Carve-out Transactions

Robert W. Dickey and Etienne Shanon, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

This Practice Note is published by Practical Law Company on its PLCCorporate & Securities web service at http://us.practicallaw.com/7-504-1544.

This Note highlights the key issues that arise in a carve-out transaction.

A carve-out transaction is the sale of a subsidiary, division or other smaller part of a larger business enterprise. These transactions raise numerous unique issues. Being prepared for them before they arise can make the difference between a successful transaction and a failed transaction (or a transaction that never happens at all).

After deciding which assets and liabilities are staying with the seller and which are being sold (and how to unwind them) there are a series of hurdles that must be overcome in a carve-out transaction. This Note highlights key issues to consider at all stages of a carve-out transaction, including preliminary planning, due diligence and transaction agreement negotiations.

For more information on private acquisitions generally, see *Practice Notes*:

- *Asset Acquisitions: Overview (http://us.practicallaw.com/6-380-7695).*
- *Stock Acquisitions: Overview (http://us.practicallaw.com/4-380-7696).*
- *Private Acquisition Structures (http://us.practicallaw.com/6-380-9171).*

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Preparing financial statements for the assets or business line that is being divested is one of the most critical tasks in a carve-out transaction.

Although the vast majority of sellers prepare audited financial statements at the top company (or enterprise) level, the degree of financial statement preparation for subsidiaries and divisions varies widely. Most of those financial statements (if prepared at all) are inadequate for a potential buyer's purposes, whether for due diligence or raising bank or public debt financing to fund the acquisition. Accordingly, the preparation of more comprehensive financial statements often becomes a condition precedent to an acquisition and raises several related issues that impact deal mechanics, timing, and expense allocation. How best to address these issues can depend on the particular facts of the deal, but they should always be addressed early in the deal process to maximize deal value and maintain credibility among deal parties.

Specific issues that arise in connection with the preparation of financial statements for carve-out transactions are discussed below.

TIMING AND MAXIMIZING DEAL VALUE

Advance planning is essential for avoiding unexpected and costly transaction delays. Because the financial statements (together with the balance of the due diligence materials provided to interested parties) represent the prospective buyer's initial view into the target assets, it is essential that those financial statements properly reflect assets and liabilities being divested. The financial statements must often be created from scratch, and the timeline for any auction of the carve-out assets must accommodate the realistic completion of the financial statements and supporting materials. Even a big four accounting firm working together with an experienced in-house accounting staff may need a longer period of time than expected to complete carve-out financial statements. This is due, in part, to the nature of carve-out accounting and the many assumptions regarding attributed costs.

Inadequate financial statements can result in potential buyers raising serious credibility concerns about the carve-out assets.

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

These concerns can decrease the value of the assets in a potential buyer's eyes, taking their focus away from the potential synergies and financial upside of the assets.

PREPARATION EXPENSES

Parties entering into a carve-out transaction should agree in advance on the payment of all expenses associated with preparation of the financial statements. Usually this agreement takes the form of a detailed covenant in the purchase agreement. When pre-and post-closing purchase price adjustment mechanisms are built into the transaction, care must be taken to ensure that the purchase price adjustment provisions do not gut the specific deal as to preparation expenses. For example, a closing balance sheet might include an accrual for preparation expenses that would result, absent any provision to the contrary, in the seller bearing these costs even if that was not the business deal.

In addition, in a transaction in which the carve-out financial statements will be used to raise public debt, the financial statements may need to be revised due to comments from the SEC. If the financial statements must be revised or restated, an issue may arise about which party is best positioned to perform the necessary work.

Pre-closing, the seller is generally the logical party, having presumably prepared the original set of financials. After closing, however, the seller will likely not be in a position to revise the financial statements. Therefore the burden would likely fall on the buyer, which has operated the business since closing. Accordingly, an agreement on payment for the expense of preparing the statements should be negotiated as early as possible during the transaction and take into account any foreseeable contingencies such as SEC-required revisions.

PERSONNEL

Before the closing, the individuals primarily involved in the preparation of the carve-out financial statements will most likely be employees of the seller. However, these employees may be a mix of employees that the seller will retain and employees that will be transferred to the buyer in the transaction, sometimes resulting in split loyalties and divergent goals (see *Identifying Employees*).

Sellers in particular must appreciate these practicalities and be prepared to deal with employees who start working for the buyer (whether officially or unofficially) before the financial statements are completed. Buyers should recognize the degree of cooperation that is required from both sets of employees, including assistance for the preparation of debt offering documents and participation in due diligence, drafting sessions and road shows.

Sellers must also be aware of the possibility of individual employees involved in the preparation of carve-out financial statements being held liable to third parties (such as lenders). It is generally good practice to include waivers, indemnities or other devices limiting the personal liability of those employees in the covenant governing the cooperation of seller employees in the preparation of financial statements.

CONDITIONS

In transactions in which the delivery of the carve-out financial statements is a condition to the buyer's obligation to close, the specific language in the condition can be a critical part of the transaction. If there is a requirement that the financial statements must be satisfactory to the buyer (whether or not this satisfaction must be reasonable), sellers should recognize that the condition acts in certain ways as a due diligence condition in favor of the buyer.

In addition, even if there is no satisfaction element to the delivery of the financial statements, sellers should realize that, as a practical matter, the preparation of the financial statements essentially gives the buyer the opportunity to engage in further due diligence. This due diligence may reveal a breach of the seller's representations and warranties (whether concerning the financial statements or not).

US FEDERAL INCOME TAX

A carve-out transaction raises a variety of tax planning opportunities and hazards. While these overlap with tax considerations that apply generally on a sale of a business, the particular circumstances of a carve-out transaction, where other business operations are continued by the seller, can raise significant issues. Although the discussion below focuses on a high-level overview of key US federal income tax considerations, international, state and local income and other tax considerations must be considered.

Key variables that may affect the tax treatment of a carve-out transaction and related structure choices include the following:

- Tax classification of the seller.
- Number of businesses being sold and entities involved in the transaction.
- Available tax attributes of the seller.
- Sale of the business at a loss.

For more information about the tax considerations in an asset and stock sale, see *Practice Notes, Asset Acquisitions: Tax Overview (http://us.practicallaw.com/6-383-6235), Stock Acquisitions: Tax Overview (http://us.practicallaw.com/9-383-6719)* and *Tax Traps in an Acquisition of a Financially Distressed Target (http://us.practicallaw.com/2-503-3971)*.

TAX CLASSIFICATION OF THE SELLER

In a carve-out transaction, the seller's tax classification must be considered. Businesses are generally formed under state law as:

- Corporations.
- Partnerships (as general partnerships, limited partnerships, limited liability partnerships or limited liability limited partnerships).
- Limited liability companies (LLCs).

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

For tax purposes, a business is treated as one of the following:

- Disregarded entity.
- C-corporation.
- S-corporation.
- Partnership.

The state law classification of a business entity is not always the same as the tax classification of a business entity (for example, a state law partnership can often elect partnership or corporation tax status). Unlike partnerships and corporations, LLCs do not have a specific set of tax rules that apply only to LLCs.

The tax classification of a business is important because of the different tax rules that apply to a disregarded entity, C-corporation, S-corporation and partnership. For more information, see *Practice Note, Choice of Entity: Tax Issues (http://us.practicallaw.com/1-382-9949)*.

Seller is a Pass-through Entity

Partnerships, multiple-member LLCs and S-corporations are treated as pass-through entities for tax purposes, absent a tax election to be treated as a C-corporation. A pass-through entity does not pay an entity level tax. Instead, the pass-through entity's profits and losses generally pass-through to its partners, members or stockholders who include their respective share of those items on their individual income tax returns (whether or not distributed).

If the seller is a pass-through entity and the divested business consists of assets directly held by the seller or held through another pass-through entity, a buyer of the assets of the divested business (or of the pass-through entity that holds those assets) receives a cost basis in the purchased assets. This reflects the purchase price paid (rather than the seller's historic basis in these assets).

Where the purchase price reflects value in excess of the fair market value of the purchased tangible assets, part of the resulting basis is allocated to the good will, going concern value and other intangible assets of the purchased business. The basis of good will, going concern value and other intangible assets generally is eligible to be written off for tax purposes on a straight-line basis over the 15 years following the purchase (see *IRC § 197*). A buyer typically evaluates the present value of these future tax deductions when calculating its purchase price.

Seller is a C-corporation

While the most common corporate form, C-corporations, unlike pass-through entities, generally are subject to two levels of tax on their income:

- At the entity level when earned.
- At the stockholder level when distributed.

If the seller is a C-corporation and the carve-out transaction consists of part but not all of its business, the sale at a gain generally results in taxable income for the seller (for a sale at a loss, see *Sale of the Business at a Loss*).

If the divested business is operated in a corporate subsidiary of a corporate seller, the seller must evaluate whether it desires to structure the carve-out transaction as an asset sale or a stock sale. If the seller's basis in the stock of the corporate subsidiary (referred to as outside basis) is higher than the subsidiary's basis in its assets (referred to as inside basis), the seller may prefer to structure the carve-out transaction as a sale of subsidiary stock.

The seller would choose a stock sale if its gain on a sale of the subsidiary's stock would be less than the gain that would be triggered if the subsidiary sold its assets at the same price. One situation where the seller's outside basis is likely to be higher than the subsidiary's inside basis is where a seller acquired a subsidiary in a prior stock purchase without a Section 338(h)(10) election.

Buyers, however, generally prefer to structure a carve-out transaction as a purchase of the subsidiary's assets (or treat the purchase of the subsidiary's stock as a deemed purchase of assets using a Section 338(h)(10) election) because the buyer receives a cost basis in the subsidiary's assets. In a stock acquisition, the subsidiary's basis in its assets generally remains unchanged. Buyers generally prefer a cost basis because a cost basis often is higher than the basis that the subsidiary had in those assets (referred to as a stepped-up basis).

However, a seller is generally unwilling to structure a carve-out transaction as an actual or deemed asset sale if it triggers a higher tax than a sale of the subsidiary's stock.

In the following example, assume that the:

- Seller's outside basis in its subsidiary's stock is $500.
- Subsidiary's inside basis in its assets is $100.
- Subsidiary's tangible assets have a fair market value of $100 (matching inside basis) and that any additional value in the subsidiary's assets is attributable to good will, going concern value and other intangible assets (for example, customer lists, workforce in place and know-how).
- Seller, subsidiary and buyer are all subject to an effective combined US federal, state and local tax rate of 40%.

If the buyer purchases the subsidiary's stock for $1,000, the seller has a gain of $500, resulting in a tax of $200 and net proceeds to the seller of $800. If instead the buyer purchases subsidiary's assets for $1,000, the subsidiary has a gain of $900, resulting in tax of $360 and net proceeds to the seller (through the subsidiary) of $640.

However, because an asset purchase would permit the buyer to write off $900 of good will and other intangible assets over 15 years (resulting in a tax benefit over 15 years of $360), the buyer may be willing to increase its purchase price to reflect all or a portion of this future tax benefit. The buyer's evaluation of the present value of this future tax benefit can take into account, among other factors, the:

- Discount rate the buyer applies in its business planning.
- Likelihood of full use of the benefit (reflecting the buyer's future taxable income and potential changes in tax rates or tax law).

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

- Buyer's investment plans (for example, a private equity business or a buyer contemplating an initial public offering may conclude that the market's evaluation of a future tax benefit will reflect a sharp discount).

If the buyer increases its purchase price for the subsidiary's assets by $180 (or half of the anticipated future tax benefit), the net proceeds to the seller (through the subsidiary) increases by $108 (net of tax on the increased purchase price) to $748. This is still less than the $800 of net proceeds to the seller on a straight stock sale.

SALE OF MULTIPLE BUSINESSES OR BUSINESS HELD IN MULTIPLE ENTITIES

Tax planning opportunities and hazards become more complex where the divested business is held in more than one entity or where more than one carve-out transaction is underway. For example, where a parent corporation is selling both one of its direct subsidiaries and a subsidiary of that direct subsidiary (often referred to as a grand-sub), and the parent and the subsidiary file consolidated US federal income tax returns, a multi-step carve-out transaction may be more tax desirable for the buyer and the seller.

In the following example, assume that the:

- Parent has a tax basis of $100 in the subsidiary's stock.
- Subsidiary has a tax basis of $50 in the stock of the grand-sub.
- Grand-sub has a tax basis of $10 in its assets.
- Subsidiary's stock has a fair market value of $500, of which $200 reflects the value of the grand-sub.

If the parent sells the stock of the subsidiary for $500, it triggers a gain of $400, resulting in a tax of $160 (assuming a federal, state and local income tax rate of 40%) and net proceeds of $340.

If instead the subsidiary sells the grand-sub stock for $200, as a first step, in a transaction treated as a deemed asset sale (meaning with a stock sale with a Section 338(h)(10) election), the sale triggers a gain of $190. Under the consolidated return rules (see *Treas. Reg. § 1.1502-32*), the parent's basis in the subsidiary's stock is increased by this gain, resulting in a basis for the parent in the subsidiary's stock of $290. Assuming that the subsidiary distributes the $200 of proceeds from the sale of the grand-sub, the parent's tax basis in the subsidiary's stock is reduced as a result to $90.

As a second step, if the parent sells the subsidiary's stock for $300 (which is the subsidiary's value after the distribution of $200 from the sale of the grand-sub), this second step triggers a gain of $210. The parent's total gain from the two-step transaction is the same amount as the one-step sale of the subsidiary's stock ($400). However, the buyer of the grand-sub often is willing to increase its purchase price (resulting in more proceeds, as well as more tax, but a net benefit for the parent) if the transaction is structured as a multi-step transaction (for example, if the buyer receives a stepped-up basis in the grand-sub's assets). In this situation, both the buyer and seller generally prefer the multi-step carve-out transaction.

AVAILABLE TAX ATTRIBUTES OF THE SELLER

A corporate seller may have tax attributes (for example, net operating losses (NOLs) or capital losses) that are available to be carried forward to offset the gain resulting from the carve-out transaction. The availability of tax attributes may increase the seller's willingness to structure a carve-out transaction as a sale of the subsidiary's assets.

For the following example, assume that parent has NOLs and the parent and the subsidiary file consolidated US federal income tax returns. By using the parent's NOLs, the subsidiary can offset its gain on a sale of assets (subject to various limitations in the IRC). If the buyer is willing to pay a premium for an asset sale (if, for example, the buyer receives a stepped-up basis), the seller is more likely to agree to structure a carve-out transaction as an asset sale (either with an actual asset sale or with a stock sale accompanied by a Section 338(h)(10) election).

SALE OF THE BUSINESS AT A LOSS

In down economies, carve-out transactions may involve the sale of businesses that have depreciated in value. If the basis of the seller in the stock or assets being sold is more than the amount received on the sale, the seller in certain circumstances may be able to:

- Use the resulting tax loss to offset other taxable income.
- Carry the tax loss back to a prior year (resulting in a refund of prior taxes).
- Carry the tax loss forward to later years (offsetting future income).

However, if the loss is from a sale of stock that results in a capital loss, the loss generally can only be used to offset capital gains of the seller (and not operating income like NOLs). In addition, among other limitations, capital losses cannot be carried forward for nearly as long as NOLs (in general, for a corporate seller, capital losses can be carried forward only five years versus 20 years for NOLs). Also, where the stock of a subsidiary member of consolidated group is sold at a loss, special tax rules can reduce or eliminate all or part of the tax loss (see *Treas. Reg. § 1.1502-36*).

Even if the loss is an NOL (as may be the case for many losses from a sale of assets), the seller may not anticipate sufficient other taxable income to take advantage of the NOL (for example, if the seller is financially distressed). In addition, if stock of a subsidiary is sold and the subsidiary has either prior NOLs that may be carried forward or built-in losses in its assets (reflecting basis in excess of value), special tax rules can limit the use of these types of tax losses following an "ownership change."

Generally, there is an ownership change under these rules if the ownership by stockholders owning 5% or more of the corporation has increased in any three-year period by more than 50 percentage points (see *IRC § 382*). These rules are designed to preclude so-called trafficking in tax losses, where a buyer buys and makes use of tax losses. In these circumstances, other approaches can be considered to preserve the benefit of tax losses for a buyer.

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

In the following example, assume the seller holds assets of the carved-out business with a basis of $200 and a fair market value of $80 (that is, reflecting a built-in loss of $120). If the assets are sold for $80, the seller may not anticipate a current ability to use the resulting tax loss of $120. Alternatively, the buyer and seller can form a new corporation (Newco). In a transaction intended to qualify as a tax-free formation of a corporation under IRC Section 351:

- The seller contributes the assets into Newco.
- The buyer contributes cash of $80 to Newco.
- Newco borrows $60 and uses the $60 to fund a payment to the seller of $60 in exchange for the contributed assets, together with 20 shares of common stock in Newco.
- The buyer receives 80 shares of Newco stock for its $80 contribution.
- The seller elects (see *IRC § 362(e)*) to reduce its tax basis in Newco shares received from $200 (its tax basis in the contributed assets) to $20 (the $80 value of the contributed assets, minus the $60 cash received).

As a result of this transaction:

- Newco retains the $200 historic basis of the seller in the contributed assets.
- The seller receives $60 and has a continuing equity interest in Newco (the 20 shares it receives, out of 100 total shares outstanding), rather than an unusable tax loss of $120.

OTHER IMPORTANT TAX CONSIDERATIONS

When considering the tax planning for a carve-out transaction, other important factors include whether:

- The seller or existing management intends to hold a continuing interest in the business post-sale.
- The seller, the carved-out business or the buyer are non-US persons or entities.
- The sale may trigger special taxes from prior transactions (for example, deferred gains or amounts reflecting prior loss deductions taken by a corporate subsidiary or the built-in gains tax imposed on an S-corporation that was formerly a C-corporation).
- The transaction can be structured as tax-free (for example, as an acquisition in exchange for buyer stock or an interest in a buyer partnership).
- There are historic tax liabilities or exposures that are to be the risk of either the buyer or the seller.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Intellectual property rights often present unique issues in carve-out transactions. The ownership of intellectual property, and the rights of certain subsidiaries and business units to use it, can be difficult to untangle when the use of intellectual property by subsidiaries and business units does not correspond to the corporate structure contemplated for the transaction. These issues should be identified early in the transaction process to ensure that the:

- Deal is structured properly.
- Value of the intellectual property rights conveyed are built into the overall deal value.

Each party must conduct considerable due diligence to ensure the rights are conveyed properly. Similarly, if there are software licenses and maintenance and support agreements that exist on an enterprise level (and are not transferable as part of the sale), this can negatively impact deal value due to the high replacement costs for prospective buyers.

Therefore, all relevant intellectual property rights and related documents, and all software license agreements and related support and maintenance agreements should be carefully reviewed. The review should focus on issues related to the:

- Divestment of the business unit.
- Intellectual property used in that business that is also used by retained divisions of the seller.

Significant intellectual property issues common to carve-out transactions are discussed below.

SOFTWARE LICENSING ISSUES

Software license agreements (together with any related maintenance or support agreements) governing the use of software used by the divested business in its day-to-day operations are typically held by the corporate parent or some other higher-level holding company so that the software is available for use by all the divisions and subsidiaries of the company. These types of enterprise-level software agreements typically will not allow the divested business to continue to use the software after the sale. Accordingly, the buyer must factor the contract negotiation and purchase of that software into its valuation of the purchased business as well as its expected timeline for closing. Because the seller may have been able to obtain favorable pricing based on economies of scale, the buyer may not obtain the same favorable pricing. These software replacement costs can impact the value of the deal for the buyer.

From the seller's perspective, it is equally important to review the terms of the software license agreements to determine whether the fees it pays should be adjusted following the sale. This may be the case if the fees were based on certain usage or headcount numbers that may be too high following the divestiture.

In addition, the seller should determine whether or not it can provide transitional services under its licenses after closing and whether it needs the consent of the software licensor to do so. If the seller cannot provide transition services for critical software licenses, then the negotiations with the buyer should factor in the buyer's time and expense in obtaining standalone licenses. Identifying these issues early in the carve-out process allows the seller the greatest flexibility in terms of renegotiating a contract with the software vender. For information on how transition services are typically documented, see *Box, Transition Services*.

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

TRANSITION SERVICES

In a carve-out transaction certain services essential to the business are often intertwined with the seller's own operations and not included in the sale. The seller and buyer often solve this problem by entering into a transition services agreement.

This agreement between the buyer and seller of the business calls for the seller to continue to provide those shared services to the buyer for a period of time. Entering into this agreement allows the transaction to proceed without any delay for the buyer to try to secure those services on its own (whether through its existing service support or through new contractual arrangements with third parties). Some common examples of the services covered by transition services agreements include:

- IT support.
- Accounting services.
- Payroll and other human resource services.
- Insurance administration.
- Litigation support.
- Shared facilities.
- Shared benefits plans.

In most carve-out deals, the buyer requires more than one transition service. When that is the case, the parties usually treat each service as its own specific arrangement, each with its own fee and term. Unless the buyer requires few and relatively simple services, it is rare for the entire agreement to expire at the same time or for the seller to be compensated with one lump sum.

The transition services agreement is usually ancillary to the underlying purchase agreement and is often negotiated in full before the parties sign the purchase agreement. The transition services agreement document is then attached as an exhibit to the purchase agreement and signed and delivered at closing. For an example of a transition services agreement, see *Standard Document, Transition Services Agreement (http://us.practicallaw.com/7-386-4628).*

LICENSING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

A carve-out transaction may involve the sale of a business that uses intellectual property rights that are also used by retained businesses. In this scenario, the parties to the transaction often consider entering into a licensing agreement which grants the buyer a license to use certain intellectual property in a manner that is appropriately limited for the scope of the divested business's usage of the intellectual property before the sale.

The scope of this license is often the subject of intense negotiations. The parties heavily debate how to define the scope of the intellectual property rights (for example, all the intellectual property rights "used by", "primarily used by", "exclusively used by", or "necessary for the operation of" the business as divested). Accordingly, the license must be drafted carefully and the seller must consider whether particular shared intellectual property rights should or should not be included in the license.

The buyer must consider what impact any changes in the seller's business may have on the license. For example, if the seller were to sell the intellectual property subject to the license in a separate transaction at a later date, the new owner may not be as friendly to the buyer. Because most licenses contain quality control and termination provisions, the new owner may have the ability under the license to terminate the buyer's rights to use intellectual property. To avoid this risk, the buyer of the carve-out business should consider actually acquiring the relevant intellectual property, as described in more detail below.

SELLING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

An alternative to licensing intellectual property rights to a buyer is an outright sale of those rights. Although this is a typical structure in most transactions, a carve-out transaction adds an additional wrinkle because the rights being sold may be limited in some fashion. For example, the seller may only be selling intellectual property rights in a specific geographical region (and retaining the rights in other geographical regions).

Determining the appropriate scope of what rights are being sold and how best to document the sale requires considerable effort by both buyer and seller. Although the purchase of intellectual property may represent a higher upfront cost as compared to licensing those rights, it may more closely reflect the business deal than a licensing arrangement.

TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES

As soon as a seller makes a decision to divest a business unit, it should consider whether the divestiture will include the use of corporate names and related trademarks. In some instances, those marks represent a large part of the value to the buyer. In other transactions, the seller must determine whether the divested business will be required to change its corporate name in connection with the transaction. This decision must be made as early on as possible to allow for the buyer to:

- Conduct trademark clearance searches.
- Prepare and file new trademark applications (potentially in multiple jurisdictions).
- Secure new domain names.

OTHER KEY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ISSUES

Other important issues to consider include:

- **Consents.** The parties should consider which party will bear the responsibility of obtaining any necessary third-party consents and have a plan in place in the event all the consents cannot be obtained.

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

- **Employee issues.** In certain cases the parties must negotiate which employees should be part of the divestiture. This becomes particularly important in connection with ongoing efforts regarding source code development and maintenance, as well as undocumented know-how of key employees.
- **Litigation.** To the extent any of the relevant intellectual property becomes subject of ongoing litigation proceedings, the parties must provide for their respective roles and financial obligations following the closing.
- **Post-closing maintenance.** Intellectual property must continue to be maintained following the closing. The seller should be required to identify all intellectual property maintenance deadlines over some reasonable period of time after closing (and provide a list of its intellectual property maintenance counsel or services). Acquisition counsel and clients should be clear on who bears responsibility for maintenance of the portfolio, either in-house counsel, the law firm acting as counsel in the transaction or some other firm.

ADVANCE PREPARATION

If the seller anticipates divesting more than one business unit, it can take certain steps to limit the intellectual property issues. In particular, once making the decision to divest, the seller can structure its intellectual property holdings in a manner that simplifies the piecemeal divestiture of affected intellectual property rights and obligations. In addition, when licensing and related agreements come up for renewal, the seller should build in provisions that recalculate fees and permit certain divestitures without consent if the buyer assumes the liabilities under the contract. This can greatly expedite the deal process and add value to both buyer and seller.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Information technology (IT), and the people, software, hardware and services that provide a company with instant connectivity and information, are an increasingly large part of any corporate budget. Not surprisingly, companies make every effort to bundle and package these products and services to achieve the desired result at an acceptable price. In particular, larger companies can take advantage of economies of scale to achieve favorable pricing. In doing so, however, companies may unintentionally create obstacles to divesting business units that are benefiting from these shared services. This may occur as the result of:

- Pricing terms that are not automatically adjusted for the divestment of a business unit.
- Licensing issues.
- How employee time and equipment usage are apportioned among various business units.

Although the business unit may seem easily separated on its face, the realities of divesting a single unit may be much more complex than initial perceptions suggest. To reduce the IT-related obstacles associated with a carve-out transaction, the impact of the divestiture must be understood from an IT perspective. The seller must identify:

- What IT services, assets and employees will be divested.
- What IT services, assets and employees will stay behind.
- How data will be transferred and stored.

The buyer must understand what personnel, services and equipment are not being acquired and how to address those issues post-closing. In addition, the buyer must analyze potential future costs as part of its due diligence to ensure that a deal that looks financially attractive at the outset does not yield unexpected costs down the road.

KEY ISSUES INVOLVING IT SERVICES, ASSETS AND EMPLOYEES

Several key IT issues may emerge during the carve-out transaction process.

Transition Services

As discussed above, IT services are often shared among a company group and not easily separated in a carve-out transaction. Several back-office services and related functions may require considerable build-out by the buyer (both in terms of personnel and infrastructure) and the seller should consider in advance whether it is willing to provide transition services to the buyer.

Although a seller may rather make a clean break from the divested business, agreeing to provide transition services may increase the value of the divested business to the buyer and justify a higher purchase price. An increased purchase price and deal certainty may outweigh the costs involved in providing the services. For more information on how transition services are documented, see *Box, Transition Services*.

Open Source Software

The vast majority of companies use some form of open source software as part of their operations. Therefore both the buyer and the seller must identify the specific open source products and applicable licenses used in the divested business. The buyer must carefully review the specific products with counsel to determine what risks (if any) there are in continuing to use the open source software (including after the closing, when divested business is combined with the buyer's business). Depending on the risk analysis, the buyer may also need to consider the technical feasibility and cost of replacing the open source software with proprietary software.

Shrink-wrap Licenses

Another important IT consideration in a carve-out transaction is shrink-wrap or off-the-shelf software licenses. Although these products are generally replaceable and are often dismissed by principals for this reason, replacement costs can be significant and should be taken into consideration in transaction planning.

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

The buyer should ensure that the licenses that are transferred as part of the business are sufficient in number for the business post-closing. If the licenses are not transferred, the buyer should ensure that new licenses can be purchased (and factor in the cost) so that the business can continue to operate after the closing.

The seller should determine how a transfer of those licenses could impact its retained businesses and should also consider evaluating all of its licenses in advance of pursuing a carve-out transaction. This type of evaluation helps the seller ensure that it retains sufficient licenses necessary (but is not paying the licensor for more licenses than are necessary) to operate its retained businesses.

IT Employees

The seller must identify its IT employees and determine which employees should stay with the seller or leave with the divested business. Because some employees are likely to have roles that extend beyond a single business unit, the decision on who stays and who goes is not always readily apparent. However, doing advance work on these issues early in the transaction allows a seller to take well-reasoned positions on issues that can be difficult points of negotiation.

ELECTRONIC DATA AND RECORDS

If the business being sold involves the use of an electronic database or information and that database is shared across multiple business units, the seller must carefully review that data to ensure that only data relevant to the divested business is transferred to the buyer. Data migration issues can be complicated by the use of proprietary software and enterprise-level data usage. If data of the business to be divested cannot be separated from companywide data, a licensing agreement may be needed. In this case, a licensing agreement would allow the buyer to use data necessary for the acquired business while the seller retains rights to data used in other aspects of its business. The buyer must consider how new data, particularly if created by the buyer post-closing, is treated and whether that data is included within the scope of the license agreement.

If proprietary software is used in the management or storage of data, additional licensing issues may arise. Identifying any of these potential issues early on in the transaction process will enable the parties to structure the transaction and related agreements in a way that minimizes their impact on deal certainty and avoids reductions in deal value.

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

Although the emotional capital invested in any transaction is high (whether from the deal team or employees unsettled by the change in status quo), carve-out transactions bring these issues into sharp relief because some employees will stay with the seller and others will be transferred with the divested business. Employees will have concerns about:

- Bonus payments.
- Benefit terms.
- Outstanding options.
- Job security.

Employers will have concerns about plan terminations and satisfaction of deal conditions related to post-closing employee issues. Beyond the human component of a carve-out transaction lie the nuts and bolts of transitioning a group of employees from one employer to another (and from one set of benefit plans to another). Predicting how employees react to a transaction and the impact on the future business also become critical issues.

To address these issues, both parties must evaluate the impact of the deal early in the transaction process and organize its benefits and human resources teams to aid in a smooth post-closing transition. Although each transaction raises unique considerations, key issues that arise in most carve-out transactions are discussed below.

IDENTIFYING EMPLOYEES

Deciding which employees will remain with the seller and which will go with the divested business unit can be one of the most fundamental decisions for a seller. Where a seller has multiple business units **and** uses certain centralized or shared services, there can be a sizable pool of employees who provide services to the divested business and provide necessary services for retained business units. Whether the seller retains those employees may be the subject of negotiation because the employees may provide functions that the buyer does not have in-house.

Other employees may work primarily with the divested unit, but the buyer does not want to take them with the business. In that case, the seller must determine whether those employees can be reassigned within the company or whether it must make post-closing staff reductions. Large staff reductions may pose greater concerns if the divested business represents a sizable portion of the seller's business as a whole because of obligations arising under the WARN Act (and state law analogs).

The buyer's considerations are just the opposite. For example, the buyer must consider whether:

- It is getting the employees it needs to run the business.
- If certain employees are unnecessary for the business.
- If it has sufficient support and back-office personnel to support the acquired business.

The buyer must also carefully review the duties of each proposed new employee to ensure that the seller is not using the transaction as a means to unload unnecessary personnel.

RETENTION OF KEY EMPLOYEES

Once the parties agree on which employees are affected by the divestiture, the parties should next consider whether steps must be taken to avoid the defection of key employees. If the buyer

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

conditions the sale on the retention of certain employees, those employees will likely need to be informed of the transaction in advance so that the buyer can negotiate employment or retention agreements as needed. For other employees, the seller may need to provide incentives for the employees to remain with the business before closing. This can take the form of a retention or stay bonus arrangement or a covenant in the purchase agreement requiring the buyer to retain certain employees for a specific period post-closing.

BENEFIT PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

Depending on how the seller's benefit plans are structured (separated by business unit or universal across all company employees), the carve-out transaction may result in a plan termination or partial termination. This also depends on the percentage of employees involved in the divestiture. Sellers must carefully weigh these benefit plan issues to determine the viability of their plans for remaining employees. Alternatively, buyers must either fold acquired personnel into existing plans or create new plans (which would be more likely in the case of a financial buyer). The time and costs of establishing these plans will factor into the overall timeline of the transaction and can delay closing.

IDENTIFYING UNDERLYING COSTS

Because many costs associated with employee benefits are not specifically identified in a company's financial statements, buyers must review carefully available data and related costs. A seller must also be mindful of these costs if it agrees to provide some form of transition services (see *Box, Transition Services*). In the case of a financial buyer, new benefit plans and human resources functions (or a transition services agreement under which these functions are provided by the seller) must be in place at closing. The most critical aspect of the buyer's employee benefits due diligence is to ascertain the actual costs of providing benefits to the employees of the divested business going forward. This process traditionally involves a coordinated effort by counsel and benefits consultants as well as in-house benefits specialists.

REAL ESTATE

Fundamental considerations to a carve-out transaction include identifying, financing, equipping and maintaining the physical space the business will occupy after the transaction closes. Relocating a business in connection with a transaction has the potential to result in significant disruption to business functions.

A company with multiple business lines often operates all of its business units out of a single facility or, especially in the case of a large corporation, multiple shared facilities. This type of arrangement has obvious advantages in terms of cost savings and accessibility. For purposes of a carve-out transaction, however, shared facilities present unique issues, regardless of whether the properties in question are leased or owned by the seller.

LEASED REAL PROPERTY

Where the divested business unit operates out of a shared leased facility and the buyer desires to use the facility post-closing, two principal options are available.

Sublease

If the lease agreement permits subleasing, the seller may enter into a sublease agreement for the facility and may need the consent of the landlord. There are numerous considerations, including the risks assumed by the seller. To preserve deal value, the seller must carefully examine shared costs that will be split with the new sublease including:

- Maintenance.
- Shared space (for example, conference facilities and reception).
- Security.
- Other hard and soft costs (such as HVAC and electricity) that must be built into the financial terms of the sublease.

In addition, if the facility has an open floor plan, the seller must consider what space the buyer will occupy and whether modifications must be made to the space to protect confidential information. The seller must also examine all possible costs in advance so they can be appropriately allocated to the buyer. If the seller's lease agreement requires landlord consent for a sublease, obtaining the consent (and planning for the time involved in obtaining that consent) must be built into the deal process along with the negotiation of the sublease.

Contract with Landlord

The second option is for the buyer to enter into a direct contractual relationship with the landlord. As with a sublease, the parties must be sensitive to the timing required for the buyer to negotiate the lease, particularly because it may involve the negotiation of a broader set of terms than in the negotiation of a sublease. In general, each party is best served by working together to avoid a situation where the landlord holds the deal hostage in an effort to extract higher rents or other concessions.

The seller may want to take advantage of the opportunity created by the new lease for the buyer to reopen discussions on its current lease. These discussions may be necessary because space leased by the seller will be reduced and certain costs must be allocated to the divested business. The timing of these discussions, however, must be considered carefully within the overall context of the deal and should only be conducted after assessing the landlord's receptiveness to them.

OWNED REAL PROPERTY

If an owned site will be shared by the business to be divested and the business units retained by the seller, there are also two principal options.

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Office Lease

The first option is for the seller to lease a portion of the owned site to the buyer. There are similar issues to a sublease as discussed above. However, the seller has a greater level of control concerning timing and the terms of the lease. In this instance, the lease agreement (and the value derived by each party under the lease) can become a more central component of the transaction. As in the sublease scenario discussed above, the seller must consider all costs that should be allocated to the buyer. This planning can be started even before identifying a buyer and can have the added advantage of reducing costs in future transactions if additional business units at the facility are also candidates for divestiture.

Title Transfer

The second option is for the seller to convey fee title of the applicable portion of real property to the buyer. In this case, there are additional issues. For example:

- Does the conveyance of a portion of an owned real property trigger local zoning or subdivision issues?
- Does the transferred real property have access to roads, utilities and facilities needed to operate?
- Are there any environmental liabilities that must be apportioned?

If the entire property is sold with the business unit, the seller may need to lease back space for retained businesses. This can be a short-term lease until a new facility can be identified or a long-term lease if the parties desire to maintain a landlord–tenant relationship.

Practical Law Company provides practical legal know-how for law firms, law departments and law schools. Our online resources help lawyers practice efficiently, get up to speed quickly and spend more time on the work that matters most. This Practice Note is just one example of the many resources Practical Law Company offers. Discover for yourself what the world's leading law firms and law departments use to enhance their practices.

Contact Us

Practical Law Company
747 Third Avenue, 36th Floor
New York, NY 10017
646.562.3405
plcinfo@practicallaw.com
www.practicallaw.com

PRACTICAL LAW COMPANY®

Copyright © 2010 Practical Law Publishing Limited and Practical Law Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
Use of PLC websites and services is subject to the Terms of Use (http://us.practicallaw.com/2-383-6690) and Privacy Policy (http://us.practicallaw.com/8-383-6692).