

International Finance: Tax and Regulation Advisor

A Twice-monthly Review for International Executives

March 15, 2006

M&A Compliance Trend Toward Formal Compliance Due Diligence Continues in 2006

BY KATHRYN ATKINSON (MILLER & CHEVALIER)

The Changing Face of Effective Internal Investigations

Having recently conducted more than a dozen internal investigations, several involving multiple countries, we have seen fundamental changes in how effective internal investigations are, or should be, conducted. Requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act ("SOX") and the urgings of enforcement officials that companies disclose violations voluntarily and promptly have increased the number of internal investigations, and raised the likelihood that results of investigations will ultimately be disclosed to government enforcement officials. Agencies are also insisting that companies immediately act to preserve documents, including often voluminous electronic files or data. And under their own guidelines, agencies are reserving the right to request, at least in some circumstances, waiver of privilege and a measure of cooperation.

continued on page 2

Trade Receivables Securitization A Comparison between Top US and European Companies

BY DEMICA

Key findings

- Trade receivables (TR) securitization is now a mainstream financing tool both in the US and Europe
- TR securitization is used by top 500 non-financial companies in the US and Europe as a means of accessing greater liquidity to fund growth.
- The assumed gulf between the securitization levels in the US and Europe is far less evident between top companies in the two regions than is commonly supposed.
- 17% of US top 500 (non-financial) companies have conducted a trade receivables securitization in the last ten years, compared with just 11% in Europe.
- The technique is equally popular with investment grade rated companies than with sub-investment grade companies seeking reasonably priced liquidity.
- 23% of respondents are principally looking to technology to deliver economies of scale and increased profitability

continued on page 16

IN THIS ISSUE

Compliance

Companies have begun to establish M&A compliance due diligence protocols. *Page 1*

Synthetic ABS

Part one of our series on Synthetic ABS illustrates the mechanism of an ABS CDS contract for home equity. The differences between the PAUG ("pay-as-you-go") template used in ABS CDS and the one-off payment used in corporate CDS are explored. *Page 3*

Restrictions on Transactions

IFTRA provides an overview of Sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act limiting the risks to banks that may arise through transactions between a bank and its affiliates in connection with securitization. *Page 3*

Anti-Monopoly Law

The People's Congress will review the latest draft of a comprehensive Chinese Anti-Monopoly law in June. The new draft omits provisions that prohibit administrative monopolies. *Page 11*

Antitrust Agency

Mexico's competition agency will be using grants of leniency and immunity to investigate allegations of antitrust violations, especially in cases of price fixing, restraints of trade and bid rigging. *Page 14*

See Foreign Exchange Rates on
page 15.

For table of contents see *page 19.*

Compliance, from Page 1

These dynamics have, in turn, affected how companies decide to structure and conduct investigations. Companies often face pressure to make decisions about self-reporting before they have had an opportunity to fully evaluate the seriousness of a possible issue or violation. With the higher likelihood of ultimate disclosure comes the question of whether the traditional admonition given to interviewees should now be modified. Also at issue is whether the company should take the common step of preparing an investigative report or consider the alternatives of either no written report at all, or two reports – a confidential, internal report and a disclosure report intended for government consumption.

We have found that it is often possible to use various techniques to control costs and keep investigations manageable without compromising their completeness or integrity.

When internal investigations are necessary, we have found that it is often possible to use various techniques to control costs and keep investigations manageable without compromising their completeness or integrity.

M&A Due Diligence as a Best Practice

In 2005, the trend toward formal compliance due diligence in the M&A context that we first forecasted in our 2003 issues preview progressed clos-

er to an established “best practice.” We expect that this trend will continue in 2006, as U.S. enforcement officials continue to press in this area, assisted by voluntary disclosures inspired by SOX and a heightened commitment to compliance. The series of FCPA enforcement actions in the M&A context, which began with Syncor in 2002, continued in 2005, and in March the Titan settlement resulted in the largest set of fines and penalties in the history of the FCPA. Parallel trends in export controls also continued in 2005.

As a result, companies have begun to establish M&A compliance due diligence protocols, which provide a “Phase I” determination of the target’s compliance risk profile and quickly focus on key risk areas to be explored in greater depth. We have seen a fairly high level of cooperation from targets in these efforts, perhaps as a result of growing recognition that buyers will abandon transactions that present significant compliance uncertainties.

M&A compliance due diligence serves several purposes. First, it identifies potential successor liability risks, which, as past cases have shown, can be deal killers. Equally important, effective compliance due diligence provides critical information *before closing* not only about a target’s risk profile, but also about its compliance culture, infrastructure, and program details. This can smooth and accelerate the post-acquisition transition that can otherwise consume tremendous financial and management resources and quickly dissipate the value of the acquisition. □

Kathryn Atkinson (katkinson@milchev.com) is a Member at Miller & Chevalier. She can be reached in the Washington office at 202 626-5800.

Advisory Board

Robert J. Baldoni <i>Ernst & Young, LLP</i>	Walter H. Diamond <i>The Offshore Institute</i>	Lionel Lavigne <i>Ernst & Young Conseil, S.A.</i>	Hans Pohlschroeder <i>Colgate-Palmolive</i>	Philip Santoriella <i>Pfizer</i>	Françoise Soares-Kemp <i>Bank of New York</i>
Fred Cohen <i>PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP</i>	Andrew Hodge <i>Banque Brussels Lambert</i>	Johann Müller <i>DeBrauw Blackstone Westbrook</i>	Anthony Regan <i>Putnam Investments, Inc.</i>	Erich Schumann <i>Global Atlantic Partners</i>	Jeffrey Wallace <i>Greenwich Treasury Advisors</i>
Michael Darby <i>Anderson School, UCLA</i>	Marie Hollein <i>Ruesch International</i>	Daniel M. Perkins <i>PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP</i>	George Sanborn <i>Borden, Inc.</i>	Sandra Shaber <i>Global Insight</i>	

International Finance: Tax and Regulation Advisor

The International Business
Information Source™
March 15, 2006

EDITORIAL OFFICE

WorldTrade Executive, Inc.
P.O. Box 761
Concord, MA 01742-0761 / USA
(978) 287-0301 Phone
(978) 287-0302 Fax
www.wtexec.com

PUBLISHER

Gary A. Brown, Esq.

MANAGING EDITOR

Amanda D. Johnson

CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

Scott P. Studebaker, Esq.

BUSINESS MANAGER

Jay Stanley

COPY EDITOR

Heather Martel

PUBLISHED TWICE A MONTH FOR SUBSCRIBERS ONLY

Reproduction or photocopying, even for personal or internal use, is prohibited without the publisher’s prior written consent. All rights reserved under the International and Pan-American Copyright Convention © 2006 by WorldTrade Executive, Inc.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION: Annual subscription: US\$1334 (add \$50 for non-US postage) Single copy: US\$65