

Index

Page numbers in *italics* refer to exhibits.

- AAR Corporation, 143
- AICPA National Conference on Current SEC and PCAOB Developments (2011), 52
- Analytical gaps
 - avoiding, 54–56, 115–119, 128, 160–162
 - finding, in business appraisal review, 183–188
- Analytical phase
 - of Credibility Pyramid, 36
 - macro and micro analysis, 71
- Appraisal review. *See* Business appraisal review
- Aronson v. Lewis, 58
- Assurance experts, 4–7
- Aviall, Inc., 143

- “Bases of an Expert’s Opinion Testimony” (Delaware Rules of Evidence, Rule 703), 14–15, 40
- Benchmarking
 - methodology, 106–110, 108, 109, 110
 - relative weights and qualitative analysis, 111–115
- Benefit stream, analysis of attributes, 161
- “Black box opinions,” 26
- Business appraisal review, 169–188
 - concluding, 177–178
 - determining scope of review, 175–176, 177
 - document requests, 171–173
 - engagement procedures, 170–171, 177, 181–182
 - errors and analytical gaps found, 183–188
 - findings and conclusions, 178–182
 - generally, 169–170
 - limiting conditions and assumptions, 174–175
 - reviewer’s independence, 182–183
 - reviewer’s role, defining, 173–174
- Business Expenses* (Internal Revenue Service), 132, 145–146
- Business valuation qualitative case review checklist, 85–86. *See also* Valuation analysis

- Campbell ex rel Campbell v. Metro. Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co.*, 12
- Capital
 - capital expenditures *versus* depreciation, 123
 - capitalized returns method, 33–34
 - decision making and cost of, 5–7
- Certification, business appraisal review report, 180–181
- Checklists
 - business valuation qualitative case review checklist, 85–86

Checklists (*continued*)

report writing qualitative checklist, for any discipline, 84

Cognitive dissonance theory, 150

Coker v. Georgia, 57

Completeness, credibility and, 17–18, 18, 192

Conclusion phase

of Credibility Pyramid, 37

opinion drawn from, 71

Concurrence, finding of, 178–179

Consensus, credibility and, 21

Contracts

business appraisal review agreement, 170–171, 177, 181–182

engagement agreement, 69–77

representation memo, 77–78

See also Engagement analysis

Cost of Capital Center, *2003 Yearbook* (Ibbotson and Associates), 137–138

Court decisions

analytical gaps and, 55, 57–59

credibility and, 12–13

integrity of opinion and, 159, 160

reasonableness tests and, 133–135

Credibility, 9–27

“black box opinions,” 26

completeness, 18

Credibility Pyramid, 10, 21

credibility threshold, 150–152, 151

(*See also* Integrity of opinion)

decision making and, 3, 7–8

defined, 9–10, 24, 189

importance of process and, 10, 21–22

observations about, 21–23

operational attributes of, 10–18, 51

of opining individuals, 44–46 (*See also* Opining)

opining *versus*, 25

personal attributes of, 10–11, 18–21

of reports, 115–119, 116, 117,

119, 120

truth *versus*, 7–8, 23–25

See also Credibility Pyramid

Credibility Pyramid, 29–41, 61–89

applying to business valuation, 38

“climbing” process, 10, 21, 39

defined, 34–36, 36

Delaware Rules of Evidence and, 38–40

general planning considerations, 69–78

identification of key pre-engagement parameters, 63–65

importance of process and, 29–31

Internal Revenue Service Ruling

59–60, 31, 32, 34

planning phase of engagement, 65–69, 66–68

problem-solving phases of, 36–40

self-assessment tools, 83–87, 84, 85–86

standard of value and, 79–83

stepped reading, 87–88

understanding scope taken, 149, 152

(*See also* Integrity of opinion)

valuation process and, 31–34, 37, 37–38

Curriculum vitae (CV), of opining individuals, 20–21

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 14–15, 19–20

Decision making, 1–8

assurance experts and, 4–7

credibility and, 3, 7–8

opining *versus*, 24, 25, 48–49, 192–193

truth and, 1–4, 7–8

“Defensible opinion,” 43–44

Delaware Rules of Evidence

Rule 701, 14–15, 38

Rule 702, 14–15, 39–40

Rule 703, 14–15, 40

Deposition, integrity of opinion at, 166

- Depreciation, capital expenditures *versus*, 123
- Derived estimate of value, 136–139, 138
- Determination of value
 - assurance experts and, 4–7
 - generally accepted practices, 53–54
- Disclosure
 - credibility and, 16–17, 192
 - decision making and, 2
- Discounted future returns method, 33–34
- Discount for lack of marketability, 102, 104–106, 114
- Discount for Lack of Marketability Job Aid for IRS Valuation Professionals* (U.S. Treasury), 104
- Dividend policy, 111
- Documentation
 - business appraisal review, 171–173
 - document requests, 70–77
 - supporting, 100 (*See also* Reports)
- Earnings, 105
- Economic analysis
 - credibility and, 45
 - integrity of opinion, 156–157
 - reasonable assurance and, 49
- Engagement analysis
 - business appraisal review, 170–171
 - integrity of opinion, 157–160
 - professional skepticism and, 100
 - See also* Contracts; Reports
- Enterprise goodwill, 81
- Entity size, relative to industry, 113
- Ethics, integrity of opinion and, 162–163
- Execution, credibility and, 45
- Expenses, general/administrative, 123
- Expertise, integrity of opinion and, 149, 154–156
- Fairchild Corporation, 143
- Fair market value
 - defined, 79–80
 - integrity of opinion and, 159, 160
 - reasonableness tests and, 136
- Fair value, 83
- Federal Rules of Evidence, 19–20
- Federal tax compliance, 145–146
- Festinger, Leon, 150
- Financial analysis
 - financial statements, 112
 - reasonable assurance and, 50
 - recession (2008) and decision making, 2
- First Aviation Services, 143
- Fishman, Jay, 82
- Forecasting
 - cash to support working capital, 123–124, 124
 - cash used to decrease debt balances, 123–124
 - growth rates, 115–119, 116, 117, 119, 120
 - projecting *versus*, 126
 - sales and cost of goods sold, 122–123
 - term of forecast, 125
- Forensic accounting, 155
- General acceptability, credibility and, 15–16
- Generally accepted practices, 50–54
 - credibility of opinion and, 191
 - expectation for, 193
 - integrity of opinion and, 162
- Goodwill, 81
- Gregg v. Georgia*, 57
- Growth rates, forecasting, 115–119, 116, 117, 119, 120
- Guideline company method, 139–144, 143
- Hearings, integrity of opinion in, 163–166

- Herbert V. Kohler, Jr., et al., Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 16, 62–63, 156–157
- Holding period, 113
- Hypothetical conditions, identifying, 126
- Ibbotson and Associates, 137–138
- Illustration, credibility and, 46
- Income approach, 33–34
- Independence, of business appraisal reviewers, 182–183
- Industry analysis
 - entity size and, 113
 - reasonable assurance and, 49–50
- Informed judgment, 56–59, 193
- Integrity of opinion, 149–167
 - analytical responsibilities and impact of analysis, 154–156
 - conducting analysis within parameters of economic issues, 156–157
 - credibility threshold, 150–152, 151
 - at deposition, 166
 - enhancing, 194–195
 - nine factors of, 149
 - professional skepticism and engagement awareness, 157–160
 - responding to ethical challenges, 162–163
 - reviewing analytical process for relevance and errors, 160–162
 - scope undertaken for, 152–154
 - at trial or in hearings, 163–166
- Interest, 111–112
- Internal rate of return (IRR), 137–138
- Internal Revenue Service (IRS)
 - Publication 535 (2011), *Business Expenses*, 132, 145–146
 - Revenue Ruling 77-287, 102, 104–105
 - Ruling 59-60, 31, 32, 34, 59–60, 61–63, 80–81, 113, 136, 159, 160
- Investigatory phase
 - of Credibility Pyramid, 36
 - as planning phase of engagement, 70
- Johnson, Bruce, 109–111
- Johnson/Park Study, 109–111, 110
- Johnson v. Trueblood*, 58
- Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*, 12, 14, 15, 20
- Lawyer's Guide to Buying, Selling, Merging and Closing a Law Practice*, 145
- Management Planning, Inc. (MPI), 108, 108–109, 109
- Marketplace, characteristics of, 106
- Mathews, Gilbert E., 123
- “Matrimonial” standard of value, 80–83
- McCulloch v. H. B. Fuller Co.*, 12, 16
- Misunderstandings, avoiding, 52–53
- Morrison, William, 82
- Multiple period discounting method, 33–34, 120–122, 144–145
- National Conference of the Institute of Business Appraisers (2002), 111
- Nonadvocacy, credibility and, 17, 192
- Nonconcurrency, finding of, 179–180
- No opinion, finding of, 180
- Opining, 43–60
 - analytical gaps and, 54–56
 - “black box opinions,” 26
 - business appraisal review, findings and conclusions, 178–182 (*See also* Business appraisal review)
 - conclusion phase for, 71
 - credibility of opining individuals, 20–21, 44–46, 190–192 (*See also* Credibility)
 - credibility *versus*, 25

- decision making *versus*, 24, 25, 48–49, 192–193
- “defensible opinion,” 43–44
- enhancing integrity of opinion (*See* Integrity of opinion)
- generally accepted practices, 50–54
- informed judgment for, 56–59
- reasonable assurance, 47–50, 48
- reporting opined results, 127–129 (*See also* Reports)
- See also* Reports
- “Opinion Testimony by Law Witnesses” (Delaware Rules of Evidence, Rule 701), 38
- Oral presentations, 91–102
- “Paralysis by analysis,” 21
- Park, James, 109–111
- Personal goodwill, 82
- Peters, Jerry O., 142, 144
- Pogostin v. Rice*, 58
- Potential buyers, 112
- Pratt, Shannon, 82
- Pre-engagement parameters, identifying, 63–65
- “Probable cause,” reasonableness tests and, 131–132
- Problem solving
 - credibility and, 45
 - opining and decision making as distinct endeavors, 48–49 (*See also* Decision making; Opining)
- Process
 - credibility and, 10, 21–22
 - Credibility Pyramid and, 29–31
 - defined, 29
 - See also* Credibility Pyramid
- Professional standards
 - engagement analysis and professional skepticism, 100
 - importance of, 50–54
 - integrity of opinion and professional skepticism, 157–160
 - Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, 24, 53, 126
- Prospective information, incorporating, 120–126, 124, 125
- Publication 535 (2011), *Business Expenses* (IRS), 132, 145–146
- “Put” rights/redemption policy, 112
- Quality control, reasonable assurance and, 47–50, 48
- Reasonable assurance, 47–50
- Reasonableness, credibility and, 15
- Reasonableness tests (RTs), 131–147
 - assessing, 134
 - derived estimate of value, 136–139, 138
 - guideline company method, 139–144, 143
 - internal rate of return (IRR) and, 137–138
 - reasonableness, defined, 131–132
 - reasonableness, determining, 132–136
 - reasonableness and credibility of opinion, 191
 - “reasonable suspicion,” 131–132
- Relevance
 - credibility and, 11–13, 190
 - “relevant,” defined (guideline company method), 139–140
 - reports and, 101
- Reliability
 - access to reliable information, 112
 - credibility and, 13–15, 44–46, 190–191
 - generally accepted practices, 53–54
 - reports and, 101

- Replication
 analytical gaps *versus*, 54–56
 credibility and, 11, 190
 generally accepted practices, 54
 as operational attribute of credibility, 51–52
- Reports, 91–130
 avoiding analytical gaps in
 development and derivation of
 growth rates, 115–119
 benchmarking, relative weights and
 qualitative analysis, 111–115
 benchmarking methodology,
 106–111, 108, 109, 110
 credibility of, 116, 117, 119, 120
 discount for lack of marketability, 102,
 104–106, 114
 incorporating prospective information,
 120–126, 124, 125
 internal guidance for establishing
 understanding of subject company,
 94–99
 oral presentations, 91–102
 reporting opined results, 127–129
 self-assessment tools, 83–87, 84,
 85–86
 stepped reading of, 87–88
 valuation adjustments, 102–106, 103
See also Business appraisal review
- Representation memo, 77–78, 182–183
- Resale agreement provisions, 105
- Restricted stock studies. *See* Johnson/
 Park Study; Management Planning,
 Inc. (MPI)
- Restriction on transfer, 112
- Revenue Ruling 59-60 (Internal Revenue
 Service)
 benchmarking, 113
 fair market value, 80–81
 importance of, 61–63
 integrity of opinion and, 159, 160
 reasonableness tests and, 136
- Revenue Ruling 77-287 (Internal
 Revenue Service), 102, 104–105
- Reviewing work of experts. *See* Business
 appraisal review
- Risk
 assurance experts and, 4–7
 credibility and, 22
 reasonableness tests and risk premium
 assessment, 138
 value drivers and risk factors
 questionnaire, 66–68
- Rules of thumb, 136–137, 144–145
- Rummel v. Estelle*, 57
- Schwartz, Richard L., 111
- Securities and Exchange Commission
 (SEC), 53, 140
- Self-assessment tools, 83–87, 84, 85–86
- SIC Code, 138, 139, 140
- “Similar,” defined (guideline company
 method), 139–140
- Sinclair Oil Corp. v. Levien*, 58
- Single period discounting method, 33–34
- “Splitting the baby” example, 1–2
- Stakeholders
 credibility and, 10, 11, 17, 22, 24
 decision making and, 2, 3–4, 7, 8
- Standard of value, 79–83
- Stepped reading, 87–88
- Sunward Corp. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.*, 13
- Terminal value, 125
- “Testimony by Experts” (Delaware Rules
 of Evidence, Rule 702), 14–15,
 39–40
- Third parties, impact on opined results,
 101–102
- Thoughtfulness, credibility and, 23
- Trading market, 105
- Transparency
 credibility and, 16, 192
 decision making and, 2

- Trial testimony, integrity of opinion at, 163–166
- Trop v. Dulles*, 57
- Truth
 - credibility *versus*, 7–8, 23–25
 - decision making and, 1–4
 - 2003 Yearbook* (Ibbotson and Associates), 137–138
 - 2008 Business Reference Guide*, 145
- Uncertainty, decision making and, 3–4
- Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice
 - assessment of general acceptability, 53
 - on credibility, 24
 - identification of hypothetical conditions, 126
- U.S. Treasury, 104
- Valuation analysis
 - acquiring knowledge of subject, 65–69
 - avoiding misunderstandings, 52–53
 - business valuation qualitative case review checklist, 85–86
 - engagement agreement, 69–77
 - general planning considerations, 69–78
 - identification of key pre-engagement parameters, 63–65
 - process of, 31–34
 - Revenue Ruling 59–60, 61–63
 - reviewing work of others (*See* Business appraisal review)
 - valuation adjustments, 102–106, 103
 - valuation date, 31, 39, 81
 - value drivers and risk factors questionnaire, 66–68
 - Viewpoint, alternatives to, 45
 - Zachowicz v. United States*, 19

<http://www.pbookshop.com>