



Shannon Pratt's BUSINESS VALUATION[®]

UPDATE

A Business Valuation Resources[®] publication

Timely news, analysis and resources for defensible valuations Excerpt from Vol. 10, No. 12, December 2004

Guest Article:

Derivatives valuation: One size does not fit all¹

By Susan M. Mangiero, AVA, CFA, FRM, Ph.D.*

A growing need for derivative instrument valuation is being fueled by the vast market size of derivatives and the increasing regulatory and shareholder interest in understanding how they are being used and their impact on the bottom line. Because there are many types of derivatives, no single valuation approach suits all derivatives. The author discusses how to select and implement an appropriate derivatives valuation model, as well as the risks of using an incorrect model and how to avoid them. — NG



Susan Mangiero

The derivatives market is huge by any account, with an estimated size of more than one hundred trillion dollars.² A market this large invites scrutiny under ordinary circumstances, but times are hardly "business as usual." Today's watchword is information. Financial market participants want better quality information in larger amounts and they want it now. Corporate misdeeds and black box investing has led to unhappy investors seeking redress through the courts as their portfolios have plummeted in value.

Increased scrutiny for derivatives

Policy-makers have been busy too. New

regulations have put derivatives at center stage, all of which entail more information gathering about these products and how they are used to minimize risk, enhance return, raise funds or synthesize securities.

Summary of Statement No. 133, *Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities*, extends earlier accounting standards by requiring publicly traded companies to regularly value any financial instrument that meets the definition of a derivative.³

This is in addition to the Securities and Exchange Commission's disclosure re-

quirement that companies with a market capitalization larger than \$2.5 billion must provide risk information about "market risk sensitive instruments."⁴ Corporations are not alone. Banks face challenges in the form of the new Basel Capital Accord, much of which involves the proper estimation of risk as a way to determine statutory capital amounts.⁵

Additionally, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 sets forth a wide array of rules that affect publicly traded firms that use derivatives.⁶ Even closely held companies and non-profit organizations are

Continued to next page..

* Dr. Mangiero is founder and managing member of BVA, LLC, an independent litigation support and business valuation firm. She has conducted business analysis, valuations, and deal evaluation and structuring for over 15 years. Her new book for John Wiley & Sons entitled *Risk Management for Pensions, Endowments, and Foundations* adds to her already long list of publications. She has written chapters for the *Litigation Services Handbook: The Role of the Financial Expert*, the *Handbook of Interest Rate Risk Management and Cases in International Finance*.

¹ Published with permission of The Michel-Shaked Group.

² According to the International Swaps and Derivatives Association, interest rate and currency notional amounts outstanding approximated \$98.8 trillion at year-end 2002 with another \$4.59 trillion in default swap and equity derivative outstanding amounts.

³ Summary of Statement No. 133, *Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities*, issued in June 1998, "requires that an entity recognize all derivatives as either assets or liabilities in the statement of financial position and measure those instruments at fair value." Go to www.fasb.org for more information. On April 30, 2003, the Financial Accounting Standards Board issued Statement No. 149, *Amendment of Statement 133 on Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities*.

⁴ See www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/guidance/derivfaq.htm#risk.

⁵ See www.bis.org/publ/bcbsca.htm.

⁶ Securities and Exchange Commission, "Disclosure in Management's Discussion and Analysis about Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements and Aggregate Contractual Obligations", 17 CFR Parts 228, 229 and 249. See www.sec.gov/rules/final/33-8182.htm.

Reprinted with permission from Business Valuation Resources, LLC

Publisher & Editor-in-Chief: Shannon Pratt
Managing Editor: Alina Niculita
Associate Editor: Noah Gordon
Legal and Court Case Editor: Travis Bryan
Production: Laurie Morrisey
Staff Writers: Paul Heidt
 Angelina Mckedy
 Adam Manson
Director of Marketing: Kyla Westfall
Customer Service: Doug Berger
 Pam Pittock

Editorial Advisory Board

RONALD D. AUCUTT, Esq.
McGuireWoods LLP—McLean, Va.

JOHN A. BOGDANSKI, JD
Lewis & Clark Law School—Portland, Ore.

HON. WILLIAM A. CHRISTIAN
N.C. 11th Judicial District Court—Sanford, N.C.

S. STACY EASTLAND, Esq.
The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.—Houston, Texas

BARNES H. ELLIS, Esq.
Stoel Rives LLP—Portland, Ore.

JAY E. FISHMAN, ASA, CBA
Kroll Lindquist Avey—Philadelphia, Pa.

OWEN G. FIORE, JD, CPA
of Counsel to Ramsbacher Prokey LLP—San Jose, Calif.

LARRY WELDON GIBBS, JD
Gibbs Professional Corporation—San Antonio, Texas

LYNNE Z. GOLD-BIKIN, Esq.
Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, LLP—Norristown, Pa.

LANCE S. HALL
FMV Opinions, Inc.—Irvine, Calif.

JARED KAPLAN, Esq.
McDermott, Will & Emery—Chicago, Ill.

MAURICE KUTNER, Esq.
Maurice Jay Kutner & Associates, P.A.—Miami, Fla.

GILBERT E. MATTHEWS, CFA
Sutter Securities Incorporated—San Francisco, Calif.

JAMES J. PODELL, Esq.
Podell & Podell—Milwaukee, Wis.

JOHN W. PORTER
Baker & Botts, LLP—Houston, Texas

JAMES S. RIGBY, ASA, CPA/ABV
Financial Valuation Group—Los Angeles, Calif.

ARTHUR D. SEDERBAUM, Esq.
Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Tyler—New York, N.Y.

DONALD S. SHANNON, Ph.D., CPA
School of Accountancy, DePaul University—Chicago, Ill.

BRUCE SILVERSTEIN, Esq.
Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor, LLP—Wilmington, Del.

GEORGE S. STERN, Esq.
Stern & Edlin—Atlanta, Ga.

Shannon Pratt's Business Valuation Update[®] (ISSN 1088-4882) is published monthly by Business Valuation Resources, L.L.C., for \$249 a year. Please call or write for multiple-subscription rates.

Periodicals postage paid at Portland, Oregon. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Business Valuation Resources, L.L.C., 7412 S.W. Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy., Suite 106, Portland, OR 97225, phone (503) 291-7963 or (888) 287-8258, fax (503) 291-7955, e-mail: CustomerService@BVRresources.com, Web page: www.BVRresources.com. Editorial office and subscription requests should go to the above address.

Please note that by submitting material to Shannon Pratt's Business Valuation Update[®], you are granting permission for the newsletter to republish your material in electronic form.

Although the information in this newsletter has been obtained from sources that Business Valuation Resources believes to be reliable, we do not guarantee its accuracy, and such information may be condensed or incomplete. This newsletter is intended for information purposes only, and it is not intended as financial, investment, legal, or consulting advice. Copyright 2004, Business Valuation Resources, L.L.C. (BVR). All rights reserved. No part of this newsletter may be reproduced without express written consent from BVR.

Derivatives valuation: One size does not fit all

...continued from front page

evaluating whether they should comply with this new legislation even though they are not obliged to do so.

Valuation complicated by derivatives diversity

Clearly, understanding how to value instruments that "derive" their value from some underlying asset is an important topic for investors, regulators, attorneys and managers alike. Climbing the learning curve, however, is easier said than done. Derivative instrument valuation is a complicated business that requires a solid understanding of the many factors that determine fair value.

An important first step is the selection of an appropriate model.

Derivatives come in all shapes and sizes and no one model can possibly work all of the time. The partial list shown in *Exhibit 1* hints at the problems associated with the "one size fits all" concept. The variety of derivative instruments mandates the use of different models for different situations.

Model selection

The model used to value a commodity forward is completely different from that used to value an equity swap. Even when derivatives can be classified similarly, valuation model selection is still not a straightforward task.

Consider two options: a warrant issued by a closely-held company and the option embedded within a callable bond that gives the issuer the right to buy the bond back before its original maturity

date.⁷ The Black-Scholes option-pricing model provides one way to value the warrants as long as adjustments are made to reflect the fact that the warrant does not trade in an established market. Unfortunately, the assumption of a constant interest rate makes the Black-Scholes model a poor choice for valuing the callable bond option.

An alternative is to use a model that recognizes the possibility that interest rates can move around over time. With something known as the lattice approach, an analyst starts by forecasting interest rate scenarios for each time period dur-

EXHIBIT I: DERIVATIVE INSTRUMENT CATEGORIES

OPTIONS	FUTURES	FORWARDS	SWAPS
Commodity	Commodity	Commodity	Commodity
Currency	Currency	Currency	Currency
Credit	Equity	Credit	Credit
Embedded	Fixed Income	Equity	Equity
Equity	Index	Fixed Income	Fixed Income
Fixed Income	Swaps	Futures	
Options on Futures			

ing which the bond is outstanding. The future expected interest rates are then used to value the callable bond on each coupon payment date. The process is repeated to generate a value for the option-free bond.

The final step requires finding the value of the embedded option as the difference between the option-free bond and the callable bond.⁸ Importantly, both situations involve options but the valuation is completely different because the options are themselves different. The warrant is a call on equity and assumes stable interest rates. The callable bond option is quite sensitive to interest rate

Continued to next page...

⁷ An embedded option cannot be sold separately from the host security.

⁸ A callable bond represents a portfolio consisting of a long position in an option-free bond and a short position in a call. This reflects the sale of a call by the investors to the bond issuer.

Repinted with permission from Business Valuation Resources, LLC

Derivatives valuation: One size does not fit all

...continued

movements and must be priced accordingly.

Model implementation

Identification of an appropriate method is just the beginning. Implementing the model requires care in evaluating inputs. What frequency of data should be used? Will valuation estimates be consistent across different data vendors? Will the input form affect the outcome and, if so, what is the likely result? Is the data stable over time?

For more complicated valuations, the objective will guide the tradeoff between precision and computational costs. An average or range may suffice for purposes of regulatory compliance or assessing legal damages.⁹ Other situations call for a point estimate. This might occur if the derivative position will be sold or, if used to hedge something else, it must be adjusted for size.

Sometimes the inputs themselves must be modeled. When this happens, valuation of the derivative instrument will be based on what is referred to as a nested model. Consider the example of a path-dependent bond such as a mortgage-backed security. The first task is to simulate a sufficient number of interest rate paths for all time periods until the bond matures. The output from this first model is used as an input for a second model.

The goal is to project future cash flows that reflect prepayment of principal when

rates decline. Complicating things, the prepayment rate depends on multiple factors such as changes in interest rates, population mobility, household disposable income, economic expectations and overall financial market health. The process does not end after running the second model. The present value of the expected cash flow outputs are then calculated using the interest rate paths from the first model.

The result is a set of discounted cash flow totals that are typically averaged in order to estimate today's value of a particular mortgage-backed security. Inaccuracies can arise from a flawed interest rate model, a poor prepayment model or both. Either way, trouble looms. Even within a given asset class, the valuation analysis depends on the characteristics of the underlying security.

For example, the option that gives homeowners the right to prepay their mortgage when interest rates fall does not affect all mortgage-backed security values in the same way. A Collateralized Mortgage Obligation that consists of principal and interest payments will be less price-sensitive to early payments of principal than is the case with an Interest Only ("IO") strip. When the outstanding principal on underlying mortgages falls, interest on that debt will likewise fall and thereby reduce the dollar cash flows associated with the IO strip.

Model risk

Derivative instrument valuation is a time-consuming process that requires care in selection and implementation of a model. The risks associated with a bad or ill-fitted model can be costly, sometimes in the millions of dollars.

Low valuations can result in additional tax liabilities and penalties. High valuations might cause a potential buyer to walk away. When a model is being used in court, the consequences are just as dire.^{10,11} Model results that fail to meet rules of evidence can be devastating for the attorney who hired the expert witness.

The solution is to carefully consider alternative models, the objective at hand and the risk-return tradeoff inherent in what is being valued.

Conclusion

The spotlight shines brightly on derivatives and all signs point to more of the same going forward. Their vast market size makes them a force to be reckoned with. Regulatory action and investor lawsuits share the need to know more about how derivative instruments are being used and the extent to which changes in their value affect the bottom line.

This is no time for senior management to stick their heads in the sand. Understanding the economics of derivative instruments and knowing when to call in outside help is de rigueur. **BVU**

⁹ Even compliance-related valuation will vary since not all regulations require the same thing.

¹⁰ Mangiero, Susan M., "Financial Model Risk Looms Large", *The Investment Lawyer*, Volume 9, Number 11, November 2003, pages 16-21.

¹¹ Mangiero, Susan M., "Model Risk and Valuation", *Valuation Strategies*, Volume 6, Number 4, March/April 2003, pages 34-39.