VALUATION OF INVESTMENTS, PROJECTS AND BUSINESSES

Aswath Damodaran
www.damodaran.com
The first principles of corporate finance & the tie to value

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

The Investment Decision
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

The Financing Decision
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

The Dividend Decision
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.

The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value.

The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets.

How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities.

How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend on whether they prefer dividends or buybacks.
The Objective in Decision Making

- In traditional corporate finance, the objective in decision making is to maximize the value of the firm.
- A narrower objective is to maximize stockholder wealth. When the stock is traded and markets are viewed to be efficient, the objective is to maximize the stock price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets in Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Expected Value that will be created by future investments | Fixed Claim on cash flows
| | Little or No role in management
| | Fixed Maturity
| | Tax Deductible
| | Residual Claim on cash flows
| | Significant Role in management
| | Perpetual Lives

Maximize firm value
Maximize equity value
Maximize market estimate of equity value
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The Classical Objective Function

STOCKHOLDERS
- Maximize stockholder wealth
- Hire & fire managers
  - Board
  - Annual Meeting

MANAGERS
- Lend money
- Protect bondholder interests
- Reveal information honestly and on time

BONDHOLDERS
- No Social Costs
  - Costs can be traced to firm

FINANCIAL MARKETS
- Markets are efficient and assess effect on value

SOCIETY
- Aswath Damodaran
What can go wrong?

STOCKHOLDERS

Managers put their interests above stockholders

Managers put their interests above stockholders

Managers

Managers can get ripped off

Bondholders

Lend Money

Bondholders can get ripped off

BONDHOLDERS

FINANCIAL MARKETS

Significant Social Costs

Markets make mistakes and can over react

SOCIETY

Some costs cannot be traced to firm

延迟 bad news or provide misleading information
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Who’s on Board? The Disney Experience - 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reveta F. Bowers 1,5</td>
<td>Head of School, Center for Early Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy E. Disney 3</td>
<td>Vice Chairman, The Walt Disney Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael D. Eisner 3</td>
<td>Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Walt Disney Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley P. Gold 4,5</td>
<td>President and Chief Executive Officer, Shamrock Holdings, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford M. Litvack</td>
<td>Senior Executive Vice President and Chief of Corporate Operations, The Walt Disney Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignacio E. Lozano, Jr. 1,2,4</td>
<td>Editor-in-Chief, LA OPINION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George J. Mitchell s</td>
<td>Special Counsel, Verner, Lipfert, Bernard, McPherson and Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas S. Murphy</td>
<td>Former Chairman, Capital Cities/ABC, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard A. Nunis</td>
<td>Chairman, Walt Disney Attractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo J. O’Donovan, S.J.</td>
<td>President, Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael S. Ovitz 3</td>
<td>President, The Walt Disney Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Poitier 2,4</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Verdon-Cedric Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin E. Russell 2,4</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. M. Stern</td>
<td>Senior Partner Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cardon Walker 1</td>
<td>Former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Walt Disney Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond L. Watson 1,2,3</td>
<td>Vice Chairman, The Irvine Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary L. Wilson 5</td>
<td>Co-Chairman, Northwest Airlines Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Member of Audit Review Committee
2 Member of Compensation Committee
3 Member of Executive Committee
4 Member of Executive Performance Plan Committee
5 Member of Nominating Committee
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The Yandex Board of Directors

Board of Directors

- **AI Fennaughty**
  Chairman of the Board of Directors

- **Elena Ivashevtseva**
  Non-executive Director

- **Arkady Volozh**
  Chief Executive Officer and Executive Director

- **John Boynton**
  Non-executive Director

- **Esther Dyson**
  Non-executive Director

- **Alexander Voloshin**
  Non-executive Director

- **Charles Ryan**
  Non-executive Director

- **Rogier Rijnja**
  Non-executive Director
So, what next? When the cat is idle, the mice will play....

- When managers do not fear stockholders, they will often put their interests over stockholder interests
  - Greenmail: The managers of the target of a hostile takeover buy out the potential acquirer's existing stake, at a price much greater than the price paid by the raider, in return for the signing of a 'standstill' agreement.
  - Golden Parachutes: Provisions in employment contracts, that allows for the payment of a lump-sum or cash flows over a period, if managers covered by these contracts lose their jobs in a takeover.
  - Poison Pills: A security, the rights or cashflows on which are triggered by an outside event, generally a hostile takeover, is called a poison pill.
  - Shark Repellents: Anti-takeover amendments are also aimed at dissuading hostile takeovers, but differ on one very important count. They require the assent of stockholders to be instituted.
  - Overpaying on takeovers: Acquisitions often are driven by management interests rather than stockholder interests.
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Application Test: Who owns/runs your firm?

- Look at: Bloomberg printout HDS for your firm
- Who are the top stockholders in your firm?
- What are the potential conflicts of interests that you see emerging from this stockholding structure?

Control of the firm

Outside stockholders
- Size of holding
- Active or Passive?
- Short or Long term?

Inside stockholders
- % of stock held
- Voting and non-voting shares
- Control structure

Employees

Managers
- Length of tenure
- Links to insiders

Lenders

Government
Case 1: Splintering of Stockholders
Disney’s top stockholders in 2003
Case 2: Yandex’s largest stockholders, in class A shares
Yandex: The rest of the story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of shares</th>
<th>Voting rights/share</th>
<th>Voting Rights</th>
<th>% of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>250.529</td>
<td>72.29%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250.529</td>
<td>26.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>70.87</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>708.7</td>
<td>73.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>25.164</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Shares</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Held by Sberbank (Russian Government)</td>
<td>Control veto of anyone acquiring &gt;25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When traditional corporate financial theory breaks down, the solution is:

- To choose a different mechanism for corporate governance, i.e., assign the responsibility for monitoring managers to someone other than stockholders.
- To choose a different objective for the firm.
- To maximize stock price, but reduce the potential for conflict and breakdown:
  - Making managers (decision makers) and employees into stockholders
  - Protect lenders from expropriation
  - By providing information honestly and promptly to financial markets
  - Minimize social costs
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A Market Based Solution

STOCKHOLDERS

1. More activist investors
2. Hostile takeovers

Managers of poorly run firms are put on notice.

BONDHOLDERS

Protect themselves

1. Covenants
2. New Types

Firms are punished for misleading markets

Managers

Corporate Good Citizen Constraints

1. More laws
2. Investor/Customer Backlash

SOCIETY

Investors and analysts become more skeptical

FINANCIAL MARKETS
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CORPORATE AND INVESTMENT HURDLE RATES: RISK AND RETURN MODELS

“You cannot swing upon a rope that is attached only to your own belt.”
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First Principles

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

The Investment Decision
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

The Financing Decision
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

The Dividend Decision
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.

The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value.

The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets.

How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities.

How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend on whether they prefer dividends or buybacks.

Maximize the value of the business (firm)
What is Risk?

- Risk, in traditional terms, is viewed as a ‘negative’. Webster’s dictionary, for instance, defines risk as “exposing to danger or hazard”. The Chinese symbols for risk, reproduced below, give a much better description of risk:

危机

- The first symbol is the symbol for “danger”, while the second is the symbol for “opportunity”, making risk a mix of danger and opportunity. You cannot have one, without the other.

- Risk is therefore neither good nor bad. It is just a fact of life. The question that businesses have to address is therefore not whether to avoid risk but how best to incorporate it into their decision making.
The CAPM and its alternatives

Step 1: Defining Risk

The risk in an investment can be measured by the variance in actual returns around an expected return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riskless Investment</th>
<th>Low Risk Investment</th>
<th>High Risk Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Differentiating between Rewarded and Unrewarded Risk

- Risk that is specific to investment (Firm Specific)
  - Can be diversified away in a diversified portfolio
  - 1. Each investment is a small proportion of portfolio
  - 2. Risk averages out across investments in portfolio

- Risk that affects all investments (Market Risk)
  - Cannot be diversified away since most assets are affected by it.

The marginal investor is assumed to hold a “diversified” portfolio. Thus, only market risk will be rewarded and priced.

Step 3: Measuring Market Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CAPM</th>
<th>The APM</th>
<th>Multi-Factor Models</th>
<th>Proxy Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If there is 1. no private information 2. no transactions cost the optimal diversified portfolio includes every traded asset. Everyone will hold this market portfolio Market Risk = Risk added by any investment to the market portfolio: Beta of asset relative to Market portfolio (from a regression)</td>
<td>If there are no arbitrage opportunities then the market risk of any asset must be captured by betas relative to factors that affect all investments. Market Risk = Risk exposures of any asset to market factors Betas of asset relative to unspecified market factors (from a factor analysis)</td>
<td>Since market risk affects most or all investments, it must come from macroeconomic factors. Market Risk = Risk exposures of any asset to macroeconomic factors. Betas of assets relative to specified macroeconomic factors (from a regression)</td>
<td>In an efficient market, differences in returns across long periods must be due to market risk differences. Looking for variables correlated with returns should then give us proxies for this risk. Market Risk = Captured by the Proxy Variable(s) Equation relating returns to proxy variables (from a regression)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of the CAPM

1. The model makes unrealistic assumptions
2. The parameters of the model cannot be estimated precisely
   - Definition of a market index
   - Firm may have changed during the 'estimation' period'
3. The model does not work well
   - If the model is right, there should be
     a linear relationship between returns and betas
     the only variable that should explain returns is betas
   - The reality is that
     the relationship between betas and returns is weak
     Other variables (size, price/book value) seem to explain differences in returns better.
Gauging the marginal investor: Disney in 2013
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Inputs required to use the CAPM -

- The capital asset pricing model yields the following expected return:
  - Expected Return = Riskfree Rate + Beta * (Expected Return on the Market Portfolio - Riskfree Rate)

- To use the model we need three inputs:
  a. The current risk-free rate
  b. The expected market risk premium (the premium expected for investing in risky assets (market portfolio) over the riskless asset)
  c. The beta of the asset being analyzed.
I. The government bond rate is not always the risk free rate

- On a riskfree asset, the actual return is equal to the expected return. Therefore, there is no variance around the expected return.
- For an investment to be riskfree, i.e., to have an actual return be equal to the expected return, two conditions have to be met –
  - There has to be no default risk, which generally implies that the security has to be issued by the government. Note, however, that not all governments can be viewed as default free.
  - There can be no uncertainty about reinvestment rates, which implies that it is a zero coupon security with the same maturity as the cash flow being analyzed.

Proposition 1: Since investment analysis and valuation are almost always done over the long term, the risk free rate in corporate finance has to be a long term rate.

Proposition 2: Only government bonds can be risk free, but not all government bonds are risk free.
Getting a Euro risk free rate

Rate on 10-year Euro Government Bonds: January 2014

Germany: 1.75%
Austria: 2.10%
France: 2.15%
Belgium: 2.35%
Ireland: 3.30%
Italy: 3.90%
Spain: 3.95%
Portugal: 5.90%
Slovenia: 6.42%
Greece: 8.30%
What if there is no default-free entity? Estimating a risk free rate

- If the government is perceived to have default risk, the government bond rate will have a default spread component in it and not be riskfree. There are three choices we have, when this is the case.
  - Adjust the local currency government borrowing rate for default risk to get a riskless local currency rate.
    - In May 2014, the Russian Government Bond rate in rubles = 8.82%
    - The Russian local currency rating was Baa1, with a default spread of 1.6%.
      However, the sovereign CDS spread for Russia in May 2014 was 2.45%.
      Riskfree rate in Russian Rubles = 8.82% - 2.45% = 6.37%
  - Do the analysis in an alternate currency, where getting the riskfree rate is easier.
    With Yandex in 2014, we could chose to do the analysis in US dollars (rather than estimate a riskfree rate in Russian Rubles). The riskfree rate is then the US treasury bond rate.
  - Do your analysis in real terms, in which case the riskfree rate has to be a real riskfree rate. The inflation-indexed treasury rate is a measure of a real riskfree rate.
Risk free rates will vary across currencies!

Risk free rate by Currency: January 2014
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Measurement of the risk premium

- The risk premium is the premium that investors demand for investing in an average risk investment, relative to the risk-free rate.

- As a general proposition, this premium should be:
  - greater than zero
  - increase with the risk aversion of the investors in that market
  - increase with the riskiness of the “average” risk investment
A. The Historical Risk Premium
United States – January 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arithmetic Average</th>
<th>Geometric Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stocks - T. Bills</td>
<td>Stocks - T. Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-2013</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-2013</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2013</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What is the right premium?
  1. Go back as far as you can. Otherwise, the standard error in the estimate will be large.
    
    \[
    \text{Std Error in estimate} = \frac{\text{Annualized Std deviation in Stock prices}}{\sqrt{\text{Number of years of historical data}}}
    \]

  2. Be consistent in your use of a riskfree rate.

  3. Use arithmetic premiums for one-year estimates of costs of equity and geometric premiums for estimates of long term costs of equity.
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- If you can observe what investors are willing to pay for stocks, you can back out an expected return from that price and an implied equity risk premium.

\[
\text{Base year cash flow} \\
\text{Dividends (TTM):} \quad 34.32 \\
+ \text{Buybacks (TTM):} \quad 49.85 \\
= \text{Cash to investors (TTM):} \quad 84.16 \\
\text{Earnings in TTM:} \\
\]

\[
\text{Expected growth in next 5 years} \\
\text{Top down analyst estimate of earnings growth for S&P 500 with stable payout:} \quad 4.28\% \\
\]

\[
\text{Beyond year 5} \\
\text{Expected growth rate = Riskfree rate = 3.04\%} \\
\text{Terminal value =} \\
103.8(1.0304)^5(1.0304)^5(1.0304)^5 \quad = \quad 1848.36 \\
\]

\[
r = \text{Implied Expected Return on Stocks} = 8.00\% \\
\]

\[
\text{Risk free rate = T.Bond rate on 1/1/14=3.04\%} \\
\]

\[
\text{Equals} \\
\text{Implied Equity Risk Premium (1/1/14) = 8\% - 3.04\% = 4.96\%} \\
\]
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What about historical premiums for other markets?

- Historical data for markets outside the United States is available for much shorter time periods. The problem is even greater in emerging markets.
- The historical premiums that emerge from this data reflects this data problem and there is much greater error associated with the estimates of the premiums.
- Put simply, if you distrust historical risk premiums in the United States, because the estimates are backward looking and noisy, you will trust them even less outside the US, where you have less data.
A Composite way of estimating ERP for countries

Step 1: Estimate an equity risk premium for a mature market. If your preference is for a forward looking, updated number, you can estimate an implied equity risk premium for the US (assuming that you buy into the contention that it is a mature market)

- My estimate: In January 2014, my estimate for the implied premium in the US was 5%. That will also be my estimate for a mature market ERP.

Step 2: Come up with a generic and measurable definition of a mature market.

- My estimate: Any AAA rated country is mature.

Step 3: Estimate the additional risk premium that you will charge for markets that are not mature. You have two choices:

- The default spread for the country, estimated based either on sovereign ratings or the CDS market.

- A scaled up default spread, where you adjust the default spread upwards for the additional risk in equity markets.
One solution: Estimating an additional country risk premium

- Emerging markets offer growth opportunities but they are also riskier. If we want to count the growth, we have to also consider the risk.

- Two ways of estimating the country risk premium:
  - Sovereign Default Spread: In this approach, the country equity risk premium is set equal to the default spread of the bond issued by the country.
    - Equity Risk Premium for mature market = 5.00%
    - Default spread for Russia
      - Based on sovereign rating of Baa1 (Moody’s), default spread = 1.60%
      - Based on CDS spread in May 2014 = 2.45%
    - Equity Risk Premium for Russia = 5.00% + 2.45% = 7.45%
  - Adjusted for equity risk: The country equity risk premium is based upon the volatility of the equity market relative to the government bond/CDS.
    - Country risk premium = Default Spread \ast \text{ Std Deviation}_{\text{Country Equity}} / \text{ Std Deviation}_{\text{Country CDS}}
    - Standard Deviation in Micex = 20.33%
    - Standard Deviation in Russian CDS = 13.12%
    - Russian Sovereign CDS = 2.45%
    - Additional country risk premium for Russia = 2.45% (20.33%/13.12%) = 3.80%
    - Equity risk premium for Russia = 5% + 3.80% = 8.80%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ERP</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep Congo</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>Rep Congo</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>Kazakhsitan</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>E. Europe &amp; Russia</td>
<td>7.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>8.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ERP: Jan 2014**

**Country**

- **Canada**
- **Latin America**
- **North America**
- **Western Europe**

**Country Risk Premium**

- **Albania**
- **Armenia**
- **Azerbaijan**
- **Belarus**
- **Bosnia and Herzegovina**
- **Bulgaria**
- **Croatia**
- **Czech Republic**
- **Estonia**
- **Georgia**
- **Hungary**
- **Kazakhstan**
- **Latvia**
- **Lithuania**
- **Lithuania**
- **Macedonia**
- **Moldova**
- **Monenegro**
- **Moldova**
- **Montenegro**
- **Poland**
- **Portugal**
- **Romania**
- **Russia**
- **Serbia**
- **Slovakia**
- **Slovenia**
- **Ukraine**
- **E. Europe & Russia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep Congo</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep Congo</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total ERP**

- **Bangladesh**
- **Cambodia**
- **China**
- **Fiji**
- **Hong Kong**
- **India**
- **Indonesia**
- **Japan**
- **Korea**
- **Macau**
- **Malaysia**
- **Mauritius**
- **Mongolia**
- **Pakistan**
- **Papua New Guinea**
- **Philippines**
- **Singapore**
- **Sri Lanka**
- **Taiwan**
- **Thailand**
- **Vietnam**
- **Asia**

**Country Risk Premium**

- **Abu Dhabi**
- **Bahrain**
- **Israel**
- **Jordan**
- **Kuwait**
- **Lebanon**
- **Oman**
- **Qatar**
- **Saudi Arabia**
- **United Arab Emirates**
- **Middle East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>6.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** AVG: GDP weighted average**

- **Black #**: Total ERP
- **Red #**: Country risk premium
Estimating ERP for Disney: November 2013

- Incorporation: The conventional practice on equity risk premiums is to estimate an ERP based upon where a company is incorporated. Thus, the cost of equity for Disney would be computed based on the US equity risk premium, because it is a US company, and the Brazilian ERP would be used for Vale, because it is a Brazilian company.

- Operations: The more sensible practice on equity risk premium is to estimate an ERP based upon where a company operates. For Disney in 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/ Country</th>
<th>Proportion of Disney’s Revenues</th>
<th>ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US &amp; Canada</td>
<td>82.01%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>11.64%</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ERPe for Yandex

- Until 2012, Yandex derived all of its revenues from Russia, and the equity risk premium for Russia would have been the ERP for Yandex as well.
- In 2013, Yandex derived 2.7 billion rubles (about 6.8% of total) in revenues from outside Russia. The ERP that we will derive for the company is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Revenues (billions Rbls)</th>
<th>% of revenues</th>
<th>ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>93.16%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine &amp; Belarus</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandex</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>9.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimating Beta

- The standard procedure for estimating betas is to regress stock returns ($R_j$) against market returns ($R_m$) - 
  $$R_j = a + b R_m$$
  where $a$ is the intercept and $b$ is the slope of the regression.

- The slope of the regression corresponds to the beta of the stock, and measures the riskiness of the stock.

- The $R$ squared ($R^2$) of the regression provides an estimate of the proportion of the risk (variance) of a firm that can be attributed to market risk. The balance ($1 - R^2$) can be attributed to firm specific risk.
Disney’s Beta: A regression – November 2013

Aswath Damodaran
Yandex: Beta estimate in May 2014

Linear Beta
- Raw BETA: 2.185
- Adjusted BETA: 1.790
- ALPHA (Intercept): -0.159
- R^2 (Correlation^2): 0.291
- R (Correlation): 0.539
- Std Dev of Error: 4.907
- Std Error of ALPHA: 0.502
- Std Error of BETA: 0.339
- t-Test: 6.436
- Significance: 0.000
- Last T-Value: 0.968
- Last P-Value: 0.832
- Number of Points: 103
- Last Spread: 1868.32
- Last Ratio: 0.017

Aswath Damodaran
Determinants of Betas

- **Beta of Firm**
  - **Nature of product or service offered by company:**
    - Other things remaining equal, the more discretionary the product or service, the higher the beta.
  - **Operating Leverage (Fixed Costs as percent of total costs):**
    - Other things remaining equal, the greater the proportion of the costs that are fixed, the higher the beta of the company.
  - **Implications**
    1. Cyclical companies should have higher betas than non-cyclical companies.
    2. Luxury goods firms should have higher betas than basic goods.
    3. High priced goods/service firms should have higher betas than low prices goods/services firms.
    4. Growth firms should have higher betas.

- **Financial Leverage:**
  - Other things remaining equal, the greater the proportion of capital that a firm raises from debt, the higher its equity beta will be.
  - **Implications**
    - Highly levered firms should have higher betas than firms with less debt.
The top-down beta for a firm comes from a regression. The bottom up beta can be estimated by doing the following:

- Find out the businesses that a firm operates in
- Find the unlevered betas of other firms in these businesses
- Take a weighted (by sales or operating income) average of these unlevered betas
- Lever up using the firm’s debt/equity ratio

The bottom up beta is a better estimate than the top down beta for the following reasons:

- The standard error of the beta estimate will be much lower
- The betas can reflect the current (and even expected future) mix of businesses that the firm is in rather than the historical mix

Aswath Damodaran
Disney’s businesses: The financial breakdown (from 2013 annual report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Income</th>
<th>D&amp;A</th>
<th>EBITDA</th>
<th>S, G &amp; A Costs</th>
<th>Cap Ex</th>
<th>Identifiable Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Networks</td>
<td>$20,356</td>
<td>$6,818</td>
<td>$251</td>
<td>$7,069</td>
<td>$2,768</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>$28,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Resorts</td>
<td>$14,087</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>$1,370</td>
<td>$3,590</td>
<td>$1,960</td>
<td>$2,110</td>
<td>$22,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Entertainment</td>
<td>$5,979</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$161</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>$2,145</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$14,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>$3,555</td>
<td>$1,112</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$1,258</td>
<td>$731</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$7,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>$1,064</td>
<td>-$87</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>-$43</td>
<td>$449</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$2,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Unlevered Betas for businesses

### Unlevered Beta

\[
(1 - \text{Cash/Firm Value})
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comparable firms</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Median Beta</th>
<th>Median D/E</th>
<th>Median Tax rate</th>
<th>Company Unlevered Beta</th>
<th>Median Cash/Firm Value</th>
<th>Business Unlevered Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Networks</td>
<td>US firms in broadcasting business</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>71.09%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>1.0024</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>1.0313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Resorts</td>
<td>Global firms in amusement park business</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>46.76%</td>
<td>35.67%</td>
<td>0.6677</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>0.7024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Entertainment</td>
<td>US movie firms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>27.06%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>1.0668</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>1.0993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>Global firms in toys/games production &amp; retail</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>29.53%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.6034</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>0.6752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Global computer gaming firms</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>34.55%</td>
<td>1.0085</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
<td>1.2187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aswath Damodaran
Disney’s unlevered beta: Operations & Entire Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>EV/Sales</th>
<th>Value of Business</th>
<th>Proportion of Disney</th>
<th>Unlevered beta</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Networks</td>
<td>$20,356</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>$66,580</td>
<td>49.27%</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>$66,579.81</td>
<td>49.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Resorts</td>
<td>$14,087</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>$45,683</td>
<td>33.81%</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>$45,682.80</td>
<td>33.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Entertainment</td>
<td>$5,979</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>$18,234</td>
<td>13.49%</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>$18,234.27</td>
<td>13.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>$3,555</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>$2,952</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>$2,951.50</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>$1,064</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>$1,684</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>$1,683.72</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney Operations</td>
<td>$45,041</td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,132</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.9239</td>
<td>$135,132.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disney has $3.93 billion in cash, invested in close to riskless assets (with a beta of zero). You can compute an unlevered beta for Disney as a company (inclusive of cash):

\[
\beta_{\text{Disney}} = \beta_{\text{Operating Assets}} \left( \frac{\text{Value}_{\text{Operating Assets}}}{\text{Value}_{\text{Operating Assets}} + \text{Value}_{\text{Cash}}} \right) + \beta_{\text{Cash}} \left( \frac{\text{Value}_{\text{Cash}}}{\text{Value}_{\text{Operating Assets}} + \text{Value}_{\text{Cash}}} \right)
\]

\[
= 0.9239 \left( \frac{135,132}{(135,132 + 3,931)} \right) + 0.00 \left( \frac{3,931}{(135,132 + 3,931)} \right) = 0.8978
\]
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The levered beta: Disney and its divisions

- To estimate the debt ratios for division, we allocate Disney’s total debt ($15,961 million) to its divisions based on identifiable assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Identifiable assets (2013)</th>
<th>Proportion of debt</th>
<th>Value of business</th>
<th>Allocated debt</th>
<th>Estimated equity</th>
<th>D/E ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Networks</td>
<td>$28,627</td>
<td>38.04%</td>
<td>$66,580</td>
<td>$6,072</td>
<td>$60,508</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Resorts</td>
<td>$22,056</td>
<td>29.31%</td>
<td>$45,683</td>
<td>$4,678</td>
<td>$41,005</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Entertainment</td>
<td>$14,750</td>
<td>19.60%</td>
<td>$18,234</td>
<td>$3,129</td>
<td>$15,106</td>
<td>20.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>$7,506</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
<td>$2,952</td>
<td>$1,592</td>
<td>$1,359</td>
<td>117.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>$2,311</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
<td>$1,684</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>$75,250</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$15,961</td>
<td>$15,961</td>
<td>$121,878</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We use the allocated debt to compute D/E ratios and levered betas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Unlevered beta</th>
<th>Value of business</th>
<th>D/E ratio</th>
<th>Levered beta</th>
<th>Cost of Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Networks</td>
<td>1.0313</td>
<td>$66,580</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
<td>1.0975</td>
<td>9.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Resorts</td>
<td>0.7024</td>
<td>$45,683</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
<td>0.7537</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Entertainment</td>
<td>1.0993</td>
<td>$18,234</td>
<td>20.71%</td>
<td>1.2448</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>0.6752</td>
<td>$2,952</td>
<td>117.11%</td>
<td>1.1805</td>
<td>9.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>1.2187</td>
<td>$1,684</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
<td>1.5385</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney Operations</td>
<td>0.9239</td>
<td>$135,132</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>1.0012</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A far simpler task: Estimating a bottom up beta and cost of equity for Yandex

- Yandex is in only one business, online advertising. The average unlevered beta for online advertising companies in May 2014 is 1.13.

- Yandex has a market debt to equity ratio of 8.60% and the marginal tax rate in Russia is 20%. The resulting levered beta for Yandex (and its single business) is 1.21.
  
  Levered beta for Yandex = 1.13 \times (1+ (1-.20) \times .086) = 1.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Risk free rate</th>
<th>ERP</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Cost of equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>0.0880</td>
<td>1.2078</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine &amp; Belarus</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>0.1550</td>
<td>1.2078</td>
<td>25.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandex</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>0.0926</td>
<td>1.2078</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimating the Cost of Debt

- If the firm has bonds outstanding, and the bonds are traded, the yield to maturity on a long-term, straight (no special features) bond can be used as the interest rate.

- If the firm is rated, use the rating and a typical default spread on bonds with that rating to estimate the cost of debt.

- If the firm is not rated, and it has recently borrowed long term from a bank, use the interest rate on the borrowing or estimate a synthetic rating for the company, and use the synthetic rating to arrive at a default spread and a cost of debt.

- The cost of debt has to be estimated in the same currency as the cost of equity and the cash flows in the valuation.
A more general route: Estimating Synthetic Ratings

- The rating for a firm can be estimated using the financial characteristics of the firm. In its simplest form, we can use just the interest coverage ratio:
  \[
  \text{Interest Coverage Ratio} = \frac{\text{EBIT}}{\text{Interest Expenses}}
  \]

- For Yandex, we obtain an interest coverage ratio of 8.52 by dividing operating income in the last twelve months by interest expenses:
  \[
  \text{Interest coverage ratio} = \frac{13884}{1630} = 8.52
  \]
## Interest Coverage Ratios, Ratings and Default Spreads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large cap (&gt;$5 billion)</th>
<th>Small cap or risky (&lt;$5 billion)</th>
<th>Rating is (S&amp;P/ Moody's)</th>
<th>Spread (11/13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;8.50</td>
<td>&gt;12.5</td>
<td>Aaa/AAA</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5-8.5</td>
<td>9.5-12.5</td>
<td>Aa2/AA</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5-6.5</td>
<td>7.5-9.5</td>
<td>A1/A+</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25-5.5</td>
<td>6-7.5</td>
<td>A2/A</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4.25</td>
<td>4.5-6</td>
<td>A3/A-</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-3</td>
<td>4-4.5</td>
<td>Baa2/BBB</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25-2.25</td>
<td>3.5-4</td>
<td>B1/BB</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.25</td>
<td>3-3.5</td>
<td>Ba2/BB</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75-2.25</td>
<td>2.5-3</td>
<td>B1/B+</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-1.75</td>
<td>2-2.5</td>
<td>B2/B</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25-1.5</td>
<td>1.5-2</td>
<td>B3/B+</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8-1.25</td>
<td>1.25-1.5</td>
<td>Caa/CCC</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65-0.8</td>
<td>0.8-1.25</td>
<td>Ca2/CC</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2-0.65</td>
<td>0.5-0.8</td>
<td>C2/C</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>D2/D</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disney: Large cap, developed
Yandex: Small cap, risky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>A1/A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From ratings to cost of debt

- For Disney, which is rated A in November 2013, this yields a US dollar cost of debt of 3.75%:
  - Disney cost of debt
  - $ = US $ Risk free rate + Default spread (based on A rating)
  - $ = 2.75% + 1.00% = 3.75%
  - Disney after-tax cost of debt = 3.75% (1-.361) = 2.40%

- For Yandex, there is no bond rating.
  - Synthetic rating = A1
  - Default spread for synthetic rating = 0.85%
  - Default spread for country (Russia) = 2.45%
  - Yandex pre-tax cost of debt = 6.37% + 2.45% + 0.85% = 9.67%
  - Yandex after-tax cost of debt = 9.67% (1-.20) = 7.74%
Weights for Cost of Capital Calculation

- The weights used in the cost of capital computation should be market values.
- There are three specious arguments used against market value
  - Book value is more reliable than market value because it is not as volatile: While it is true that book value does not change as much as market value, this is more a reflection of weakness than strength
  - Using book value rather than market value is a more conservative approach to estimating debt ratios: For most companies, using book values will yield a lower cost of capital than using market value weights.
  - Since accounting returns are computed based upon book value, consistency requires the use of book value in computing cost of capital: While it may seem consistent to use book values for both accounting return and cost of capital calculations, it does not make economic sense.
- In practical terms, estimating the market value of equity should be easy for a publicly traded firm, but some or all of the debt at most companies is not traded. As a consequence, most practitioners use the book value of debt as a proxy for the market value of debt.
Disney: From book value to market value for interest bearing debt...

- In Disney’s 2013 financial statements, the debt due over time was footnoted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time due</th>
<th>Amount due</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight * Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$1,452</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,650</td>
<td>21.83%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>11.53%</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time due</th>
<th>Amount due</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight * Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,139</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Disney’s total debt due, in book value terms, on the balance sheet is $14,288 million and the total interest expense for the year was $349 million. Using 3.75% as the pre-tax cost of debt:

- Estimated MV of Disney Debt = \[ 349 \left( \frac{1}{(1.0375)^{7.92}} \right) + \frac{14,288}{(1.0375)^{7.92}} = 13,028 \text{ million} \]
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Operating Leases at Disney

- The “debt value” of operating leases is the present value of the lease payments, at a rate that reflects their risk, usually the pre-tax cost of debt.
- The pre-tax cost of debt at Disney is 3.75%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Present Value @3.75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$507.00</td>
<td>$488.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$422.00</td>
<td>$392.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$342.00</td>
<td>$306.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$272.00</td>
<td>$234.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$217.00</td>
<td>$180.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>$356.80</td>
<td>$1,330.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt value of leases</td>
<td>$2,932.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disney reported $1,784 million in commitments after year 5. Given that their average commitment over the first 5 years, we assumed 5 years @ $356.8 million each.

- Debt outstanding at Disney = $13,028 + $ 2,933 = $15,961 million
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Current Cost of Capital: Disney

- **Equity**
  - Cost of Equity = Riskfree rate + Beta * Risk Premium
    \[= 2.75\% + 1.0013 \times (5.76\%) = 8.52\%\]
  - Market Value of Equity = $121,878 million
  - \(\text{Equity/(Debt+Equity)}\) = 88.42%

- **Debt**
  - After-tax Cost of debt = (Riskfree rate + Default Spread) \(\times (1-t)\)
    \[= (2.75\%+1\%) \times (1-.361) = 2.40\%\]
  - Market Value of Debt = $13,028 + $2933 = $ 15,961 million
  - \(\text{Debt/(Debt +Equity)}\) = 11.58%

- **Cost of Capital** = \(8.52\% \times (0.8842) + 2.40\% \times (0.1158) = 7.81\%\)
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**Debt and Operating Leases at Yandex**

- Conventional Debt outstanding = 20,783 million Rubles
- Lease commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Present Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RUB 3,021.00</td>
<td>RUB 2,754.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RUB 2,101.00</td>
<td>RUB 1,746.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RUB 1,901.00</td>
<td>RUB 1,441.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RUB 2,197.00</td>
<td>RUB 1,518.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RUB 3,556.00</td>
<td>RUB 2,241.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and beyond</td>
<td>RUB 0.00</td>
<td>RUB 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Value of leases = RUB 9,702.78

- Total Debt outstanding = 20,783 + 9,702 = 30,486 million Rubles
- Market value of equity = 354,409 million Rubles
- Debt to capital ratio = 30,486/(354,409+30,486) = 7.92%
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### Divisional Costs of Capital: Disney and Yandex Cost of Capital

#### Disney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Cost of equity</th>
<th>Cost of debt</th>
<th>Marginal tax rate</th>
<th>After-tax cost of debt</th>
<th>Debt ratio</th>
<th>Cost of capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Networks</td>
<td>9.07%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Resorts</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Entertainment</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>17.16%</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>9.55%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>53.94%</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>11.65%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>29.11%</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney Operations</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Yandex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cost of equity</th>
<th>After-tax cost of debt</th>
<th>Debt to capital ratio</th>
<th>Cost of capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>16.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine &amp; Belarus</td>
<td>25.09%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>23.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandex</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maximize the value of the business (firm)

The Investment Decision
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

The Financing Decision
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

The Dividend Decision
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.

The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value.

The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets.

How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities.

How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend whether they prefer dividends or buybacks.
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MEASURING INVESTMENT RETURNS

“Show me the money” from Jerry Maguire
First Principles

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

**The Investment Decision**
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

- The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.
- The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

**The Financing Decision**
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

- The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value
- The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets

**The Dividend Decision**
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

- How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities
- How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend on whether they prefer dividends or buybacks

Maximize the value of the business (firm)
Measures of return: earnings versus cash flows

- **Principles Governing Accounting Earnings Measurement**
  - Accrual Accounting: Show revenues when products and services are sold or provided, not when they are paid for. Show expenses associated with these revenues rather than cash expenses.
  - Operating versus Capital Expenditures: Only expenses associated with creating revenues in the current period should be treated as operating expenses. Expenses that create benefits over several periods are written off over multiple periods (as depreciation or amortization).

- **To get from accounting earnings to cash flows:**
  - you have to add back non-cash expenses (like depreciation)
  - you have to subtract out cash outflows which are not expensed (such as capital expenditures)
  - you have to make accrual revenues and expenses into cash revenues and expenses (by considering changes in working capital).
Measuring Returns Right: The Basic Principles

- Use cash flows rather than earnings. You cannot spend earnings.
- Use “incremental” cash flows relating to the investment decision, i.e., cashflows that occur as a consequence of the decision, rather than total cash flows.
- Use “time weighted” returns, i.e., value cash flows that occur earlier more than cash flows that occur later.

Earnings versus Cash Flows: A Disney Theme Park

- The theme parks to be built near Rio, modeled on Euro Disney in Paris and Disney World in Orlando.
- The complex will include a “Magic Kingdom” to be constructed, beginning immediately, and becoming operational at the beginning of the second year, and a second theme park modeled on Epcot Center at Orlando to be constructed in the second and third year and becoming operational at the beginning of the fourth year.
- The earnings and cash flows are estimated in nominal U.S. Dollars.
Key Assumptions on Start Up and Construction

- Disney has already spent $0.5 Billion researching the proposal and getting the necessary licenses for the park; none of this investment can be recovered if the park is not built. This expenditure has been capitalized and will be depreciated straight line over ten years to a salvage value of zero.

- Disney will face substantial construction costs, if it chooses to build the theme parks.
  - The cost of constructing Magic Kingdom will be $3 billion, with $2 billion to be spent right now, and $1 Billion to be spent one year from now.
  - The cost of constructing Epcot II will be $1.5 billion, with $1 billion to be spent at the end of the second year and $0.5 billion at the end of the third year.
  - These investments will be depreciated based upon a depreciation schedule in the tax code, where depreciation will be different each year.
Step 1: Estimate Accounting Earnings on Project

Direct expenses: 60% of revenues for theme parks, 75% of revenues for resort properties.
Allocated G&A: Company G&A allocated to project, based on projected revenues. Two thirds of expense is fixed, rest is variable.
Taxes: Based on marginal tax rate of 36.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magic Kingdom - Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$2,420</td>
<td>$2,662</td>
<td>$2,928</td>
<td>$2,987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epcot Rio - Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$605</td>
<td>$666</td>
<td>$732</td>
<td>$747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resort &amp; Properties - Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$688</td>
<td>$756</td>
<td>$832</td>
<td>$915</td>
<td>$933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Revenues** | $1,250 | $1,750 | $2,500 | $3,125 | $3,438 | $3,781 | $4,159 | $4,575 | $4,667 |

| **Magic Kingdom – Direct Expenses** | $0  | $600 | $840 | $1,020 | $1,200 | $1,320 | $1,452 | $1,597 | $1,757 | $1,792 |
| **Epcot Rio – Direct Expenses**    | $0  | $0   | $0   | $180 | $300 | $330 | $363 | $399 | $439 | $448 |
| **Resort & Property – Direct Expenses** | $0  | $188 | $263 | $375 | $469 | $516 | $567 | $624 | $686 | $700 |

| **Total Direct Expenses** | $788 | $1,103 | $1,575 | $1,969 | $2,166 | $2,382 | $2,620 | $2,882 | $2,940 |

| **Depreciation & Amortization** | $50  | $425 | $469 | $444 | $372 | $367 | $364 | $364 | $366 | $368 |
| **Allocated G&A Costs**         | $0   | $188 | $263 | $375 | $469 | $516 | $567 | $624 | $686 | $700 |
| **Operating Income**           | -$50 | -$150 | -$84 | $106 | $315 | $389 | $467 | $551 | $641 | $658 |
| **Taxes**                      | -$18 | -$54 | -$30 | $38  | $114 | $141 | $169 | $199 | $231 | $238 |
| **Operating Income after Taxes** | -$32 | -$96 | -$54 | $68  | $202 | $249 | $299 | $352 | $410 | $421 |
And the Accounting View of Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>After-tax Operating Income</th>
<th>BV of pre-project investment</th>
<th>BV of fixed assets</th>
<th>BV of Working capital</th>
<th>BV of Capital</th>
<th>Average BV of Capital</th>
<th>ROC(a)</th>
<th>ROC(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-$32</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
<td>$2,975</td>
<td>-1.07%</td>
<td>-1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-$96</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$4,275</td>
<td>$3,863</td>
<td>-2.48%</td>
<td>-2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-$54</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$4,145</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$4,582</td>
<td>$4,429</td>
<td>-1.22%</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$4,027</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$4,452</td>
<td>$4,517</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$3,962</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>$4,368</td>
<td>$4,410</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$3,931</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$4,302</td>
<td>$4,335</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$299</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$3,931</td>
<td>$189</td>
<td>$4,270</td>
<td>$4,286</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$3,946</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$4,254</td>
<td>$4,262</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>8.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$3,978</td>
<td>$229</td>
<td>$4,257</td>
<td>$4,255</td>
<td>9.62%</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$421</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,010</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$4,243</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>9.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Based upon book capital at the start of each year
(b) Based upon average book capital over the year
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What should this return be compared to?

□ The computed return on capital on this investment is about 4%. To make a judgment on whether this is a sufficient return, we need to compare this return to a “hurdle rate”. Which of the following is the right hurdle rate? Why or why not?

a. The riskfree rate of 2.75% (T. Bond rate)
b. The cost of equity for Disney as a company (8.52%)
c. The cost of equity for Disney theme parks (7.09%)
d. The cost of capital for Disney as a company (7.81%)
e. The cost of capital for Disney theme parks (6.61%)
f. None of the above
Should there be a risk premium for foreign projects?

- The exchange rate risk should be diversifiable risk (and hence should not command a premium) if
  - the company has projects in a large number of countries (or)
  - the investors in the company are globally diversified.
  - For Disney, this risk should not affect the cost of capital used. Consequently, we would not adjust the cost of capital for Disney’s investments in other mature markets (Germany, UK, France)

- The same diversification argument can also be applied against some political risk, which would mean that it too should not affect the discount rate. However, there are aspects of political risk especially in emerging markets that will be difficult to diversify and may affect the cash flows, by reducing the expected life or cash flows on the project.

- For Disney, this is the risk that we are incorporating into the cost of capital when it invests in Brazil (or any other emerging market)
We did estimate a cost of capital of 6.61% for the Disney theme park business, using a bottom-up levered beta of 0.7537 for the business. This cost of equity may not adequately reflect the additional risk associated with the theme park being in an emerging market. The only concern we would have with using this cost of equity for this project is that it may not adequately reflect the additional risk associated with the theme park being in an emerging market (Brazil). We first computed the Brazil country risk premium (by multiplying the default spread for Brazil by the relative equity market volatility) and then re-estimated the cost of equity:

- Country risk premium for Brazil = 5.5% + 3% = 8.5%
- Cost of Equity in US$ = 2.75% + 0.7537 (8.5%) = 9.16%

Using this estimate of the cost of equity, Disney’s theme park debt ratio of 10.24% and its after-tax cost of debt of 2.40% (see chapter 4), we can estimate the cost of capital for the project:

- Cost of Capital in US$ = 9.16% (0.8976) + 2.40% (0.1024) = 8.46%
Would lead us to conclude that...

- Do not invest in this park. The return on capital of 4.18% is lower than the cost of capital for theme parks of 8.46%; This would suggest that the project should not be taken.
- Given that we have computed the average over an arbitrary period of 10 years, while the theme park itself would have a life greater than 10 years, would you feel comfortable with this conclusion?
  - Yes
  - No
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A Tangent: From New to Existing Investments: ROC for the entire firm

How “good” are the existing investments of the firm?

Measuring ROC for existing investments..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>EBIT (1-t)</th>
<th>BV of Debt</th>
<th>BV of Equity</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>BV of Capital</th>
<th>Return on Capital</th>
<th>Cost of Capital</th>
<th>ROC - Cost of Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>$6,920</td>
<td>$16,328</td>
<td>$41,958</td>
<td>$3,387</td>
<td>$54,899</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandex</td>
<td>9,868 R</td>
<td>0 R</td>
<td>37,047 R</td>
<td>12,130</td>
<td>24,917 F</td>
<td>39.61%</td>
<td>16.78%</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cash flow view of this project..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After-tax Operating Income</td>
<td>-$32</td>
<td>-$96</td>
<td>-$54</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$299</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Depreciation &amp; Amortization</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$469</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$364</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,188</td>
<td>$752</td>
<td>$276</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change in non-cash Work Capital</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashflow to firm</td>
<td>($2,500)</td>
<td>($982)</td>
<td>($921)</td>
<td>($361)</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$332</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$407</td>
<td>$434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To get from income to cash flow, we

I. added back all non-cash charges such as depreciation. Tax benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$469</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$364</td>
<td>$364</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>$368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Bendfits from Depreciation</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>$133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. subtracted out the capital expenditures

III. subtracted out the change in non-cash working capital
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The incremental cash flows on the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After-tax Operating Income</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Depreciation &amp; Amortization</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$469</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$364</td>
<td>$364</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>$368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,188</td>
<td>$752</td>
<td>$276</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change in non-cash Working Capital</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashflow to firm</td>
<td>($2,500)</td>
<td>($982)</td>
<td>($921)</td>
<td>($361)</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$332</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$407</td>
<td>$434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Pre-project investment (sunk)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pre-project Depreciation * tax rate</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Non-incremental Allocated Expense (1-t)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Cash flow to the firm</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td>($860)</td>
<td>($267)</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>$467</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>$555</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$681</td>
<td>$715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 500 million has already been spent & $50 million in depreciation will exist anyway

2/3rd of allocated G&A is fixed.
Add back this amount (1-t)
Tax rate = 36.1%
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To Time-Weighted Cash Flows

- Incremental cash flows in the earlier years are worth more than incremental cash flows in later years.
- In fact, cash flows across time cannot be added up. They have to be brought to the same point in time before aggregation.
- This process of moving cash flows through time is
  - discounting, when future cash flows are brought to the present
  - compounding, when present cash flows are taken to the future
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Discounted cash flow measures of return

- **Net Present Value (NPV):** The net present value is the sum of the present values of all cash flows from the project (including initial investment).
  - NPV = Sum of the present values of all cash flows on the project, including the initial investment, with the cash flows being discounted at the appropriate hurdle rate (cost of capital, if cash flow is cash flow to the firm, and cost of equity, if cash flow is to equity investors)
  - Decision Rule: Accept if NPV > 0

- **Internal Rate of Return (IRR):** The internal rate of return is the discount rate that sets the net present value equal to zero. It is the percentage rate of return, based upon incremental time-weighted cash flows.
  - Decision Rule: Accept if IRR > hurdle rate
Closure on Cash Flows

- In a project with a finite and short life, you would need to compute a salvage value, which is the expected proceeds from selling all of the investment in the project at the end of the project life. It is usually set equal to book value of fixed assets and working capital.

- In a project with an infinite or very long life, we compute cash flows for a reasonable period, and then compute a terminal value for this project, which is the present value of all cash flows that occur after the estimation period ends.

- Assuming the project lasts forever, and that cash flows after year 10 grow 2% (the inflation rate) forever, the present value at the end of year 10 of cash flows after that can be written as:
  - Terminal Value in year 10= CF in year 11/(Cost of Capital - Growth Rate)
  - $715 \times (1.02) / (.0846 - .02) = $11,275$ million
Which yields a NPV of..  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Cashflow</th>
<th>Terminal Value</th>
<th>Present Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-$859</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-$267</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td></td>
<td>$246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$466</td>
<td></td>
<td>$311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td></td>
<td>$317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$555</td>
<td></td>
<td>$314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td></td>
<td>$321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$681</td>
<td></td>
<td>$328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td>$11,275</td>
<td>$5,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discounted at Rio Disney cost of capital of 8.46%
The IRR of this project

Internal Rate of Return = 12.60%
Disney Theme Park: The irrelevance of currency

Expected Exchange Rate\(_t\) = Exchange Rate today \(* (1.09/1.02)^t\)

Discount at $R$ cost of capital
\(= (1.0846) (1.09/1.02) – 1 = 15.91\%\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cashflow ($)</th>
<th>$R/$</th>
<th>Cashflow (Bt)</th>
<th>Present Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-R$ 2,000</td>
<td>R$ 2.35</td>
<td>-R$ 4,700</td>
<td>-R$ 4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-R$ 1,000</td>
<td>R$ 2.51</td>
<td>-R$ 2,511</td>
<td>-R$ 2,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-R$ 859</td>
<td>R$ 2.68</td>
<td>-R$ 2,305</td>
<td>-R$ 1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-R$ 267</td>
<td>R$ 2.87</td>
<td>-R$ 767</td>
<td>-R$ 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R$ 340</td>
<td>R$ 3.06</td>
<td>R$ 1,043</td>
<td>R$ 578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R$ 466</td>
<td>R$ 3.27</td>
<td>R$ 1,527</td>
<td>R$ 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R$ 516</td>
<td>R$ 3.50</td>
<td>R$ 1,807</td>
<td>R$ 745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>R$ 555</td>
<td>R$ 3.74</td>
<td>R$ 2,076</td>
<td>R$ 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R$ 615</td>
<td>R$ 4.00</td>
<td>R$ 2,458</td>
<td>R$ 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R$ 681</td>
<td>R$ 4.27</td>
<td>R$ 2,910</td>
<td>R$ 771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R$ 11,990</td>
<td>R$ 4.56</td>
<td>R$ 54,720</td>
<td>R$ 12,504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPV = R$ 7,745/2.35 = $3,296 Million

NPV is equal to NPV in dollar terms
One simplistic solution: See how quickly you can get your money back...

- If your biggest fear is losing the billions that you invested in the project, one simple measure that you can compute is the number of years it will take you to get your money back.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cash Flow</th>
<th>Cumulated CF</th>
<th>PV of Cash Flow</th>
<th>Cumulated DCF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$2,000</td>
<td>-$2,000</td>
<td>-$2,000</td>
<td>-$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-$1,000</td>
<td>-$3,000</td>
<td>-$922</td>
<td>-$2,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-$859</td>
<td>-$3,859</td>
<td>-$730</td>
<td>-$3,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-$267</td>
<td>-$4,126</td>
<td>-$210</td>
<td>-$3,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>-$3,786</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td>-$3,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$466</td>
<td>-$3,320</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>-$3,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>-$2,803</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>-$2,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$555</td>
<td>-$2,248</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>-$2,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>-$1,633</td>
<td>$321</td>
<td>-$2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$681</td>
<td>-$952</td>
<td>$328</td>
<td>-$2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td>-$237</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>-$1,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$729</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>$298</td>
<td>-$1,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$743</td>
<td>$1,235</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>-$1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$758</td>
<td>$1,993</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>-$865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$773</td>
<td>$2,766</td>
<td>$248</td>
<td>-$617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$789</td>
<td>$3,555</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>-$384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$805</td>
<td>$4,360</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>-$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$821</td>
<td>$5,181</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payback = 10.3 years

Discounted Payback = 16.8 years
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A slightly more sophisticated approach: Sensitivity Analysis & What-if Questions...

- The NPV, IRR and accounting returns for an investment will change as we change the values that we use for different variables.
- One way of analyzing uncertainty is to check to see how sensitive the decision measure (NPV, IRR..) is to changes in key assumptions. While this has become easier and easier to do over time, there are caveats that we would offer.
- **Caveat 1**: When analyzing the effects of changing a variable, we often hold all else constant. In the real world, variables move together.
- **Caveat 2**: The objective in sensitivity analysis is that we make better decisions, not churn out more tables and numbers.
  - **Corollary 1**: Less is more. Not everything is worth varying...
  - **Corollary 2**: A picture is worth a thousand numbers (and tables).
And here is a really good picture...
The final step up: Incorporate probabilistic estimates. Rather than expected values..

- Actual Revenues as % of Forecasted Revenues (Base case = 100%)
- Country Risk Premium (Base Case = 3% (Brazil))
- Operating Expenses at Parks as % of Revenues (Base Case = 60%)
The resulting simulation...

Average = $3.40 billion
Median = $3.28 billion

NPV ranges from -$1 billion to +$8.5 billion. NPV is negative 12% of the time.
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A side bar: Should you hedge risks?

- Disney can reduce the risk in this project by hedging against exchange rate risk. Should it?
  a. Yes
  b. No
  c. Maybe
Will the benefits persist if investors hedge the risk instead of the firm?

Yes

Hedge this risk. The benefits to the firm will exceed the costs

No

Let the risk pass through to investors and let them hedge the risk.

Yes

Hedge this risk. The benefits to the firm will exceed the costs

No

Is there a significant benefit in terms of higher expected cash flows or a lower discount rate?

Yes

Can marginal investors hedge this risk cheaper than the firm can?

Yes

Indifferent to hedging risk

No

Do not hedge this risk. The benefits are small relative to costs

Negligible

Is there a significant benefit in terms of higher cash flows or a lower discount rate?

Yes

Hedge this risk. The benefits to the firm will exceed the costs

No

Let the risk pass through to investors and let them hedge the risk.

High

What is the cost to the firm of hedging this risk?

Negligible

Value Trade Off

Cash flow benefits
- Tax benefits
- Better project choices

Survival benefits (truncation risk)
- Protect against catastrophic risk
- Reduce default risk

Discount rate benefits
- Hedge "macro" risks (cost of equity)
- Reduce default risk (cost of debt or debt ratio)

Discount rate benefits
- Hedge "macro" risks (cost of equity)
- Reduce default risk (cost of debt or debt ratio)

Pricing Trade

Earnings Multiple
- Effect on multiple

Earnings
- Level
- Volatility
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A final thought: Side Costs and Benefits

- Most projects considered by any business create side costs and benefits for that business.
  - The side costs include the costs created by the use of resources that the business already owns (opportunity costs) and lost revenues for other projects that the firm may have.
  - The benefits that may not be captured in the traditional capital budgeting analysis include project synergies (where cash flow benefits may accrue to other projects) and options embedded in projects (including the options to delay, expand or abandon a project).
- The returns on a project should incorporate these costs and benefits.
First Principles

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

**The Investment Decision**
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

- The **hurdle rate** should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.
- The **return** should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

**The Financing Decision**
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

- The **optimal mix** of debt and equity maximizes firm value
- The **right kind** of debt matches the tenor of your assets

**The Dividend Decision**
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

- How much **cash** you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities
- How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend whether they prefer dividends or buybacks
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Neither a borrower nor a lender be

Someone who obviously hated this part of corporate finance
First Principles

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

**The Investment Decision**
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

- The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.
- The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

**The Financing Decision**
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

- The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value
- The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets

**The Dividend Decision**
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

- How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities
- How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend on whether they prefer dividends or buybacks

Maximize the value of the business (firm)
Debt or Equity: The Continuum

- The simplest measure of how much debt and equity a firm is using currently is to look at the proportion of debt in the total financing. This ratio is called the debt to capital ratio:
  
  \[
  \text{Debt to Capital Ratio} = \frac{\text{Debt}}{\text{Debt} + \text{Equity}}
  \]

- In general, this ratio should be computed using market values for both debt and equity, and include all debt.
# Debt: Summarizing the trade off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of Debt</th>
<th>Disadvantages of Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Tax Benefit:** Interest expenses on debt are tax deductible but cash flows to equity are generally not.  
*Implication: The higher the marginal tax rate, the greater the benefits of debt.* | **1. Expected Bankruptcy Cost:** The expected cost of going bankrupt is a product of the probability of going bankrupt and the cost of going bankrupt. The latter includes both direct and indirect costs. The probability of going bankrupt will be higher in businesses with more volatile earnings and the cost of bankruptcy will also vary across businesses.  
*Implication:*  
1. Firms with more stable earnings should borrow more, for any given level of earnings.  
2. Firms with lower bankruptcy costs should borrow more, for any given level of earnings. |
| **2. Added Discipline:** Borrowing money may force managers to think about the consequences of the investment decisions a little more carefully and reduce bad investments.  
*Implication: As the separation between managers and stockholders increases, the benefits to using debt will go up.* | **2. Agency Costs:** Actions that benefit equity investors may hurt lenders. The greater the potential for this conflict of interest, the greater the cost borne by the borrower (as higher interest rates or more covenants).  
*Implication:* Firms where lenders can monitor/control how their money is being used should be able to borrow more than firms where this is difficult to do. |
| **3. Loss of flexibility:** Using up available debt capacity today will mean that you cannot draw on it in the future. This loss of flexibility can be disastrous if funds are needed and access to capital is shut off.  
*Implication:*  
1. Firms that can forecast future funding needs better should be able to borrow more.  
2. Firms with better access to capital markets should be more willing to borrow more today. |
A Hypothetical Scenario

Assume that you live in a world where

(a) There are no taxes
(b) Managers have stockholder interests at heart and do what’s best for stockholders.
(c) No firm ever goes bankrupt
(d) Equity investors are honest with lenders; there is no subterfuge or attempt to find loopholes in loan agreements.
(e) Firms know their future financing needs with certainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of debt</th>
<th>Costs of debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax benefits</td>
<td>Expected Bankruptcy Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Discipline</td>
<td>Agency Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for financial flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Miller-Modigliani Theorem

- In an environment, where there are no taxes, default risk or agency costs, capital structure is irrelevant.

- In this world,
  - Leverage is irrelevant. A firm's value will be determined by its project cash flows.
  - The cost of capital of the firm will not change with leverage. As a firm increases its leverage, the cost of equity will increase just enough to offset any gains to the leverage.
Optimizing capital structure: Cost of capital approach

- Value of a Firm = Present Value of Cash Flows to the Firm, discounted back at the cost of capital.
- If the cash flows to the firm are held constant, and the cost of capital is minimized, the value of the firm will be maximized.
The beta for Disney’s stock in November 2013 was 1.0013. The T. bond rate at that time was 2.75%. Using an estimated equity risk premium of 5.76%, we estimated the cost of equity for Disney to be 8.52%:

\[
\text{Cost of Equity} = 2.75\% + 1.0013(5.76\%) = 8.52\%
\]

Disney’s bond rating in May 2009 was A, and based on this rating, the estimated pretax cost of debt for Disney is 3.75%. Using a marginal tax rate of 36.1, the after-tax cost of debt for Disney is 2.40%.

\[
\text{After-Tax Cost of Debt} = 3.75\% (1 - 0.361) = 2.40\%
\]

The cost of capital was calculated using these costs and the weights based on market values of equity (121,878) and debt (15,961):

\[
\text{Cost of capital} = 8.52\% \frac{121,878}{(15,961+121,878)} + 2.40\% \frac{15,961}{(15,961+121,878)} = 7.81\%
\]
Mechanics of Cost of Capital Estimation

1. Estimate the Cost of Equity at different levels of debt:
   - Equity will become riskier -> Beta will increase -> Cost of Equity will increase.
   - Estimation will use levered beta calculation

2. Estimate the Cost of Debt at different levels of debt:
   - Default risk will go up and bond ratings will go down as debt goes up -> Cost of Debt will increase.
   - To estimating bond ratings, we will use the interest coverage ratio (EBIT/Interest expense)

3. Estimate the Cost of Capital at different levels of debt

4. Calculate the effect on Firm Value and Stock Price.
## I. Cost of Equity

Levered Beta = $0.9239 \times (1 + (1- .361) (D/E))$

Cost of equity = $2.75\% + \text{Levered beta} \times 5.76\%$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt to Capital Ratio</th>
<th>D/E Ratio</th>
<th>Levered Beta</th>
<th>Cost of Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.9239</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>0.9895</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>1.0715</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>1.1770</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>1.3175</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1.5143</td>
<td>11.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>150.00%</td>
<td>1.8095</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>233.33%</td>
<td>2.3016</td>
<td>16.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>400.00%</td>
<td>3.2856</td>
<td>21.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>900.00%</td>
<td>6.2376</td>
<td>38.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Cost of Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Ratio</th>
<th>$ Debt</th>
<th>Interest Expense</th>
<th>Interest Coverage Ratio</th>
<th>Bond Rating</th>
<th>Pre-tax cost of debt</th>
<th>Tax rate</th>
<th>After-tax cost of debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>Aaa/AAA</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$13,784</td>
<td>$434</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>Aaa/AAA</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$27,568</td>
<td>$868</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>Aaa/AAA</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$41,352</td>
<td>$1,427</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>Aa2/AA</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$55,136</td>
<td>$2,068</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>A2/A</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$68,919</td>
<td>$6,892</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>B3/B-</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$82,703</td>
<td>$9,511</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Caa/CCC</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$96,487</td>
<td>$11,096</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Caa/CCC</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>32.64%</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$110,271</td>
<td>$13,508</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Ca2/CC</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>26.81%</td>
<td>8.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$124,055</td>
<td>$16,437</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>C2/C</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td>22.03%</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disney’s cost of capital schedule...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Ratio</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Cost of Equity</th>
<th>Cost of Debt (after-tax)</th>
<th>WACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.9239</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.9895</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1.0715</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>7.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1.1770</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1.3175</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.5143</td>
<td>11.48%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1.8095</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2.3762</td>
<td>16.44%</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
<td>10.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3.6289</td>
<td>23.66%</td>
<td>8.97%</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7.4074</td>
<td>45.43%</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
<td>13.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cost of capital approach suggests that Disney should do the following...

- Disney currently has $15.96 billion in debt. The optimal dollar debt (at 40%) is roughly $55.1 billion. Disney has excess debt capacity of 39.14 billion.
- To move to its optimal and gain the increase in value, Disney should borrow $39.14 billion and buy back stock.
- Given the magnitude of this decision, you should expect to answer three questions:
  - Why should we do it?
  - What if something goes wrong?
  - What if we don’t want (or cannot) buy back stock and want to make investments with the additional debt capacity?
At its existing debt ratio of 7.92%, the company may be either close to correctly levered or slightly over levered.
Now that we have an optimal.. And an actual.. What next?

- At the end of the analysis of financing mix (using whatever tool or tools you choose to use), you can come to one of three conclusions:
  - The firm has the right financing mix
  - It has too little debt (it is under levered)
  - It has too much debt (it is over levered)

- The next step in the process is
  - Deciding how much quickly or gradually the firm should move to its optimal
  - Assuming that it does, the right kind of financing to use in making this adjustment
A Framework for Getting to the Optimal Debt Ratio

Is the actual debt ratio greater than or lesser than the optimal debt ratio?

**Actual > Optimal**
- Overlevered
  - Is the firm under bankruptcy threat?
    - Yes
      - Reduce Debt quickly
        1. Equity for Debt swap
        2. Sell Assets; use cash to pay off debt
        3. Renegotiate with lenders
    - No
      - Does the firm have good projects?
        1. Pay off debt with retained earnings.
        2. Reduce or eliminate dividends.
        3. Issue new equity and pay off debt.

**Actual < Optimal**
- Underlevered
  - Is the firm a takeover target?
    - Yes
      - Increase leverage quickly
        1. Debt/Equity swaps
        2. Borrow money & buy shares.
    - No
      - Does the firm have good projects?
        1. Pay Dividends
        2. Buy back stock
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Disney: Applying the Framework

Is the actual debt ratio greater than or lesser than the optimal debt ratio?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual &gt; Optimal</th>
<th>Actual &lt; Optimal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlevered</td>
<td>Actual (11.5%) &lt; Optimal (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the firm under bankruptcy threat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Debt quickly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Equity for Debt swap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sell Assets; use cash to pay off debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Renegotiate with lenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the firm a takeover target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase leverage quickly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Debt/Equity swaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Borrow money &amp; buy shares.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the firm have good projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take good projects with new equity or with retained earnings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay off debt with retained earnings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce or eliminate dividends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue new equity and pay off debt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the firm have good projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes. ROC &gt; Cost of capital</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take good projects With debt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do your stockholders like dividends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Dividends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy back stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Yandex: Applying the Framework

Is the actual debt ratio greater than or lesser than the optimal debt ratio?

**Actual > Optimal**
- **Over levered**
  - Is the firm under bankruptcy threat?
    - Yes
      - Reduce Debt quickly
        1. Equity for Debt swap
        2. Sell Assets; use cash to pay off debt
        3. Renegotiate with lenders
    - No
      - Does the firm have good projects?
        1. ROE > Cost of Equity
        2. ROC > Cost of Capital
  - No
    - Take good projects with new equity or with retained earnings.

**Actual < Optimal**
  - Is the firm a takeover target?
    - Yes
      - Increase leverage quickly
        1. Debt/Equity swaps
        2. Borrow money & buy shares.
    - No
      - Does the firm have good projects?
        1. ROE > Cost of Equity
        2. ROC > Cost of Capital
  - No
    - Yes. ROC > Cost of capital
      - Do your stockholders like dividends?
        - Yes
          - Pay Dividends
        - No
          - Buy back stock
    - No
      - 1. Pay off debt with retained earnings.
      - 2. Reduce or eliminate dividends
      - 3. Issue new equity and pay off debt.
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Designing Debt: The Fundamental Principle

- The objective in designing debt is to make the cash flows on debt match up as closely as possible with the cash flows that the firm makes on its assets.
- By doing so, we reduce our risk of default, increase debt capacity and increase firm value.
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## Designing Disney’s Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Project Cash Flow Characteristics</th>
<th>Type of Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Studio entertainment      | Movie projects are likely to  
• Be short-term  
• Have cash outflows primarily in dollars (because Disney makes most of its movies in the U.S.), but cash inflows could have a substantial foreign currency component (because of overseas revenues)  
• Have net cash flows that are heavily driven by whether the movie is a hit, which is often difficult to predict | Debt should be  
1. Short-term  
2. Primarily dollar debt. Mixed currency debt, reflecting audience make-up.  
3. If possible, tied to the success of movies. |
| Media networks            | Projects are likely to be  
1. Short-term  
2. Primarily in dollars, though foreign component is growing, especially for ESPN.  
3. Driven by advertising revenues and show success (Nielsen ratings) | Debt should be  
1. Short-term  
2. Primarily dollar debt  
3. If possible, linked to network ratings |
| Park resorts              | Projects are likely to be  
1. Very long-term  
2. Currency will be a function of the region (rather than country) where park is located.  
3. Affected by success of studio entertainment and media networks divisions | Debt should be  
1. Long-term  
2. Mix of currencies, based on tourist makeup at the park. |
| Consumer products         | Projects are likely to be short- to medium-term and linked to the success of the movie division; most of Disney’s product offerings and licensing revenues are derived from their movie productions | Debt should be  
1. Medium-term  
2. Dollar debt |
| Interactive               | Projects are likely to be short-term, with high growth potential and significant risk. While cash flows will initially be primarily in US dollars, the mix of currencies will shift as the business ages. | Debt should be short-term, convertible US dollar debt. |
Recommendations for Disney

- The debt issued should be long term and should have duration of about 4.3 years.
- A significant portion of the debt should be floating rate debt, reflecting Disney’s capacity to pass inflation through to its customers and the fact that operating income tends to increase as interest rates go up.
- Given Disney’s sensitivity to a stronger dollar, a portion of the debt should be in foreign currencies. The specific currency used and the magnitude of the foreign currency debt should reflect where Disney makes its revenues. Based upon 2013 numbers at least, this would indicate that about 18% of its debt should be foreign currency debt. As its broadcasting businesses expand into Latin America, it may want to consider using either Mexican Peso or Brazilian Real debt as well.
Analyzing Disney’s Current Debt

- Disney has $14.3 billion in interest-bearing debt with a face-value weighted average maturity of 7.92 years. Allowing for the fact that the maturity of debt is higher than the duration, this would indicate that Disney’s debt may be a little longer than would be optimal, but not by much.

- Of the debt, about 5.49% of the debt is in non-US dollar currencies (Indian rupees and Hong Kong dollars), but the rest is in US dollars and the company has no Euro debt. Based on our analysis, we would suggest that Disney increase its proportion of Euro debt to about 12% and tie the choice of currency on future debt issues to its expansion plans.

- Disney has no convertible debt and about 5.67% of its debt is floating rate debt, which looks low, given the company’s pricing power. While the mix of debt in 2013 may be reflective of a desire to lock in low long-term interest rates on debt, as rates rise, the company should consider expanding its use of foreign currency debt.
Adjusting Debt at Disney

- It can swap some of its existing fixed rate, dollar debt for floating rate, foreign currency debt. Given Disney’s standing in financial markets and its large market capitalization, this should not be difficult to do.

- If Disney is planning new debt issues, either to get to a higher debt ratio or to fund new investments, it can use primarily floating rate, foreign currency debt to fund these new investments. Although it may be mismatching the funding on these investments, its debt matching will become better at the company level.
Analyzing Yandex debt

- Given that Yandex gets almost all of its revenues in Russia, you would expect its debt to be in Russian rubles.
- Since the technology business is short term, you would expect the debt to be short term debt.
- Since the company is expected to grow and has limited cash flows today, you would expect the debt to be convertible.

Yandex’s actual debt is, in fact, composed of convertible debt and leases, though the former is in US dollars.
RETURNING CASH TO THE OWNERS: DIVIDEND POLICY

“Companies don’t have cash. They hold cash for their stockholders.”
First Principles

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

The Investment Decision
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

The Financing Decision
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

The Dividend Decision
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.

The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value.

The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets.

How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities.

How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend on whether they prefer dividends or buybacks.
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I. Dividends are sticky

*Dividend Changes at US companies*
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II. Dividends tend to follow earnings
II. Are affected by tax laws...

In 2003

In the last quarter of 2012
- As the possibility of tax rates reverting back to pre-2003 levels rose, 233 companies paid out $31 billion in dividends.
- Of these companies, 101 had insider holdings in excess of 20% of the outstanding stock.
IV. More and more firms are buying back stock, rather than pay dividends...
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V. And there are differences across countries...
Measures of Dividend Policy

- **Dividend Payout =** \( \frac{\text{Dividends}}{\text{Net Income}} \)
  - Measures the percentage of earnings that the company pays in dividends
  - If the net income is negative, the payout ratio cannot be computed.

- **Dividend Yield =** \( \frac{\text{Dividends per share}}{\text{Stock price}} \)
  - Measures the return that an investor can make from dividends alone
  - Becomes part of the expected return on the investment.
Dividend Payout Ratios

Dividend Payout Ratios in 2014

Global

US
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Three Schools Of Thought On Dividends

1. If there are no tax disadvantages associated with dividends & companies can issue stock, at no issuance cost, to raise equity, whenever needed
   Dividends do not matter, and dividend policy does not affect value.

2. If dividends create a tax disadvantage for investors (relative to capital gains)
   Dividends are bad, and increasing dividends will reduce value

3. If dividends create a tax advantage for investors (relative to capital gains) and/or stockholders like dividends
   Dividends are good, and increasing dividends will increase value
The balanced viewpoint

- If a company has excess cash, and few good investment opportunities (NPV>0), returning money to stockholders (dividends or stock repurchases) is good.

- If a company does not have excess cash, and/or has several good investment opportunities (NPV>0), returning money to stockholders (dividends or stock repurchases) is bad.
Assessing Dividend Policy: The Cash/Trust Assessment

- **Step 1:** How much could the company have paid out during the period under question?
- **Step 2:** How much did the company actually pay out during the period in question?
- **Step 3:** How much do I trust the management of this company with excess cash?
  - How well did they make investments during the period in question?
  - How well has my stock performed during the period in question?
How much has the company returned to stockholders?

- As firms increasing use stock buybacks, we have to measure cash returned to stockholders as not only dividends but also buybacks.

- For instance, for the companies we are analyzing the cash returned looked as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disney Dividends</th>
<th>Disney Buybacks</th>
<th>Yandex Dividends</th>
<th>Yandex Buybacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$653</td>
<td>$2,669</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$756</td>
<td>$4,993</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,076</td>
<td>$3,015</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,324</td>
<td>$4,087</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-13</td>
<td>$4,457</td>
<td>$15,412</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
<td>0 RUB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Measure of How Much a Company Could have Afforded to Pay out: FCFE

- The Free Cashflow to Equity (FCFE) is a measure of how much cash is left in the business after non-equity claimholders (debt and preferred stock) have been paid, and after any reinvestment needed to sustain the firm’s assets and future growth.

Net Income
- + Depreciation & Amortization
- = Cash flows from Operations to Equity Investors
- - Preferred Dividends
- - Capital Expenditures
- - Working Capital Needs
- - Principal Repayments
+ + Proceeds from New Debt Issues
- = Free Cash flow to Equity
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## Disney’s FCFE: 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>$6,136</td>
<td>$5,682</td>
<td>$4,807</td>
<td>$3,963</td>
<td>$3,307</td>
<td>$23,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Cap. Exp - Depr)</td>
<td>$604</td>
<td>$1,797</td>
<td>$1,718</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$122</td>
<td>$4,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ∂ Working Capital</td>
<td>($133)</td>
<td>$940</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$308</td>
<td>($109)</td>
<td>$1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free CF to Equity (pre-debt)</td>
<td>$5,665</td>
<td>$2,945</td>
<td>$2,139</td>
<td>$3,258</td>
<td>$3,294</td>
<td>$17,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Net Debt Issued</td>
<td>$1,881</td>
<td>$4,246</td>
<td>$2,743</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>($235)</td>
<td>$9,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Free CF to Equity (actual debt)</td>
<td>$7,546</td>
<td>$7,191</td>
<td>$4,882</td>
<td>$4,448</td>
<td>$3,059</td>
<td>$27,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free CF to Equity (target debt ratio)</td>
<td>$5,720</td>
<td>$3,262</td>
<td>$2,448</td>
<td>$3,340</td>
<td>$3,296</td>
<td>$18,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>$1,324</td>
<td>$1,076</td>
<td>$756</td>
<td>$653</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>$4,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends + Buybacks</td>
<td>$5,411</td>
<td>$4,091</td>
<td>$5,749</td>
<td>$3,322</td>
<td>$1,296</td>
<td>$19,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disney returned about $1.5 billion more than the $18.1 billion it had available as FCFE with a normalized debt ratio of 11.58% (its current debt ratio).
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## Yandex FCFE: 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>RUB 13,474</td>
<td>RUB 8,223</td>
<td>RUB 5,773</td>
<td>RUB 3,817</td>
<td>RUB 2,010</td>
<td><strong>RUB 33,297</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Cap. Exp - Depr)</td>
<td>RUB 3,679</td>
<td>RUB 1,033</td>
<td>RUB 4,391</td>
<td>RUB 1,253</td>
<td>RUB 307</td>
<td><strong>RUB 10,663</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- δ Working Capital</td>
<td>RUB 1,142</td>
<td>RUB 162</td>
<td>RUB 544</td>
<td>RUB 638</td>
<td>RUB 494</td>
<td><strong>RUB 716</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free CF to Equity (pre-debt)</td>
<td>RUB 8,653</td>
<td>RUB 7,028</td>
<td>RUB 838</td>
<td>RUB 3,202</td>
<td>RUB 2,197</td>
<td><strong>RUB 21,918</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dividends versus FCFE: Across the globe

Figure 11.2: Dividends versus FCFE in 2014
A Practical Framework for Analyzing Dividend Policy

How much did the firm pay out? How much could it have afforded to pay out?

What it could have paid out
What it actually paid out
Net Income
- (Cap Ex - Depr’n) (1-DR)
- Chg Working Capital (1-DR)
= FCFE

Firm pays out too little
FCFE > Dividends

Do you trust managers in the company with your cash?
Look at past project choice:
Compare ROE to Cost of Equity
ROC to WACC

Firm has history of good project choice and good projects in the future
Give managers the flexibility to keep cash and set dividends

Firm has history of poor project choice
Force managers to justify holding cash or return cash to stockholders

Firm pays out too much
FCFE < Dividends

What investment opportunities does the firm have?
Look at past project choice:
Compare ROE to Cost of Equity
ROC to WACC

Firm has good projects
Firm should cut dividends and reinvest more

Firm has poor projects
Firm should deal with its investment problem first and then cut dividends
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### A Dividend Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dividends paid out relative to FCFE</th>
<th>Quality of projects taken: ROE versus Cost of Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Surplus + Poor Projects</td>
<td>Poor projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant pressure to pay out more to stockholders as dividends or stock buybacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Surplus + Good Projects</td>
<td>Good projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum flexibility in setting dividend policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cash Deficit + Poor Projects      | Poor projects                                  |
| Cut out dividends but real problem is in investment policy. |
| Cash Deficit + Good Projects      | Good projects                                  |
| Reduce cash payout, if any, to stockholders |
Case 1: Disney in 2003

- **FCFE versus Dividends**
  - Between 1994 & 2003, Disney generated $969 million in FCFE each year.
  - Between 1994 & 2003, Disney paid out $639 million in dividends and stock buybacks each year.

- **Cash Balance**
  - Disney had a cash balance in excess of $4 billion at the end of 2003.

- **Performance measures**
  - Between 1994 and 2003, Disney has generated a return on equity, on its projects, about 2% less than the cost of equity, on average each year.
  - Between 1994 and 2003, Disney’s stock has delivered about 3% less than the cost of equity, on average each year.
  - The underperformance has been primarily post 1996 (after the Capital Cities acquisition).
Can you trust Disney’s management?

- Given Disney’s track record between 1994 and 2003, if you were a Disney stockholder, would you be comfortable with Disney’s dividend policy?
  
  a. Yes
  
  b. No

- Does the fact that the company is run by Michael Eisner, the CEO for the last 10 years and the initiator of the Cap Cities acquisition have an effect on your decision.
  
  a. Yes
  
  b. No
Following up: Disney in 2009

- Between 2004 and 2008, Disney made significant changes:
  - It replaced its CEO, Michael Eisner, with a new CEO, Bob Iger, who at least on the surface seemed to be more receptive to stockholder concerns.
  - Its stock price performance improved (positive Jensen’s alpha)
  - Its project choice improved (ROC moved from being well below cost of capital to above)
- The firm also shifted from cash returned < FCFE to cash returned > FCFE and avoided making large acquisitions.
- If you were a stockholder in 2009 and Iger made a plea to retain cash in Disney to pursue investment opportunities, would you be more receptive?
  a. Yes
  b. No
Final twist: Disney in 2013

- Disney did return to holding cash between 2008 and 2013, with dividends and buybacks amounting TO $2.6 billion less than the FCFE (with a target debt ratio) over this period.
- Disney continues to earn a return on capital well in excess of the cost of capital and its stock has doubled over the last two years.
- Now, assume that Bob Iger asks you for permission to withhold even more cash to cover future investment needs. Are you likely to go along?
  a. Yes
  b. No
Case 2: Yandex

- Yandex has been accumulating cash for the last few years. Do you trust Yandex’s management with your cash?
  a. Yes
  b. No
- If yes, why? What may cause your trust to shift?
- If no, why not? What do you plan to do to try to get the cash out of the company?
Cynic: A person who knows the price of everything but the value of nothing.
Oscar Wilde
First Principles

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

**The Investment Decision**
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate

- The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.
- The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

**The Financing Decision**
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations

- The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value
- The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets

**The Dividend Decision**
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business

- How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities
- How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend on whether they prefer dividends or buybacks
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Three approaches to valuation

1. Intrinsic valuation: The value of an asset is a function of its fundamentals – cash flows, growth and risk. In general, discounted cash flow models are used to estimate intrinsic value.

2. Relative valuation: The value of an asset is estimated based upon what investors are paying for similar assets. In general, this takes the form of value or price multiples and comparing firms within the same business.

3. Contingent claim valuation: When the cash flows on an asset are contingent on an external event, the value can be estimated using option pricing models.
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The value of an asset is the present value of the expected cash flows on that asset, over its expected life:

\[
\text{Value of asset} = \frac{E(CF_1)}{1 + r} + \frac{E(CF_2)}{(1 + r)^2} + \frac{E(CF_3)}{(1 + r)^3} + \ldots + \frac{E(CF_n)}{(1 + r)^n}
\]

1. **The IT Proposition:** If “it” does not affect the cash flows or alter risk (thus changing discount rates), “it” cannot affect value.
2. **The DUH Proposition:** For an asset to have value, the expected cash flows have to be positive some time over the life of the asset.
3. **The DON’T FREAK OUT Proposition:** Assets that generate cash flows early in their life will be worth more than assets that generate cash flows later; the latter may however have greater growth and higher cash flows to compensate.
4. **The VALUE IS NOT PRICE Proposition:** The value of an asset may be very different from its price.
## DCF Choices: Equity Valuation versus Firm Valuation

**Firm Valuation**: Value the entire business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Investments</strong></td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate cashflows today</td>
<td>Fixed Claim on cash flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes long lived (fixed) and short-lived (working capital) assets</td>
<td>Little or No role in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Value that will be created by future investments</td>
<td><strong>Fixed Maturity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tax Deductible</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets in Place</strong></td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Assets</strong></td>
<td>Residual Claim on cash flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant Role in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Perpetual Lives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity valuation**: Value just the equity claim in the business
The Ingredients that determine value.

Cashflows can be
a. After debt payments to equity
   - Dividends
   - Free Cashflow to Equity
b. Before debt payments to firm
   - Free Cashflow to Firm

Growth rate can be
a. In Equity Earnings
   - Net Income
   - Earnings per share
b. In Operating Earnings

Firm is in stable growth which it can sustain forever

Expected Cashflows during extraordinary growth phase

Discount the cashflows and terminal value to the present

Discount Rate can be
a. Cost of equity, if cashflows are equity cashflows
b. Cost of capital, if cashflows are to the firm

Present value is
a. Value of equity, if cashflows to equity discounted at cost of equity
b. Value of operating assets of the firm, if cashflows to firm discounted at the cost of capital
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I. Estimating Cash Flows

Cash Flow used

Cash flow to equity

Free Cash flow to Firm
EBIT (1 - tax rate)
- (Cap Ex - Depreciation)
- Change in Working Capital

Dividends

Augmented Dividends Dividends + Stock Buybacks

Free Cash flow to Equity (Potential Dividend)
Net Income
- (Cap Ex - Depreciation)
- Change in Working Capital
- (Debt issued - Debt repaid)
Estimating FCFF: Disney

- In the fiscal year ended September 2013, Disney reported the following:
  - Operating income (adjusted for leases) = $10,032 million
  - Effective tax rate = 31.02%
  - Capital Expenditures (including acquisitions) = $5,239 million
  - Depreciation & Amortization = $2.192 million
  - Change in non-cash working capital = $103 million

- The free cash flow to the firm can be computed as follows:
  - After-tax Operating Income = 10,032 (1 -.3102) = $6,920
  - Net Cap Expenditures = $5,239 - $2,192 = $3,629
  - Change in Working Capital = $103
  - Free Cashflow to Firm (FCFF) = $3,188

- The reinvestment and reinvestment rate are as follows:
  - Reinvestment = $3,629 + $103 = $3,732 million
  - Reinvestment Rate = $3,732/ $6,920 = 53.93%
II. Discount Rates

- **Keep it current**: When doing a valuation, you need a discount rate that reflects today’s conditions. Not only does this require you to update the base risk free rate, but also your risk premiums (equity risk premium and default spread) and perhaps even your measures of risk (betas, default risk measures).

- **Keep it consistent**: At an intuitive level, the discount rate used should be consistent with both the riskiness and the type of cash flow being discounted. The cost of equity is the rate at which we discount cash flows to equity (dividends or free cash flows to equity). The cost of capital is the rate at which we discount free cash flows to the firm.

- **Keep it in perspective**: The discount rate obviously matters in a discounted cash flow valuation, but not as much as your other inputs. In fact, as uncertainty about the future increases, the more you should focus on estimating cash flows and the less your should focus on discount rates.
Current Cost of Capital: Disney

- The beta for Disney’s stock in November 2013 was 1.0013. The T. bond rate at that time was 2.75%. Using an estimated equity risk premium of 5.76%, we estimated the cost of equity for Disney to be 8.52%:

  \[
  \text{Cost of Equity} = 2.75\% + 1.0013(5.76\%) = 8.52\%
  \]

- Disney’s bond rating in May 2009 was A, and based on this rating, the estimated pretax cost of debt for Disney is 3.75%. Using a marginal tax rate of 36.1, the after-tax cost of debt for Disney is 2.40%.

  \[
  \text{After-Tax Cost of Debt} = 3.75\% (1 - 0.361) = 2.40\%
  \]

- The cost of capital was calculated using these costs and the weights based on market values of equity (121,878) and debt (15,961):

  \[
  \text{Cost of capital} = 8.52\% \frac{121,878}{(15,961+121,878)} + 2.40\% \frac{15,961}{(15,961+121,878)} = 7.81\%
  \]
But costs of equity and capital can and should change over time...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Cost of Equity</th>
<th>After-tax Cost of Debt</th>
<th>Debt Ratio</th>
<th>Cost of capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0013</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0013</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0013</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0013</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0013</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0010</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0008</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0005</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0003</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Expected Growth

Expected Growth

- **Net Income**
  - Retention Ratio = \(1 - \frac{\text{Dividends}}{\text{Net Income}}\)
  - Return on Equity = \(\frac{\text{Net Income}}{\text{Book Value of Equity}}\)

- **Operating Income**
  - Reinvestment Rate = \(\frac{\text{Net Cap Ex} + \text{Chg in WC}}{\text{EBIT}(1-t)}\)
  - Return on Capital = \(\frac{\text{EBIT}(1-t)}{\text{Book Value of Capital}}\)
Estimating Growth in EBIT: Disney

- We started with the reinvestment rate that we computed from the 2013 financial statements:

\[
\text{Reinvestment rate} = \frac{3.629 + 103}{10,032 (1-0.3102)} = 53.93\%
\]

We computed the reinvestment rate in prior years to ensure that the 2013 values were not unusual or outliers.

- We compute the return on capital, using operating income in 2013 and capital invested at the start of the year:

\[
\text{Return on Capital}_{2013} = \frac{\text{EBIT} (1-t)}{(\text{BV of Equity} + \text{BV of Debt} - \text{Cash})} = \frac{10,032 (1-.361)}{(41,958+16,328 - 3,387)} = 12.61\%
\]

Disney’s return on capital has improved gradually over the last decade and has levelled off in the last two years.

- If Disney maintains its 2013 reinvestment rate and return on capital for the next five years, its growth rate will be 6.80 percent.

\[
\text{Expected Growth Rate from Existing Fundamentals} = 53.93\% \times 12.61\% = 6.8\%
\]
IV. Getting Closure in Valuation

- Since we cannot estimate cash flows forever, we estimate cash flows for a “growth period” and then estimate a terminal value, to capture the value at the end of the period:

\[
\text{Value} = \sum_{t=1}^{t=N} \frac{\text{CF}_t}{(1+r)^t} + \frac{\text{Terminal Value}}{(1+r)^N}
\]

- When a firm’s cash flows grow at a “constant” rate forever, the present value of those cash flows can be written as:
  - Value = Expected Cash Flow Next Period / (r - g)
  - where,
    - \( r \) = Discount rate (Cost of Equity or Cost of Capital)
    - \( g \) = Expected growth rate forever.

- This “constant” growth rate is called a stable growth rate and cannot be higher than the growth rate of the economy in which the firm operates.
Getting to stable growth...

- A key assumption in all discounted cash flow models is the period of high growth, and the pattern of growth during that period. In general, we can make one of three assumptions:
  - there is no high growth, in which case the firm is already in stable growth
  - there will be high growth for a period, at the end of which the growth rate will drop to the stable growth rate (2-stage)
  - there will be high growth for a period, at the end of which the growth rate will decline gradually to a stable growth rate (3-stage)

- The assumption of how long high growth will continue will depend upon several factors including:
  - the size of the firm (larger firm -> shorter high growth periods)
  - current growth rate (if high -> longer high growth period)
  - barriers to entry and differential advantages (if high -> longer growth period)
Estimating Stable Period Inputs: Disney

- **Respect the cap**: The growth rate forever is assumed to be 2.5. This is set lower than the riskfree rate (2.75%).

- **Stable period excess returns**: The return on capital for Disney will drop from its high growth period level of 12.61% to a stable growth return of 10%. This is still higher than the cost of capital of 7.29% but the competitive advantages that Disney has are unlikely to dissipate completely by the end of the 10th year.

- **Reinvest to grow**: Based on the expected growth rate in perpetuity (2.5%) and expected return on capital forever after year 10 of 10%, we compute a stable period reinvestment rate of 25%:
  - Reinvestment Rate = Growth Rate / Return on Capital = 2.5% / 10% = 25%

- **Adjust risk and cost of capital**: The beta for the stock will drop to one, reflecting Disney’s status as a mature company.
  - Cost of Equity = Riskfree Rate + Beta * Risk Premium = 2.75% + 5.76% = 8.51%
  - The debt ratio for Disney will rise to 20%. Since we assume that the cost of debt remains unchanged at 3.75%, this will result in a cost of capital of 7.29%
  - Cost of capital = 8.51% (.80) + 3.75% (1-.361) (.20) = 7.29%
## V. From firm value to equity value per share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach used</th>
<th>To get to equity value per share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount dividends per share at the cost of equity</td>
<td>Present value is value of equity per share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount aggregate FCFE at the cost of equity</td>
<td>Present value is value of aggregate equity. Subtract the value of equity options given to managers and divide by number of shares.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discount aggregate FCFF at the cost of capital    | \[
PV = \text{Value of operating assets} + \text{Cash & Near Cash investments} + \text{Value of minority cross holdings} - \text{Debt outstanding} \\
= \text{Value of equity} - \text{Value of equity options} \\
= \text{Value of equity in common stock} / \text{Number of shares}
\]                                                                 |

Aswath Damodaran
Getting from DCF to value per share: The Loose Ends

Discount FCFF at Cost of capital = Operating Asset Value

The adjustments to get to firm value

+ Cash & Marketable Securities
  Discount? Premium?
  + Value of Cross holdings
  Book value? Market value?
  + Value of other non-operating assets
  What should be here? What should not?

Intangible assets (Brand Name) Premium
Synergy Premium

Value of business (firm)

Complexity discount

Value of Equity

Debt

Underfunded pension/health care obligations?
Lawsuits & Contingent liabilities?

Control Premium

Value per share

Minority Discount
Distress discount
Liquidity discount

Option Overhang
Differences in cashflow/voting rights across shares
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1. The Value of Cash
An Exercise in Cash Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company A</th>
<th>Company B</th>
<th>Company C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Value</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$100 mil</td>
<td>$100 mil</td>
<td>$100 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Capital</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Capital</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades in</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In which of these companies is cash most likely to trade at face value, at a discount and at a premium?
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Cash: Discount or Premium?

Market Value of $1 in cash:
Estimates obtained by regressing Enterprise Value against Cash Balances
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2. Dealing with Holdings in Other firms

- Holdings in other firms can be categorized into:
  - Minority passive holdings, in which case only the dividend from the holdings is shown in the balance sheet.
  - Minority active holdings, in which case the share of equity income is shown in the income statements.
  - Majority active holdings, in which case the financial statements are consolidated.

- We tend to be sloppy in practice in dealing with cross holdings. After valuing the operating assets of a firm, using consolidated statements, it is common to add on the balance sheet value of minority holdings (which are in book value terms) and subtract out the minority interests (again in book value terms), representing the portion of the consolidated company that does not belong to the parent company.
How to value holdings in other firms.. In a perfect world..

- In a perfect world, we would strip the parent company from its subsidiaries and value each one separately. The value of the combined firm will be:
  - Value of parent company + Proportion of value of each subsidiary

- To do this right, you will need to be provided detailed information on each subsidiary to estimate cash flows and discount rates.
Two compromise solutions...

- **The market value solution:** When the subsidiaries are publicly traded, you could use their traded market capitalizations to estimate the values of the cross holdings. You do risk carrying into your valuation any mistakes that the market may be making in valuation.

- **The relative value solution:** When there are too many cross holdings to value separately or when there is insufficient information provided on cross holdings, you can convert the book values of holdings that you have on the balance sheet (for both minority holdings and minority interests in majority holdings) by using the average price to book value ratio of the sector in which the subsidiaries operate.
3. Other Assets that have not been counted yet..

- **Unutilized assets**: If you have assets or property that are not being utilized (vacant land, for example), you have not valued it yet. You can assess a market value for these assets and add them on to the value of the firm.

- **Overfunded pension plans**: If you have a defined benefit plan and your assets exceed your expected liabilities, you could consider the over funding with two caveats:
  - Collective bargaining agreements may prevent you from laying claim to these excess assets.
  - There are tax consequences. Often, withdrawals from pension plans get taxed at much higher rates.

- **Do not double count an asset**: If you count the income from an asset in your cash flows, you cannot count the market value of the asset in your value.
## Disney: Inputs to Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Growth Phase</th>
<th>Transition Phase</th>
<th>Stable Growth Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Period</strong></td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Forever after 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Rate</strong></td>
<td>31.02% (Effective)</td>
<td>31.02% (Effective)</td>
<td>31.02% (Effective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.1% (Marginal)</td>
<td>36.1% (Marginal)</td>
<td>36.1% (Marginal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Capital</strong></td>
<td>12.61%</td>
<td>Declines linearly to 10%</td>
<td>Stable ROC of 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Reinvestment Rate**    | 53.93% (based on normalized acquisition costs) | Declines gradually to 25% as ROC and growth rates drop: | 25% of after-tax operating income. Reinvestment rate = g/ ROC $= 2.5/10 = 25\%$
| **Expected Growth Rate in EBIT** | ROC * Reinvestment Rate = $0.1261 \times 0.5393 = 0.068$ or 6.8% | Linear decline to Stable Growth Rate of 2.5% | 2.5% |
| **Debt/Capital Ratio**   | 11.5%             | Rises linearly to 20.0% | 20%                |
| **Risk Parameters**      | Beta = $1.0013$, $k_e = 8.52\%$ | Beta changes to 1.00; Cost of debt stays at 3.75% | Beta = 1.00; $k_e = 8.51\%$ |
|                          | Pre-tax Cost of Debt = 3.75% | Cost of capital declines gradually to 7.29% | Cost of debt stays at 3.75% |
|                          | Cost of capital = 7.81% |                          | Cost of capital = 7.29% |
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Disney - November 2013

Current Cashflow to Firm
EBIT(1-t)= 10,032(1-.31)= 6,920
- (Cap Ex - Deprec) 3,629
- Chg Working capital 103
= FCFF 3,188
Reinvestment Rate = 3,732/6920 =53.93%
Return on capital = 12.61%

Op. Assets 125,477
+ Cash: 3,931
+ Non op inv 2,849
- Debt 15,961
- Minority Int 2,721
=Equity 113,575
-Options 972
Value/Share $ 62.56

Expected Growth
.5393*.1261=.068 or 6.8%

Return on Capital 12.61%
Reinvestment Rate 53.93%

Stable Growth
$g = 2.75%; Beta = 1.00;
Debt % = 20%; k(debt)=3.75
Cost of capital =7.29%
Tax rate=36.1%; ROC= 10%;
Reinvestment Rate=2.5/10=25%

Terminal Value_{10} = 7,980/(.0729-.025) = 165,323

In November 2013, Disney was trading at $67.71/share

Cost of Capital (WACC) = 8.52% (0.885) + 2.40% (0.115) = 7.81%

Cost of Equity 8.52%
Cost of Debt (2.75%+1.00%)(1-.361) = 2.40%
Based on actual A rating

Riskfree Rate:
Riskfree rate = 2.75%

Beta 1.0013

ERP for operations 5.76%
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Disney: Corporate Financing Decisions and Firm Value
If your job is enhancing value, it’s got to come from changing the fundamentals.
Revenues
* Operating Margin
= EBIT
- Tax Rate * EBIT
EBIT (1-t)
+ Depreciation
- Capital Expenditures
- Chg in Working Capital
= FCFF

More efficient operations and cost cutting: Higher Margins
Divest assets that have negative EBIT
Reduce tax rate
- moving income to lower tax locales
- transfer pricing
- risk management

Divest assets that have negative EBIT

Live off past over-investment
Better inventory management and tighter credit policies

Increase Cash Flows

Reduce the cost of capital

Make your product/service less discretionary
Reduce Operating leverage
Reduce beta

Cost of Equity * (Equity/Capital) + Pre-tax Cost of Debt (1- tax rate) * Debt/Capital
Match your financing to your assets: Reduce your default risk and cost of debt
Shift interest expenses to higher tax locales
Change financing mix to reduce cost of capital

Firm Value

Increase Expected Growth
Reinvestment Rate
* Return on Capital
= Expected Growth Rate
Reinvest more in projects
Increase operating margins
Do acquisitions
Increase capital turnover ratio

Increase length of growth period
Build on existing competitive advantages
Create new competitive advantages
Disney (Restructured) - November 2013

In November 2013, Disney was trading at $67.71/share. Move to optimal debt ratio, with higher beta.

First 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EBIT * (1 - tax rate)</th>
<th>Reinvestment</th>
<th>Free Cashflow to Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,404</td>
<td>$3,702</td>
<td>$3,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$7,923</td>
<td>$3,961</td>
<td>$3,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$8,477</td>
<td>$4,239</td>
<td>$4,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$9,071</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$9,706</td>
<td>$4,853</td>
<td>$4,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$10,298</td>
<td>$5,664</td>
<td>$5,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,833</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$11,299</td>
<td>$7,344</td>
<td>$7,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$11,683</td>
<td>$8,178</td>
<td>$8,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$11,975</td>
<td>$8,981</td>
<td>$8,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EBIT * (1 - .31) = $7,923
- Reinvestment $3,961
Free Cashflow to Firm = $3,961

Cost of Capital (WACC) = 8.52% (0.60) + 2.40%(0.40) = 7.16%

Cost of Capital declines gradually to 6.76%

Terminal Value_{ten} = 9,206/(.0676-.025) = 216,262

Expected Growth = .50 * .14 = .07 or 7%

Return on Capital = 14.00%

Return on Capital = 12.61%

Stable Growth
- g = 2.75%; Beta = 1.20;
- Debt %= 40%; k(debt)=3.75%
- Cost of capital =6.76%
- Tax rate=36.1%; ROC= 10%;
- Reinvestment Rate=2.5/10=25%

Op. Assets 147,704
+ Cash: 3,931
+ Non op inv 2,849
- Debt 15,961
- Minority Int 2,721
= Equity 135,802
-Options 869
Value/Share $ 74.96

Cost of Equity = 10.34%

Cost of Equity
- Riskfree Rate: Riskfree rate = 2.75%
- Beta 1.3175
- ERP for operations 5.76%

Weights
- E = 60%
- D = 40%

Stable Growth
- g = 2.75%; Beta = 1.20;
- Debt %= 40%; k(debt)=3.75%
- Cost of capital =6.76%
- Tax rate=36.1%; ROC= 10%;
- Reinvestment Rate=2.5/10=25%

Disney (Restructured) - November 2013

In November 2013, Disney was trading at $67.71/share. Move to optimal debt ratio, with higher beta.

Cost of Capital (WACC) = 8.52% (0.60) + 2.40%(0.40) = 7.16%

Terminal Value_{ten} = 9,206/(.0676-.025) = 216,262

Expected Growth = .50 * .14 = .07 or 7%

Return on Capital = 14.00%

Return on Capital = 12.61%

Stable Growth
- g = 2.75%; Beta = 1.20;
- Debt %= 40%; k(debt)=3.75%
- Cost of capital =6.76%
- Tax rate=36.1%; ROC= 10%;
- Reinvestment Rate=2.5/10=25%

Op. Assets 147,704
+ Cash: 3,931
+ Non op inv 2,849
- Debt 15,961
- Minority Int 2,721
= Equity 135,802
-Options 869
Value/Share $ 74.96

Cost of Equity = 10.34%

Cost of Equity
- Riskfree Rate: Riskfree rate = 2.75%
- Beta 1.3175
- ERP for operations 5.76%

Weights
- E = 60%
- D = 40%

Stable Growth
- g = 2.75%; Beta = 1.20;
- Debt %= 40%; k(debt)=3.75%
- Cost of capital =6.76%
- Tax rate=36.1%; ROC= 10%;
- Reinvestment Rate=2.5/10=25%

Op. Assets 147,704
+ Cash: 3,931
+ Non op inv 2,849
- Debt 15,961
- Minority Int 2,721
= Equity 135,802
-Options 869
Value/Share $ 74.96

Cost of Equity = 10.34%

Cost of Equity
- Riskfree Rate: Riskfree rate = 2.75%
- Beta 1.3175
- ERP for operations 5.76%

Weights
- E = 60%
- D = 40%

Stable Growth
- g = 2.75%; Beta = 1.20;
- Debt %= 40%; k(debt)=3.75%
- Cost of capital =6.76%
- Tax rate=36.1%; ROC= 10%;
- Reinvestment Rate=2.5/10=25%
THE DARK SIDE OF VALUATION:
VALUING DIFFICULT-TO-VALUE COMPANIES
The fundamental determinants of value...

- What are the cashflows from existing assets?
  - Equity: Cashflows after debt payments
  - Firm: Cashflows before debt payments

- What is the value added by growth assets?
  - Equity: Growth in equity earnings/ cashflows
  - Firm: Growth in operating earnings/ cashflows

- How risky are the cash flows from both existing assets and growth assets?
  - Equity: Risk in equity in the company
  - Firm: Risk in the firm’s operations

- When will the firm become a mature firm, and what are the potential roadblocks?
The Dark Side of Valuation...

- Valuing stable, money making companies with consistent and clear accounting statements, a long and stable history and lots of comparable firms is easy to do.

- The true test of your valuation skills is when you have to value “difficult” companies. In particular, the challenges are greatest when valuing:
  - Young companies, early in the life cycle, in young businesses
  - Companies that don’t fit the accounting mold
  - Companies that face substantial truncation risk (default or nationalization risk)
The challenge with young companies...

Figure 5.2: Estimation Issues - Young and Start-up Companies

Making judgments on revenues/profits difficult because you cannot draw on history. If you have no product/service, it is difficult to gauge market potential or profitability. The company’s entire value lies in future growth but you have little to base your estimate on.

Cash flows from existing assets non-existent or negative.

What are the cashflows from existing assets?

Different claims on cash flows can affect value of equity at each stage.

What is the value of equity in the firm?

What is the value added by growth assets?

How risky are the cash flows from both existing assets and growth assets?

Limited historical data on earnings, and no market prices for securities makes it difficult to assess risk.

When will the firm become a mature firm, and what are the potential roadblocks?

Will the firm make it through the gauntlet of market demand and competition? Even if it does, assessing when it will become mature is difficult because there is so little to go on.
Upping the ante.. Young companies in young businesses...

- When valuing a business, we generally draw on three sources of information
  - The firm’s current financial statement
    - How much did the firm sell?
    - How much did it earn?
  - The firm’s financial history, usually summarized in its financial statements.
    - How fast have the firm’s revenues and earnings grown over time?
    - What can we learn about cost structure and profitability from these trends?
    - Susceptibility to macro-economic factors (recessions and cyclical firms)
  - The industry and comparable firm data
    - What happens to firms as they mature? (Margins.. Revenue growth... Reinvestment needs... Risk)

- It is when valuing these companies that you find yourself tempted by the dark side, where
  - “Paradigm shifts” happen...
  - New metrics are invented ...
  - The story dominates and the numbers lag...
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Amazon in January 2000

- Current Revenue $1,117
- Current Margin: -36.71%
- EBIT -410m
- NOL: 500 m

Value of Op Assets $15,170
- Value of Firm $15,196
- Value of Debt $349
- Value of Equity $14,847
- Equity Options $2,892
- Value per share $35.08

All existing options valued as options, using current stock price of $84.

Sales to capital ratio and expected margin are retail industry average numbers

Sales Turnover Ratio: 3.00
Revenue Growth: 42%
Competitive Advantages
Expected Margin: -> 10.00%

Cost of Equity 12.90%
Cost of Debt 6.5% + 1.5% = 8.0%

After-tax cost of debt 8.00% 8.00% 8.00% 8.00% 8.00% 7.80% 7.75% 7.67% 7.50% 7.00%

Cost of Capital 12.84% 12.84% 12.84% 12.83% 12.81% 12.13% 11.62% 11.08% 10.49% 9.61%

Sales Revenue Growth: 42%
Stable Revenue Growth: 6%
Stable Operating Margin: 10.00%
Stable ROC = 20% Reinvest 30% of EBIT(1-t)

Terminal Value = 1881/(.0961-.06) = 52,148

Internet/Retail Operating Leverage Current D/E: 1.21%
Riskfree Rate: T. Bond rate = 6.5%

Dot.com retailers for first 5 years
Convensional retailers after year 5

Used average interest coverage ratio over next 5 years to get BBB rating.

Risk Premium: 4%

Amazon was trading at $84 in January 2000.

Pushed debt ratio to retail industry average of 15%.
Lesson 1: Don’t trust regression betas....
Lesson 2: Work backwards and keep it simple...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue Growth</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Operating Margin</th>
<th>EBIT</th>
<th>EBIT (1-t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr 12 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,117</td>
<td>-36.71%</td>
<td>-$410</td>
<td>-$410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00%</td>
<td>$2,793</td>
<td>-13.35%</td>
<td>-$373</td>
<td>-$373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$5,585</td>
<td>-1.68%</td>
<td>-$94</td>
<td>-$94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>$9,774</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>$407</td>
<td>$407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>$14,661</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
<td>$871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>$19,059</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>$1,628</td>
<td>$1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.20%</td>
<td>$23,862</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>$2,212</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>$28,729</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
<td>$2,768</td>
<td>$1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>$33,211</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
<td>$3,261</td>
<td>$2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>$36,798</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
<td>$3,646</td>
<td>$2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$39,006</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
<td>$3,883</td>
<td>$2,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$41,346</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>$4,135</td>
<td>$2,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson 3: Scaling up is hard to do...

Typically, the revenue growth rate of a newly public company outpaces its industry average for only about five years.

Post-I.P.O. growth
Median of new issues from 1965 to 2005

Number of years after coming to market

Source: Andrew Metrick, The New York Times
Lesson 4: Don’t forget to pay for growth...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Δ Revenue</th>
<th>Sales/Cap</th>
<th>Δ Investment</th>
<th>Invested Capital</th>
<th>EBIT (1-t)</th>
<th>Imputed ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr 12 mths</td>
<td>$1,117</td>
<td>$1,676</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td>-$410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,793</td>
<td>$1,676</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>$1,045</td>
<td>-$373</td>
<td>-76.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,585</td>
<td>$2,793</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$931</td>
<td>$1,976</td>
<td>-$94</td>
<td>-8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$9,774</td>
<td>$4,189</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$1,396</td>
<td>$3,372</td>
<td>$407</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$14,661</td>
<td>$4,887</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$5,001</td>
<td>$871</td>
<td>25.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$19,059</td>
<td>$4,398</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$1,466</td>
<td>$6,467</td>
<td>$1,058</td>
<td>21.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$23,862</td>
<td>$4,803</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$1,601</td>
<td>$8,068</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
<td>22.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$28,729</td>
<td>$4,868</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$1,623</td>
<td>$9,691</td>
<td>$1,799</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$33,211</td>
<td>$4,482</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
<td>$11,185</td>
<td>$2,119</td>
<td>21.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$36,798</td>
<td>$3,587</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td>$12,380</td>
<td>$2,370</td>
<td>21.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$39,006</td>
<td>$2,208</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$736</td>
<td>$13,116</td>
<td>$2,524</td>
<td>20.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY</td>
<td>$41,346</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Assumed to be =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lesson 5: There are always scenarios where the market price can be justified...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound annual Revenue Growth rate</th>
<th>Target pre-tax Operating Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$ (1.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$ 1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$ 6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$ 12.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$ 21.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$ 33.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$ 49.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson 6: Don’t forget to mop up...

- Watch out for “other” equity claims: If you buy equity in a young, growth company, watch out for other (often hidden) claims on the equity that don’t take the form of common shares. In particular, watch for options granted to managers, employees, venture capitalists and others (you will be surprised...).
  - Value these options as options (not at exercise value)
  - Take into consideration expectations of future option grants when computing expected future earnings/cash flows.

- Not all shares are equal: If there are differences in cash flow claims (dividends or liquidation) or voting rights across shares, value these differences.
  - Voting rights matter even at well run companies
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Lesson 7: You will be wrong 100% of the time... and it really is not (always) your fault...

- No matter how careful you are in getting your inputs and how well structured your model is, your estimate of value will change both as new information comes out about the company, the business and the economy.

- As information comes out, you will have to adjust and adapt your model to reflect the information. Rather than be defensive about the resulting changes in value, recognize that this is the essence of risk.

- A test: If your valuations are unbiased, you should find yourself increasing estimated values as often as you are decreasing values. In other words, there should be equal doses of good and bad news affecting valuations (at least over time).
And the market is often “more wrong”....

Amazon: Value and Price

Time of analysis

2000 2001 2002 2003

Value per share
Price per share
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Yandex: Valuation on May 24, 2014 (in Rubles)

Revenues growth of 25% a year for 5 years, tapering down to 6.37% in year 10
Pre-tax operating margin stays stable at 30% over time, with tax rate at 20%
Sales to capital ratio maintained at 2.50 (current level is 2.55)

Terminal Value

\[
\text{Terminal Value}_{10} = \frac{36,103}{0.12 - 0.0637} = 641,260
\]

Cost of capital = 17.55% (.9208) + 7.74% (.0792) = 16.77%

Cost of capital decreases to 12% from years 6-10

At the time of the valuation, Yandex was trading at $32.73 per share. Converted at the prevailing exchange rate of 34.59 Rubles/$, the price was 1,132 Rubles/share.
II. Dealing with decline and distress...

Historical data often reflects flat or declining revenues and falling margins. Investments often earn less than the cost of capital.

Growth can be negative, as firm sheds assets and shrinks. As less profitable assets are shed, the firm’s remaining assets may improve in quality.

What are the cashflows from existing assets?

What is the value added by growth assets?

How risky are the cash flows from both existing assets and growth assets?

When will the firm become a mature firm, and what are the potential roadblocks?

Depending upon the risk of the assets being divested and the use of the proceeds from the divestiture (to pay dividends or retire debt), the risk in both the firm and its equity can change.

Underfunded pension obligations and litigation claims can lower value of equity. Liquidation preferences can affect value of equity.

There is a real chance, especially with high financial leverage, that the firm will not make it. If it is expected to survive as a going concern, it will be as a much smaller entity.

What is the value of equity in the firm?
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Dealing with the “downside” of Distress

- A DCF valuation values a firm as a going concern. If there is a significant likelihood of the firm failing before it reaches stable growth and if the assets will then be sold for a value less than the present value of the expected cashflows (a distress sale value), DCF valuations will understate the value of the firm.

- Value of Equity = DCF value of equity \( (1 - \text{Probability of distress}) \) + Distress sale value of equity \( \times \text{Probability of distress} \)

- There are three ways in which we can estimate the probability of distress:
  - Use the bond rating to estimate the cumulative probability of distress over 10 years
  - Estimate the probability of distress with a probit
  - Estimate the probability of distress by looking at market value of bonds..

- The distress sale value of equity is usually best estimated as a percent of book value (and this value will be lower if the economy is doing badly and there are other firms in the same business also in distress).
Adjusting the value of LVS for distress.

In February 2009, LVS was rated B+ by S&P. Historically, 28.25% of B+ rated bonds default within 10 years. LVS has a 6.375% bond, maturing in February 2015 (7 years), trading at $529. If we discount the expected cash flows on the bond at the riskfree rate, we can back out the probability of distress from the bond price:

\[
529 = \sum_{t=1}^{7} \frac{63.75(1-\Pi_{\text{Distress}})^t}{(1.03)^t} + \frac{1000(1-\Pi_{\text{Distress}})^7}{(1.03)^7}
\]

Solving for the probability of bankruptcy, we get:

- $\Pi_{\text{Distress}}$ = Annual probability of default = 13.54%
  - Cumulative probability of surviving 10 years = (1 - .1354)10 = 23.34%
  - Cumulative probability of distress over 10 years = 1 - .2334 = .7666 or 76.66%

If LVS is becomes distressed:

- Expected distress sale proceeds = $2,769 million < Face value of debt
- Expected equity value/share = $0.00

Expected value per share = $8.12 (1 - .7666) + $0.00 (.7666) = $1.92
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III. Valuing Financial Service Companies

Existing assets are usually financial assets or loans, often marked to market. Earnings do not provide much information on underlying risk.

What are the cashflows from existing assets?

Preferred stock is a significant source of capital.

What is the value of equity in the firm?

Defining capital expenditures and working capital is a challenge. Growth can be strongly influenced by regulatory limits and constraints. Both the amount of new investments and the returns on these investments can change with regulatory changes.

What is the value added by growth assets?

When will the firm become a mature firm, and what are the potential roadblocks?

How risky are the cash flows from both existing assets and growth assets?

For financial service firms, debt is raw material rather than a source of capital. It is not only tough to define but if defined broadly can result in high financial leverage, magnifying the impact of small operating risk changes on equity risk.

In addition to all the normal constraints, financial service firms also have to worry about maintaining capital ratios that are acceptable to regulators. If they do not, they can be taken over and shut down.
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Lesson 1: Financial service companies are opaque...

- With financial service firms, we enter into a Faustian bargain. They tell us very little about the quality of their assets (loans, for a bank, for instance are not broken down by default risk status) but we accept that in return for assets being marked to market (by accountants who presumably have access to the information that we don’t have).

- In addition, estimating cash flows for a financial service firm is difficult to do. So, we trust financial service firms to pay out their cash flows as dividends. Hence, the use of the dividend discount model.
Lesson 2: For financial service companies, book value matters...

- The book value of assets and equity is mostly irrelevant when valuing non-financial service companies. After all, the book value of equity is a historical figure and can be nonsensical. (The book value of equity can be negative and is so for more than a 1000 publicly traded US companies)

- With financial service firms, book value of equity is relevant for two reasons:
  - Since financial service firms mark to market, the book value is more likely to reflect what the firms own right now (rather than a historical value)
  - The regulatory capital ratios are based on book equity. Thus, a bank with negative or even low book equity will be shut down by the regulators.

- From a valuation perspective, it therefore makes sense to pay heed to book value. In fact, you can argue that reinvestment for a bank is the amount that it needs to add to book equity to sustain its growth ambitions and safety requirements:
  - FCFE = Net Income – Reinvestment in regulatory capital (book equity)
2d. Deutsche Bank: March 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last 2 years</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>3,954 m</td>
<td>-3,855 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>2,146 m</td>
<td>285 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk adjusted assets</td>
<td>312,882 m</td>
<td>31,914 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normalized Net Income for base year 3,000 m</th>
<th>Normalized ROE = 9.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Expected growth in asset base | Target capital ratio 10% | Target ROE 10.2% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable Growth</th>
<th>g = 3%; Beta = 1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of equity</td>
<td>10.20%; Return on equity = 10.20%; Reinvestment Rate = g/ROE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Terminal Value | 2,823/(1.102-0.03) = 39.209 m |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cashflows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income - Reinvestment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCFE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PV of CF = 31,383 m
/
# shares = 581.85
Value/Share = 53.94 €

Discount at Cost of equity = 3.60% + 1.162 * 6% + -0.60% = 11.172%

In March 2009
Deutsche Bank price = 48 Euros/share (down from 89 Euros in early 2008)

Riskfree Rate: Euro Riskfree Rate = 3.6%

Beta 1.162 (for commercial & investment banking)

Mature market premium 6%

Region | Lambda | CRP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa &amp; Middle East</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Bank</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Valuing cyclical and commodity companies

Company growth often comes from movements in the economic cycle, for cyclical firms, or commodity prices, for commodity companies.

What are the cashflows from existing assets?

What is the value added by growth assets?

How risky are the cash flows from both existing assets and growth assets?

When will the firm become a mature firm, and what are the potential roadblocks?

Historical revenue and earnings data are volatile, as the economic cycle and commodity prices change.

Primary risk is from the economy for cyclical firms and from commodity price movements for commodity companies. These risks can stay dormant for long periods of apparent prosperity.

For commodity companies, the fact that there are only finite amounts of the commodity may put a limit on growth forever. For cyclical firms, there is the peril that the next recession may put an end to the firm.
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As a cyclical company, Toyota’s earnings have been volatile and 2009 earnings reflect the troubled global economy. We will assume that when economic growth returns, the operating margin for Toyota will revert back to the historical average.

Normalized Operating Income = Revenues in 2009 * Average Operating Margin (98--09)

\[ = 22661 \times 0.0733 = 1660.7 \text{ billion yen} \]

The cost of capital is computed using the average beta of automobile companies (1.10), and Toyota’s cost of debt (3.25%) and debt ratio (52.9% debt ratio. We use the Japanese marginal tax rate of 40.7% for computing both the after-tax cost of debt and the after-tax operating income.

\[ \text{Cost of capital} = 8.65\% \times 0.471 + 3.25\% \times (1 - 0.407) \times 0.529 = 5.09\% \]

Once earnings are normalized, we assume that Toyota, as the largest market-share company, will be able to maintain only stable growth (1.5% in Yen terms).

\[ \text{Value of equity} = \text{No of shares} / 3,448 \times \text{Value per share} = \text{¥4735} \]

In early 2009, Toyota Motors had the highest market share in the sector. However, the global economic recession in 2008-09 had pulled earnings down.

Normalized Return on capital and Reinvestment

Once earnings bounce back to normal, we assume that Toyota will be able to earn a return on capital equal to its cost of capital (5.09%). This is a sector, where earning excess returns has proved to be difficult even for the best of firms.

To sustain a 1.5% growth rate, the reinvestment rate has to be:

\[ \text{Reinvestment rate} = \frac{1.5\%}{5.09\%} = 29.46\% \]
Valuing a commodity company - Exxon in Early 2009

Historical data: Exxon Operating Income vs Oil Price

Regressing Exxon’s operating income against the oil price per barrel from 1985-2008:

\[
\text{Operating Income} = -6,395 + 911.32 \times \text{Average Oil Price} \quad R^2 = 90.2\%
\]

Exxon Mobil's operating income increases about $9.11 billion for every $10 increase in the price per barrel of oil and 90% of the variation in Exxon's earnings over time comes from movements in oil prices.

Estimate normalized income based on current oil price

At the time of the valuation, the oil price was $45 a barrel. Exxon’s operating income based on this price is

\[
\text{Normalized Operating Income} = -6,395 + 911.32 \times 45 = 34,614
\]

Estimate return on capital and reinvestment rate based on normalized income

This operating income translates into a return on capital of approximately 21% and a reinvestment rate of 9.52%, based upon a 2% growth rate.

\[
\text{Reinvestment Rate} = \frac{g}{\text{ROC}} = \frac{2}{21\%} = 9.52\%
\]

Exxon’s cost of capital

Exxon has been a predominantly equity funded company, and is expected to remain so, with a debt ratio of only 2.85%. It’s cost of equity is 8.35% (based on a beta of 0.90) and its pre-tax cost of debt is 3.75% (given AAA rating). The marginal tax rate is 38%.

\[
\text{Cost of capital} = 8.35\% \times 0.9715 + 3.75\% \times (1 - 0.38) \times 0.0285 = 8.18\%
\]

Expected growth in operating income

Since Exxon Mobile is the largest oil company in the world, we will assume an expected growth of only 2% in perpetuity.
Lesson 1: With “macro” companies, it is easy to get lost in “macro” assumptions…

- With cyclical and commodity companies, it is undeniable that the value you arrive at will be affected by your views on the economy or the price of the commodity.
- Consequently, you will feel the urge to take a stand on these macro variables and build them into your valuation. Doing so, though, will create valuations that are jointly impacted by your views on macro variables and your views on the company, and it is difficult to separate the two.
- The best (though not easiest) thing to do is to separate your macro views from your micro views. Use current market based numbers for your valuation, but then provide a separate assessment of what you think about those market numbers.
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Lesson 2: Use probabilistic tools to assess value as a function of macro variables...

- If there is a key macro variable affecting the value of your company that you are uncertain about (and who is not), why not quantify the uncertainty in a distribution (rather than a single price) and use that distribution in your valuation.

- That is exactly what you do in a Monte Carlo simulation, where you allow one or more variables to be distributions and compute a distribution of values for the company.

- With a simulation, you get not only everything you would get in a standard valuation (an estimated value for your company) but you will get additional output (on the variation in that value and the likelihood that your firm is under or over valued)
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Exxon Mobil Valuation: Simulation
First Principles

Maximize the value of the business (firm)

**The Investment Decision**
Invest in assets that earn a return greater than the minimum acceptable hurdle rate.

- The hurdle rate should reflect the riskiness of the investment and the mix of debt and equity used to fund it.
- The return should reflect the magnitude and the timing of the cashflows as well as all side effects.

**The Financing Decision**
Find the right kind of debt for your firm and the right mix of debt and equity to fund your operations.

- The optimal mix of debt and equity maximizes firm value.
- The right kind of debt matches the tenor of your assets.

**The Dividend Decision**
If you cannot find investments that make your minimum acceptable rate, return the cash to owners of your business.

- How much cash you can return depends upon current & potential investment opportunities.
- How you choose to return cash to the owners will depend on whether they prefer dividends or buybacks.
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