party generally made a sponsor-led deal riskier than a sale to a strategic buyer.
Overview - continued

- More recently, auctions for the sale of the company became more overheated, resulting not only in a dramatic increase in purchase price multiples of EBITDA, but also in a rapid change in standard key terms in acquisition agreements.

- Some of these shifts include:
  - Disappearance of the Financing Condition
  - Recourse Against the Sponsor
  - Reverse Break Up Fees

Disappearance of the Financing Condition

- Prior to 2004, the typical purchase agreement for a sponsor-led acquisition of a private or public company contained a financing condition and was accompanied by a fully committed debt commitment letter or letters.

- Sellers/targets would attempt to further negotiate the material adverse change (MAC) conditions of the commitment letters in an effort to reduce the risk of the acquisition not closing.

- Sellers/targets occasionally succeeded in mirroring the MAC conditions in the commitment letters to those in the purchase agreement – in other words, sellers/targets occasionally had “market outs” or “market MACs” and other broad conditions eliminated from financing commitments.
Disappearance of the Financing Condition - continued

- Typical acquisition agreements also required the sponsor to draw down on the financing if the closing conditions were satisfied.
- The acquisition agreement would be signed only by a shell corporation with no assets other than the debt commitment from the lender and the equity commitment from the sponsor (which itself was conditioned on receiving the debt financing).
- Thus, a third party beneficiary provision in favor of the target/seller often was provided, which gave a target/seller the potential to specifically enforce an acquisition agreement.

In the last few years, a number of factors changed the pre-2004 scenario:
- Because of the competition for deals among private equity firms, sponsors became more concerned with the reputational damage caused by walking away from a deal.
- The use of an acquisition shell coupled with debt and equity commitment letters created uncertainty, which in turn put private equity firms at a disadvantage to strategic buyers, which rarely require a financing condition.
- The ready availability of cheap debt, the advent of “covenant lite” loans, and the use of PIK notes (where interest is paid with more notes) enabled private equity firms to compete favorably with strategic buyers on price.
Disappearance of the Financing Condition - continued

- The result was:
  - The disappearance of the financing condition in many sponsor-led acquisitions.
  - Commitment letter conditions were tightened further.
  - The requirement to draw the financing and close became more specific.

Rise of the Reverse Termination Fee

- The removal of the financing out led to a desire of the private equity firms to protect themselves in the event that a lender breached its obligations in the commitment letter.
- This led a liquidated damages provision in favor of the target/seller known as a “reverse termination fee.”
- A reverse termination fee is a fee payable to the target/seller in the event the deal did not close because the financing was not available.
Rise of the Reverse Termination Fee
- continued

- Reverse termination fees evolved into a broader limitation on liability if the transaction did not close for any reason (a result of the tightening of all MAC conditions).

- Sellers/targets often are now successful in negotiating for a higher termination fee if the transaction does not close for a reason other than failed financing.

- Private equity firms typically guarantee the reverse termination fee (as the shell buyer has limited assets).

- Sometimes, private equity firms successfully make the reverse termination fee the exclusive remedy – which makes the transaction essentially an option (except for reputational issues for walking away from a deal).

- Other times, specific performance remains a remedy for the target/seller – so that the reverse termination fee operates as a cap on damages.
Now that the Markets May be Changing Again, Who Won?

- In the pre-2004 scenario, sellers took some risk that the financing would not be available. But, if all conditions were satisfied, it would be risky for the private equity firm or the financing source to decide not to close.

- The target retained the ability to seek specific performance, including the possibility that a court would require the shell specifically to enforce its debt and equity commitment letters against the lenders and the private equity fund or that a court would conclude that the private equity fund was in any event the real party in interest.

Now that the Markets May be Changing Again, Who Won? - continued

- In contrast, the new form of documentation, except perhaps where a specific performance remedy has been clearly preserved, has effectively given private equity sponsors an option to walk away for a reverse termination fee.

- In addition, the removal of the financing conditions and the presence of a reverse termination fee could create greater leverage for buyers and lenders to renegotiate price and other deal terms if there are increased borrowing costs or deterioration in the business of the target.

- The result may be a shift back to the pre-2004 form of deal documentation.
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