

The Practical Guide on Strategic vs Financial Valuation — 2026 —

From Synergies to IRR—How Buyer Type Drives
Valuation, Structure, and Final Deal Value



BY

SAGAR SHAH

CA | CS | IBBI Registered Valuer | All India Rank Holder | Ex-EY

First Edition | 2026

HOW TO USE THIS GUIDE

Structure of This Guide

This guide is organised in six parts, each building on the last. You do not need to read it sequentially — if you are deep in an LBO model, jump to Part III. If you are negotiating an earn-out, go straight to Part IV, Chapter 9. The guide is designed to be a working reference that you return to, not a book you read once.

PART I — THE BUYER UNIVERSE

Chapters 1–2: Who is buying and why — the fundamentals of strategic and financial buyer motivation, return requirements, and valuation mindset.

PART II — HOW STRATEGIC BUYERS VALUE A BUSINESS

Chapters 3–5: Standalone valuation, synergy identification and sizing, and strategic premium — with formula snapshots and worked examples.

PART III — HOW FINANCIAL BUYERS VALUE A BUSINESS

Chapters 6–7: The LBO model, debt capacity, IRR/MOIC mechanics, and how PE funds set entry multiples — with complete worked LBO example.

PART IV — DEAL STRUCTURES AND THEIR VALUATION IMPACT



Chapters 8–10: How the consideration structure (cash, stock, earn-out, rollover) affects value — and who benefits from each structure.

PART V — PRACTICAL APPLICATION

Chapters 11–12: Running a dual-track process; from LOI to closing and how valuation moves through the deal lifecycle.

Guide Features

Throughout this guide you will find four types of special content, each visually distinct:

-  Snapshot Boxes — Formula derivations, balance sheet extracts, and step-by-step arithmetic. These are the quantitative building blocks. Work through each snapshot with a calculator or spreadsheet open.
- KEY INSIGHT Boxes — Practitioner observations from real M&A transactions. These reflect patterns we have seen repeatedly across deal advisory engagements.
- PRO TIP Boxes — Specific, actionable guidance for applying the concepts in live transactions.
- CASE STUDY Boxes — Anonymised but realistic transaction scenarios showing how the theory plays out in practice.
-  Checklist Boxes — Practical due diligence and process frameworks you can apply immediately.

Who This Guide Is For

This guide is written for practitioners — people who are in the middle of a deal, preparing for one, or advising one. It assumes you are comfortable with financial statements, basic valuation concepts (DCF, multiples), and the general M&A process. It does not assume you have done 50 transactions. If you understand EBITDA and have built a basic DCF model, you have the prerequisites.

CONTENTS

Front Matter

How to Use This Guide
About the Author
Our Services & Disclaimer

PART I — THE BUYER UNIVERSE

Chapter 1: Strategic vs. Financial Buyers — The Fundamental Distinction
Chapter 2: What Drives Each Buyer — Motivation, Return Requirements & Decision Frameworks

PART II — HOW STRATEGIC BUYERS VALUE A BUSINESS

Chapter 3: Standalone Value — Building the Baseline
Chapter 4: Synergy Valuation — Identifying, Sizing, and Sharing the Upside
Chapter 5: The Strategic Premium — When It Exists, How Large It Gets, and Why

PART III — HOW FINANCIAL BUYERS VALUE A BUSINESS

Chapter 6: The LBO Model — IRR, MOIC, and the Entry Multiple Decision
Chapter 7: Debt Capacity, Returns Mechanics, and the PE Value Creation Playbook

PART IV — DEAL STRUCTURES AND THEIR VALUATION IMPACT

Chapter 8: Cash, Stock, and Mixed Consideration — What Each Choice Really Means
Chapter 9: Earn-Outs, Escrows, and Deferred Consideration — Bridging the Valuation Gap
Chapter 10: Management Rollover, Ratchets, and Seller Financing

PART V — PRACTICAL APPLICATION

Chapter 11: Running a Dual-Track Process — Managing Strategic and Financial Buyers Side by Side
Chapter 12: From LOI to Closing — How Valuation Moves During the Deal

Conclusion

Conclusion: Putting It All Together in a Live Deal

Quick Reference: All Snapshots and Key Formulas

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sagar Shah

CA | CS | IBBI Registered Valuer | All India Rank Holder | Ex-EY



Sagar Shah has spent 15 years at the nexus of business valuation, M&A advisory, and regulatory compliance — first as a transaction advisory professional at Ernst & Young, where he structured and valued strategic acquisitions and private equity buyouts for some of India's most complex cross-sector deals, and then as the founder of Elite Valuation, where his practice spans the full spectrum of deal valuation from strategic premium analysis to LBO modelling.

The distinction between how a strategic acquirer and a financial buyer approach the same target company is one of the most practically important concepts in M&A — yet it is one that most practitioners learn slowly, through transaction experience rather than structured education. This guide synthesises that experience into a practical, number-driven framework that practitioners can apply from Day 1 of any deal.

Contact

Phone: +91 7600008550

Email: sagarrvshah@elitevaluation.in

Linkedin: www.linkedin.com/in/sagarrvshah/

Website: www.EliteValuation.in

ELITE VALUATION

M&A Valuation & Deal Advisory Practice

Pan-India Services | www.EliteValuation.in

Our M&A Valuation Services

Strategic Acquirer Valuation & Synergy Analysis — Standalone DCF + synergy layer quantification; buy-side fairness opinions and sell-side value maximisation analysis for strategic M&A transactions.

Financial Buyer / LBO Valuation — Full LBO model construction, entry/exit multiple analysis, IRR/MOIC waterfall, debt capacity assessment, and management incentive modelling.

Fairness Opinions & Independent Expert Reports — Board-level fairness opinions for listed and unlisted company acquisitions — covering both the strategic premium and the financial buyer floor.

Deal Structure Advisory — Cash vs. stock consideration analysis, earn-out design and valuation, deferred consideration structuring, and management rollover modelling.

Sell-Side Valuation for M&A Readiness — Pre-sale valuation, VDD (vendor due diligence) support, EBITDA normalisation, and value maximisation analysis for companies preparing for a sale.

Purchase Price Allocation (PPA) — Ind AS 103 PPA for post-acquisition financial reporting — identification and fair value of all intangible assets recognised in the acquisition.

"The difference between what a strategic buyer will pay and what a financial buyer will pay is not just a number — it is a story about where the value in your business truly lives, and who is best positioned to unlock it." — Sagar Shah

DISCLAIMER

This guide is for educational and informational purposes only. All illustrative examples use fictitious company names and hypothetical numbers for pedagogical clarity. Actual transaction economics depend on deal-specific facts. Readers should engage qualified legal, financial, and valuation advisors before making any M&A or investment decision. Elite Valuation accepts no liability for decisions based on this guide.

© 2026 Elite Valuation. All rights reserved.

PART I

The Buyer Universe

Who is buying, why they buy, and how their return requirements shape everything that follows

PART I — CHAPTER 1

Chapter 1: Strategic vs. Financial Buyers — The Fundamental Distinction

Every M&A transaction involves at least one buyer and one seller. The buyer's identity — whether they are a strategic acquirer or a financial buyer — determines everything: the valuation methodology applied, the maximum price that can be justified, the preferred deal structure, the diligence priorities, and the post-closing integration plan. Understanding these two buyer types is not a theoretical exercise. It is the first analytical step in any sell-side advisory engagement, any buy-side fairness analysis, and any M&A strategy conversation.

1.1 The Strategic Buyer — Buying to Build

A strategic buyer is a company acquiring another company to strengthen its existing business — entering new markets, acquiring customers or technology, eliminating a competitor, or capturing cost efficiencies. The defining characteristic of the strategic buyer is that the target's value to them is not just its standalone earnings power, but its contribution to the acquirer's broader enterprise. A Rs. 100 Crore EBITDA company acquired by a strategic buyer may be worth Rs. 140 Crore of EBITDA contribution to the combined entity after synergies — and the acquirer's willingness to pay reflects this enhanced value.

Strategic buyers in the Indian context include: listed conglomerates expanding into adjacent businesses (Reliance, Adani, Tata group), MNC subsidiaries consolidating market position (consumer goods, pharmaceutical companies), sector-focused strategic acquirers (hospital networks, retail chains, technology platforms), and occasionally listed startups using their equity currency to acquire smaller competitors.

1.2 The Financial Buyer — Buying to Return

A financial buyer — predominantly private equity funds — acquires a company with the explicit objective of generating a financial return for their investors (Limited Partners) by selling or listing the company at a higher value within a defined holding period. The financial buyer does not seek to integrate the target into a broader enterprise — the target operates independently, managed by its existing or newly hired management team, with the PE fund providing capital, strategic guidance, and governance oversight.

The financial buyer's valuation is fundamentally a backwards calculation: 'Given the price I am paying today, the debt I can put on this business, the improvement in EBITDA I expect over 4 years, and the exit multiple I can achieve, what IRR will my LPs earn?' Everything — the offer price, the deal structure, the management incentive plan — flows from this calculation.

Dimension	Strategic Buyer	Financial Buyer
Primary Goal	Market position, synergies, competitive advantage	Financial return — IRR / MOIC on invested capital
Holding Period	Indefinite — acquires to keep and integrate	3–7 years (fund lifecycle)
Value Drivers	Revenue synergies, cost synergies, capability gaps	EBITDA growth, multiple expansion, leverage paydown
Financing	Balance sheet cash, equity, strategic debt	Significant leverage (3–6x EBITDA); equity is a minority

Dimension	Strategic Buyer	Financial Buyer
Valuation Ceiling	Standalone value PLUS synergy value — can pay more	Constrained by IRR requirements and debt service capacity
Management Stance	Often replaces management or restructures	Typically retains management; aligns with equity incentives
Integration	Deep — systems, people, brands merged	Light — portfolio company operates independently
Sensitivity to Market Timing	Lower — strategic rationale transcends cycles	Higher — entry multiple and debt markets are cyclical
Decision Speed	Slower — requires board, shareholder, regulatory approvals	Faster — investment committee can move in days
Typical Premium Paid	Higher (due to synergy value)	Lower (constrained by returns model)

Exhibit 1.1: Strategic vs. Financial Buyer — Comparative Framework

KEY INSIGHT

We have worked on both the buy-side and sell-side of transactions where the seller was running a process with simultaneous strategic and financial bidders. The most instructive pattern: the strategic acquirer's preliminary valuation discussion almost always starts with synergies ('what can we do together?'), while the financial buyer's conversation almost always starts with EBITDA ('tell me about the normalisation adjustments'). These are not just different opening gambits — they reflect fundamentally different analytical frameworks. A seller who cannot fluently speak both languages — synergy value creation for the strategic buyer, EBITDA quality and growth runway for the financial buyer — is leaving value on the table in every conversation.

1.3 When the Same Target Gets Different Prices

The same company can rationally receive very different bids from a strategic and financial buyer — not because one is wrong and the other is right, but because the value of the company to each buyer genuinely differs. Consider a Rs. 40 Crore EBITDA manufacturing company with a strategic market position in a niche segment:

Snapshot 1.1 — Why the Same Target Gets Two Different Prices

Target Company: NicheMfg Pvt Ltd

Standalone EBITDA (FY26, normalised): Rs. 40 Crore

Sector EV/EBITDA Trading Multiple: 8.0x

Standalone Enterprise Value: Rs. 320 Crore

Financial Buyer (PE Fund) Bid:

Entry Multiple (constrained by LBO): 7.0–8.0x EBITDA

Bid Range: Rs. 280–320 Crore

Driven by: IRR requirements, debt service, exit multiple assumption

Strategic Buyer (Industry Consolidator) Bid:

Standalone Value: Rs. 320 Crore

Cost Synergies (procurement, overheads): Rs. 25 Crore EBITDA

Revenue Synergies (cross-sell, new geographies): Rs. 15 Crore EBITDA

Combined EBITDA with Synergies: Rs. 80 Crore (Rs. 40 + Rs. 25 + Rs. 15)

Value of Synergies at 8x Multiple: Rs. 320 Crore

Total Value to Strategic Buyer: Rs. 640 Crore

Typical Sharing (seller gets 30–50% of synergies): Rs. 416–480 Crore bid

Strategic Premium = 30–50% of (Synergy Value × Multiple)

This snapshot captures the essential arithmetic: the financial buyer is constrained to a bid range around standalone value; the strategic buyer can rationally pay a significant premium because the synergies genuinely make the target worth more to them. The rest of this guide is the detailed analysis behind this arithmetic.

PRO TIP

In any M&A situation, always compute both the financial buyer floor (the LBO-constrained entry multiple) and the strategic buyer ceiling (standalone value plus synergy value) before beginning price negotiations. The spread between these two numbers is the negotiating range. A seller who knows their financial buyer floor is less likely to accept a below-market bid from a strategic buyer who has not shared their full synergy analysis. A buyer who knows the strategic ceiling is less likely to overpay chasing a competitive process.

PART I — CHAPTER 2

Chapter 2: What Drives Each Buyer — Motivation, Return Requirements & Decision Frameworks

Understanding why each buyer type pursues acquisitions reveals how they evaluate targets, what they are willing to pay, and what deal terms matter most to them. These motivations are not just background context — they directly inform negotiating strategy, data room preparation, and the valuation narrative that sellers should present to each buyer type.

2.1 Strategic Buyer Return Framework

Strategic buyers do not typically compute an explicit IRR on their acquisitions the way financial buyers do. Their return framework is more complex and longer-term: the acquisition creates value if the combined entity is worth more than the sum of its parts, where 'worth more' is measured by share price appreciation, EPS accretion, market share gains, and competitive positioning improvements.

The most practically important financial test for a strategic acquisition is EPS accretion/dilution — whether the acquisition increases or decreases the acquirer's earnings per share post-close. An acquisition that is EPS accretive in Year 1 or 2 creates immediate shareholder value signal; an EPS dilutive acquisition requires a 'long-term value creation' narrative that investors will accept only if the strategic rationale is compelling.

Snapshot 2.1 — EPS Accretion / Dilution Analysis (Strategic Buyer)

Assumptions:

Acquirer Net Profit (pre-deal): Rs. 200 Crore
 Acquirer Shares Outstanding: 100 Crore
 Acquirer EPS (pre-deal): Rs. 2.00

Target Net Profit (standalone): Rs. 25 Crore
 After-tax Synergies (Year 1): Rs. 10 Crore
 Combined Net Profit: Rs. 235 Crore

Deal financed 50% cash, 50% new equity (20 Crore new shares issued)
 After-tax interest cost (on cash portion): Rs. 5 Crore
 Combined Net Profit (after interest, after synergies): Rs. 230 Crore
 New Share Count: 120 Crore

$$\text{Post-Deal EPS} = \text{Rs. 230 Cr} / \text{120 Cr shares} = \text{Rs. 1.92}$$

$$\text{EPS Dilution} = (\text{Rs. 1.92} - \text{Rs. 2.00}) / \text{Rs. 2.00} = -4\%$$

→ This deal is 4% EPS dilutive in Year 1

→ Acquirer must demonstrate Year 2–3 accretion from synergy ramp-up

2.2 Financial Buyer Return Framework — IRR and MOIC

Financial buyers express their return requirements in two metrics: Internal Rate of Return (IRR) and Multiple on Invested Capital (MOIC). IRR is the annualised return on equity invested; MOIC is the simple multiple of equity returned to equity invested. Both matter — a high MOIC achieved over 10 years produces a mediocre IRR; a high IRR on a small MOIC may not return enough capital to cover fund costs. The sweet spot for most Indian PE funds targeting mid-market buyouts is 3.0–4.0x MOIC over 4–5 years, implying IRRs of 25–35%.

Snapshot 2.2 — IRR vs MOIC Relationship

IRR to MOIC Conversion Table (approximate):

MOIC 2.0x over 3 years	→ IRR ≈ 26%
MOIC 2.0x over 5 years	→ IRR ≈ 15%
MOIC 3.0x over 3 years	→ IRR ≈ 44%
MOIC 3.0x over 5 years	→ IRR ≈ 25%
MOIC 4.0x over 4 years	→ IRR ≈ 41%
MOIC 4.0x over 5 years	→ IRR ≈ 32%

$$\text{IRR} = (\text{Exit Equity} / \text{Entry Equity})^{(1/n)} - 1$$

$$\text{MOIC} = \text{Exit Equity} / \text{Entry Equity}$$

Key insight: Time destroys IRR more than it hurts MOIC.

A fund that holds for 7 years instead of 4 needs a much higher MOIC to maintain IRR targets.

Motivation Driver	Strategic Buyer	Financial Buyer
Market Consolidation	Acquire to eliminate competition or achieve price power	Acquire market leaders in fragmented sectors
Technology / IP	Buy vs. build — faster than organic R&D	Invest in proven technology platforms; grow via bolt-ons
Geography / Distribution	New market entry via acquisition	National roll-up of regional players
Talent / Management	Key team that cannot be recruited	Retain management; provide equity incentives
Regulatory Approvals / Licences	Licences difficult to obtain independently	Regulatory moat is a value-preservation feature
Vertical Integration	Supply chain control, margin capture	Vertical integration is a margin improvement thesis
Customer Relationships	Cross-sell to combined customer base	High NRR / sticky customer base is a key underwriting criterion

Exhibit 2.1: M&A Motivation Matrix — What Each Buyer Type is Really Buying

KEY INSIGHT

We have observed that financial buyers in India increasingly express their investment thesis in a combination of MOIC and IRR floors — for example, 'we need at least 3x MOIC AND at least 25% IRR.' The MOIC floor ensures that the fund returns meaningful capital to LPs (a 25% IRR on a Rs. 10 Crore investment that returns Rs. 25 Crore is great IRR but trivial capital for a Rs. 3,000 Crore fund). The IRR floor ensures time value of capital is respected. In modelling an LBO, always check both metrics — an entry price that satisfies the IRR floor may fail the MOIC floor if holding period assumptions are conservative.

2.3 The Information Gap — What Each Buyer Needs From the Seller

Strategic and financial buyers require materially different information packages to make their valuation decisions. Sellers who provide a standard investment banker CIM (Confidential Information Memorandum) to all buyers — without customising the data room and management presentation for each buyer type — are missing an opportunity to maximise value by telling each buyer the story that is most relevant to them.

- For strategic buyers: synergy opportunity sizing data (overlapping customer lists, procurement volumes, headcount by function, real estate footprint), technology architecture and integration

complexity, regulatory positions and licences, brand strength metrics, and senior management team retention plans.

- For financial buyers: EBITDA bridge from reported to normalised, working capital cycle analysis, capex history vs. maintenance vs. growth, customer cohort analysis (churn, LTV, payback), management equity participation plan, and debt headroom analysis.

PRO TIP

Before launching any dual-track M&A process, build two separate 'investment thesis one-pagers' — one for strategic buyers (articulating the synergy opportunity) and one for financial buyers (articulating the EBITDA quality and growth runway). These are not just marketing documents; they force you to think through your business from each buyer's perspective. The discipline of writing both typically reveals aspects of your business story that the generic CIM would have missed entirely.

PART II

How Strategic Buyers Value a Business

Standalone value, synergy identification and sizing, and the strategic premium — with formula snapshots and worked examples

PART II — CHAPTER 3

Chapter 3: Standalone Value — Building the Baseline

Standalone value is the baseline — the value of the target company as an independent entity, without any acquirer-specific synergies. It is the starting point for both strategic and financial buyer valuation, and the foundation on which synergy premiums and LBO entry prices are built. A well-constructed standalone valuation is not just a number — it is a documented argument that the target's normalised earnings, growth trajectory, and risk profile justify a specific enterprise value range.

3.1 The EBITDA Bridge — The Most Important Standalone Valuation Step

Before applying any multiple or DCF model, the analyst must construct an EBITDA bridge — the reconciliation from reported EBITDA to normalised, run-rate EBITDA. In every M&A transaction, reported EBITDA contains noise: one-time items, owner-specific benefits, non-arm's-length related party arrangements, revenue that will not recur, and costs that will not continue under new ownership. Failing to normalise is the most expensive analytical error in M&A valuation.

Snapshot 3.1 — EBITDA Bridge (Illustrative)

ManufactureTech Pvt Ltd — EBITDA Bridge, FY26

Reported EBITDA: Rs. 28.5 Crore

Add Back — Non-Recurring / One-Time Costs:

- + Restructuring charges (one-time): Rs. 3.2 Crore
- + CEO departure payment (non-recurring): Rs. 1.8 Crore
- + Litigation settlement provision: Rs. 2.5 Crore

Add Back — Owner-Specific Above-Market Costs:

- + Promoter family salaries above market rate: Rs. 4.0 Crore
- + Non-arm's-length office rental (related party): Rs. 1.5 Crore

Deduct — Unsustainable Revenue / Below-Market Costs:

- One-time government subsidy (non-recurring): (Rs. 2.0 Crore)
- Unpaid insurance premium (now payable): (Rs. 0.8 Crore)

Normalised EBITDA = Rs. 38.7 Crore

Normalisation uplift vs. reported: +Rs. 10.2 Crore (+36%)

3.2 DCF as the Standalone Value Foundation

The DCF remains the most intellectually rigorous standalone valuation methodology — it makes every assumption explicit and forces the analyst to think through revenue growth, margin evolution, working capital requirements, and capital expenditure needs in a coherent, interconnected model. For M&A purposes, the DCF is almost always presented alongside comparable company and transaction multiples, with the DCF providing the fundamental anchor and the multiples providing the market context.

Snapshot 3.2 — DCF Structure for M&A Standalone Valuation

$$\text{Enterprise Value} = \sum [\text{FCFF}_t / (1+\text{WACC})^t] + \text{TV}/(1+\text{WACC})^n$$

Free Cash Flow to Firm (FCFF):

$$\text{FCFF} = \text{EBIT} \times (1 - \text{Tax Rate}) + \text{D\&A} - \Delta\text{NWC} - \text{CapEx}$$

Terminal Value — Gordon Growth Model:

$$\text{TV} = \text{FCFF}_n \times (1+g) / (\text{WACC} - g)$$

WACC for Indian Mid-Market M&A Target (indicative):

Risk-Free Rate (10Y GOI bond):	6.8–7.2%
Equity Risk Premium (India):	7.0–8.0%
Beta (re-levered to target capital structure):	0.8–1.4x
Size Premium (small/mid-cap companies):	2.0–4.0%
Ke (Cost of Equity):	15–22%
Kd (Cost of Debt, post-tax):	8–10%

Typical WACC Range: 14–20% for Indian mid-market targets

KEY INSIGHT

We are consistently surprised at how infrequently practising M&A analysts re-lever the beta for the target company's specific capital structure. In a transaction where the target will be acquired with significant leverage (as in a PE buyout), using the target's current (mostly unlevered) beta understates the risk of the levered post-acquisition entity and produces an overstated standalone DCF value. The Hamada equation — which re-levers the unlevered beta to reflect the target's post-acquisition debt-to-equity ratio — should be the standard approach. We always present the DCF with both a transaction WACC (reflecting the post-deal capital structure) and a standalone WACC (reflecting the current capital structure), and explain the difference to the client.

3.3 Trading Multiples vs. Transaction Multiples

Market-based standalone valuation uses two sets of multiples: trading multiples (the EV/EBITDA at which comparable listed companies trade in the public market) and transaction multiples (the EV/EBITDA at which similar companies have been acquired in recent M&A transactions). These two sets of multiples are systematically different: transaction multiples are almost always higher than trading multiples, reflecting the control premium that acquirers pay.

Snapshot 3.3 — Trading Multiple vs. Transaction Multiple Gap**Indian Manufacturing Sector — Illustrative Reference (2024–2026):**

Listed Comparable EV/EBITDA (trailing):	7.5–10.0x
M&A Transaction EV/EBITDA (closed deals):	10.0–14.0x

$$\text{Control Premium} = (\text{Transaction Multiple} / \text{Trading Multiple}) - 1$$

Illustrative: $(12.0x / 8.5x) - 1 = 41\%$ control premium

Why Transaction Multiples > Trading Multiples:

1. Control premium (buyer gains control rights)
2. Synergy value partially shared with seller
3. Strategic scarcity premium (limited comparable targets)
4. Competitive bidding process uplift

For standalone valuation: use trading multiples as the baseline.

For acquisition context: present both, with control premium explicitly stated.

CASE STUDY — Standalone Valuation — FastLogistics Pvt Ltd

FastLogistics is a mid-sized Indian third-party logistics company with Rs. 420 Crore revenue and Rs. 52 Crore normalised EBITDA (12.4% margin) in FY26, following a detailed EBITDA bridge that added back Rs. 14 Crore of non-recurring costs from the reported figure of Rs. 38 Crore. The DCF — using a 5-year explicit forecast with 14% revenue CAGR and EBITDA margin expansion to 16% by Year 5, discounted at 16% WACC — produces an enterprise value of Rs. 495–540 Crore. Comparable listed logistics companies trade at 9–11x trailing EBITDA, implying Rs. 468–572 Crore. Recent logistics M&A transactions have closed at 12–14x, implying Rs. 624–728 Crore. Standalone valuation range: Rs. 480–550 Crore. Acquisition value range (including control premium): Rs. 600–720 Crore. The spread represents the negotiating range between the financial buyer floor (LBO-constrained at approximately Rs. 520–560 Crore) and the strategic buyer ceiling (synergy-adjusted, potentially Rs. 700–800 Crore for the right acquirer).

PRO TIP

In a sell-side mandate, always prepare the standalone valuation before engaging buyers — not as a starting point for negotiation, but as a floor that prevents you from accepting below-market bids. A rigorous standalone valuation tells you the minimum acceptable price based on intrinsic value alone. Any offer above this floor represents premium being paid for either control, synergies, or financial engineering — and you can negotiate on the basis of which premium component you are capturing.

PART II — CHAPTER 4

Chapter 4: Synergy Valuation — Identifying, Sizing, and Sharing the Upside

Synergy is the reason strategic buyers consistently pay more than financial buyers for the same target. It is also the most manipulated concept in M&A — management teams and investment bankers routinely present synergy analyses that are either wildly optimistic (to justify a high price) or deliberately understated (to avoid overpaying). Building a credible, bottoms-up synergy analysis — one that can be defended in a board presentation and stress-tested in due diligence — is one of the most valuable skills in strategic M&A.

4.1 Synergy Framework — Revenue vs. Cost vs. Financial

Synergies fall into three broad categories: cost synergies (reducing the combined entity's costs below the sum of the two companies' standalone costs), revenue synergies (increasing the combined entity's revenues above the sum of standalone revenues), and financial synergies (tax benefits, improved debt capacity, reduced cost of capital). Of these three, cost synergies are the most reliable to estimate and achieve; revenue synergies are the most valuable but the least reliable; financial synergies are deal-specific.

Synergy Type	Description	Typical Realisability	Time to Realise	Who Initiates
Cost — Headcount	Elimination of duplicate functions (finance, HR, IT)	High — 70-90% typically realised	6-18 months	Acquirer (integration plan)
Cost — Procurement	Combined purchasing power reduces input costs	High — 60-80% realised	12-24 months	Acquirer + Target
Cost — Facilities	Consolidation of offices, plants, warehouses	Medium — 40-70% realised	18-36 months	Acquirer (real estate planning)
Cost — IT / Systems	Elimination of duplicate software licences, infrastructure	Medium — 50-75% realised	12-24 months	Acquirer (IT integration)
Revenue — Cross-Sell	Sell acquirer's products to target's customers (and vice versa)	Lower — 20-40% realised	24-48 months	Sales team (joint effort)
Revenue — New Geography	Target enters acquirer's markets or vice versa	Low-Medium — 30-50% realised	24-60 months	Acquirer (market knowledge)
Revenue — Pricing Power	Combined entity has more pricing power in shared markets	Low — 15-30% realised	Ongoing	Market dependent

Synergy Type	Description	Typical Realisability	Time to Realise	Who Initiates
Tax Synergies	Efficient use of deferred tax assets, loss carry-forwards	High — if applicable	Immediate to 3 years	Tax counsel

Exhibit 4.1: Synergy Taxonomy — Types, Realisability, and Timeline

4.2 Sizing Synergies — The Bottom-Up Method

Credible synergy analysis is built from the bottom up — identifying specific cost line items, specific customer relationships, and specific capability overlaps, and estimating the realistic improvement in each. This is categorically different from the 'top-down' synergy analysis that takes a percentage of combined revenue or cost and calls it a synergy target. Top-down synergy analysis is easy to build and easy to dismiss — bottom-up analysis is harder to construct but far more credible and far more actionable.

Snapshot 4.1 — Bottom-Up Cost Synergy Build (Illustrative)

Acquirer (AquireCo) + Target (TargetCo) — Cost Synergy Analysis

HEADCOUNT SYNERGIES:

Combined finance/accounts headcount: 42 people

Estimated redundancies post-integration: 18 people

Avg. fully-loaded cost per head: Rs. 18 Lakh/year

$$\text{Headcount Synergy} = 18 \times \text{Rs. 18L} = \text{Rs. 3.24 Crore/year}$$

PROCUREMENT SYNERGIES:

Combined annual raw material spend: Rs. 280 Crore

AquireCo's current negotiated rate vs TargetCo: -3.5% discount

Annual saving applying AquireCo rate to TargetCo spend:

$$\text{Procurement Synergy} = \text{Rs. 100 Cr (Target spend)} \times 3.5\% = \text{Rs. 3.5 Crore/year}$$

IT / SYSTEMS SYNERGIES:

TargetCo annual software licence cost: Rs. 4.2 Crore

Portion eliminated (consolidated to AquireCo systems): 60%

$$\text{IT Synergy} = \text{Rs. 4.2 Cr} \times 60\% = \text{Rs. 2.52 Crore/year}$$

TOTAL RUN-RATE COST SYNERGIES: Rs. 9.26 Crore/year

Integration costs to achieve (one-time): Rs. 6.5 Crore

Net Present Value of synergies at 8x: Rs. 74 Crore

(NPV = Annual synergies × multiple, less one-time costs)

4.3 Revenue Synergies — The Honest Assessment

Revenue synergies are the most seductive and the most frequently overestimated component of M&A value creation. Every acquirer believes that cross-selling opportunities exist — that their sales force will aggressively sell the target's products to their customers and vice versa. In practice, revenue synergy realisation rates are typically 20–40% of the stated target, and time to realise is almost always longer than projected.

The framework for honest revenue synergy estimation: identify the specific products that will be cross-sold, the specific customer segments that are addressable, the realistic penetration rate (how many existing customers will actually buy the new product), the average contract value, and the time to first close given sales cycle length. This produces a probability-weighted, time-phased revenue synergy model that is defensible in due diligence.

Snapshot 4.2 — Revenue Synergy Sizing Framework

Cross-Sell Opportunity Sizing — AcquireCo Selling TargetCo Products:

AcquireCo customer base: 850 enterprise accounts
 Accounts that buy products in TargetCo category: 60% = 510 accounts
 Currently buying from TargetCo: 30 accounts (3.5% penetration)
 Additional addressable accounts: 480 accounts
 Realistic new penetration rate (Year 3): 10% of 480 = 48 new accounts
 Average annual contract value (TargetCo product): Rs. 25 Lakh

Year 3 Revenue Synergy (cross-sell) = 48 × Rs. 25L = Rs. 12 Crore/year

EBITDA contribution (at TargetCo 35% margin): Rs. 4.2 Crore/year

Year 1 (ramp-up, 25% of target): Rs. 1.05 Crore EBITDA

Year 2 (50% of target): Rs. 2.1 Crore EBITDA

Year 3 (100% of target): Rs. 4.2 Crore EBITDA

4.4 Sharing the Synergies — The Negotiation Principle

A fundamental principle of M&A economics: the seller wants to capture 100% of the synergy value; the buyer wants to pay zero for synergies (i.e., pay only standalone value). The actual outcome is always somewhere between these extremes — and the negotiation dynamics of the process (how many bidders, how strategic the asset, how critical the deal is for each side) determine where between these extremes the price settles.

Snapshot 4.3 — Synergy Sharing: From Buyer Value to Bid Price

Deal Mechanics: How Synergy Value Becomes a Price Premium

Standalone EV (DCF / multiples): Rs. 320 Crore

PV of Total Synergies (NPV): Rs. 120 Crore

Total Synergistic Value: Rs. 440 Crore

Synergy Sharing Scenarios:

Scenario A — Buyer captures 80% of synergies:

Bid = Rs. 320 Cr + 20% × Rs. 120 Cr = Rs. 344 Crore

Scenario B — Buyer captures 60% of synergies:

Bid = Rs. 320 Cr + 40% × Rs. 120 Cr = Rs. 368 Crore

Scenario C — Seller captures 50% of synergies (strong competitive process):

Bid = Rs. 320 Cr + 50% × Rs. 120 Cr = Rs. 380 Crore

Key: The competitive process (dual-track, multiple strategic bidders) is the seller's mechanism for moving up the synergy sharing scale.

KEY INSIGHT

We have studied the synergy realisation track records of numerous Indian M&A transactions by examining post-deal financial performance against the synergy targets disclosed in acquisition announcements. The consistent finding: cost synergies are realised at approximately 70–80% of the initial estimate and within the stated timeline. Revenue synergies are realised at approximately 20–35% of the initial estimate and typically 2–3 years later than projected. This asymmetry has important implications for valuation: when building the synergy layer on top of standalone value, discount revenue synergies heavily (apply a 30–50% probability to each specific opportunity) and treat cost synergies with significantly more confidence.

PART II — CHAPTER 5

Chapter 5: The Strategic Premium — When It Exists, How Large It Gets, and Why

The acquisition premium is the percentage by which the purchase price exceeds the target's pre-announcement market value (for listed companies) or its assessed standalone intrinsic value (for unlisted companies). It is the most visible output of M&A valuation analysis, the most frequently cited statistic in deal announcements, and the most misunderstood concept in M&A negotiation. The premium is not a single thing — it is the sum of multiple components, each with different drivers and different negotiating dynamics.

5.1 Decomposing the Strategic Premium

The strategic premium paid by an acquirer is economically justified only if the combined entity creates value above the standalone values of the two companies. That value creation comes from the sources analysed in Chapter 4 (synergies) and from the control premium (the value of being able to direct the company's strategy, capital allocation, and management without requiring minority shareholder consent).

Snapshot 5.1 — Acquisition Premium Decomposition

Acquisition Premium Analysis — Illustrative Rs. 400 Crore Bid

Target standalone DCF value: Rs. 300 Crore
 Trading multiple implied value: Rs. 285 Crore
 Reference value (average of DCF and trading): Rs. 292 Crore

Premium Decomposition:

Control premium component: Rs. 30 Crore (+10%)
 Synergy premium component (30% of NPV): Rs. 48 Crore (+16%)
 Scarcity / competitive process component: Rs. 30 Crore (+10%)

Total bid: Rs. 292 + Rs. 30 + Rs. 48 + Rs. 30 = Rs. 400 Crore

Total premium = (Rs. 400 / Rs. 292) - 1 = 37%

Buyer check: Is the remaining 70% of synergy NPV (Rs. 112 Crore) more than the Rs. 8 Crore premium above standalone? YES → deal is accretive for buyer.

Premium Type	Driver	Typical Magnitude	When It Applies
Control Premium	Buyer gains control rights over the business	20–40% above trading value	All acquisitions of controlling stakes
Scarcity Premium	Target is the only/best available platform in a segment	Additional 10–25% on control premium	Niche market leaders, unique capabilities
Strategic Necessity Premium	Acquirer must have this asset to protect their position	Potentially >50% above standalone	Defensive M&A; competitive threat scenarios
Synergy Premium	PV of synergies shared with seller	Depends on synergy magnitude and sharing	Strategic acquirers with genuine synergies

Competitive Process Premium	Multiple bidders push price above any single bidder's rational limit	5–20% additional uplift	Well-run dual-track processes
-----------------------------	--	-------------------------	-------------------------------

Exhibit 5.1: Sources of Acquisition Premium — Drivers and Typical Magnitude

5.2 The Defensive Acquisition Premium

Some of the largest acquisition premiums in M&A history have been paid not because of synergy opportunity, but because of competitive threat — the acquirer's existing business would be seriously damaged if a competitor acquired the target instead. This defensive logic can justify premiums that are economically irrational from a pure synergy standpoint, because the denominator of the analysis is not just the value created by the acquisition but also the value destroyed if the acquisition does not occur.

Snapshot 5.2 — The Defensive Acquisition Logic

Scenario: TelecomA evaluating acquisition of SpectrumTech

SpectrumTech standalone value: Rs. 500 Crore
 Synergy value to TelecomA (NPV): Rs. 80 Crore
 Value to TelecomA (standalone + synergies): Rs. 580 Crore

Competitive Threat Analysis:

If Competitor B acquires SpectrumTech instead:

- TelecomA revenue at risk (customers lost): Rs. 120 Crore/year
- PV of competitive damage (5 years at 15%): Rs. 400 Crore

True Maximum Price TelecomA Can Justify:

$$= \text{Standalone Value} + \text{Own Synergies} + \text{Competitive Damage Avoided}$$

$$= \text{Rs. 500} + \text{Rs. 80} + \text{Rs. 400} = \text{Rs. 980 Crore}$$

TelecomA can rationally outbid almost any other acquirer.

Premium paid: up to 96% above standalone — defensible from TelecomA's perspective.

5.3 When Acquirers Overpay — The Winner's Curse

The winner's curse in M&A refers to the empirical finding that acquirers in competitive processes frequently pay prices that exceed the genuine economic value of the target — and that the winner (the acquirer who paid the most) is often the one who estimated synergies most aggressively or discounted risks most heavily. Academic research and deal outcome studies consistently show that approximately 50–60% of acquisitions destroy value for acquirers' shareholders in the 3 years post-closing.

The practical implication is not that synergy-based premiums are unjustified — they are, when synergies are realistically estimated and achieved. The implication is that the discipline of rigorous synergy analysis, conservative realisation assumptions, and explicit integration cost modelling is the most important safeguard against overpayment.

CASE STUDY — Synergy Overestimation — The Rs. 1,800 Crore Question

A large Indian consumer goods company acquired a regional beverage brand for Rs. 1,800 Crore — an 11x EV/EBITDA multiple in a sector that typically trades at 8–9x. The acquisition announcement cited Rs. 120 Crore in annual synergies (cost and distribution-related), implying that Rs. 960 Crore of the Rs. 1,800 Crore price was synergy-justified (at 8x), and the remaining Rs. 840 Crore was standalone value. The standalone value analysis using trailing EBITDA of Rs. 105 Crore at 8x implied only Rs. 840 Crore — but normalised EBITDA was closer to Rs. 130 Crore, making the standalone multiple more like 10.4x, already stretching. Three years post-closing, the integration revealed: distribution synergies were achieved at 45% of the target (route-to-market complexity was significantly underestimated); cost synergies were achieved at 85% of target; revenue synergies were near zero (the brand's regional identity actually conflicted with the acquirer's national

positioning). Total synergy realisation: approximately Rs. 75 Crore vs. the Rs. 120 Crore projected. At a reasonable 8x multiple, the value of realised synergies was Rs. 600 Crore — not the Rs. 960 Crore used to justify the premium. The acquirer overpaid by approximately Rs. 360 Crore due to synergy overestimation.

PRO TIP

Apply a 'synergy haircut' discipline in every acquisition valuation: for each synergy category, apply a probability of realisation (cost synergies: 75%; revenue synergies: 30%) and a time discount (revenue synergies realised in Year 3–5 not Year 1–2). This haircut produces a risked synergy NPV that should be the basis of the premium decision — not the unadjusted synergy estimate. If the deal is financially attractive after applying the haircut, it is a resilient acquisition. If it only works at the full optimistic synergy estimate, you are buying in hope, not in analysis.

PART III

How Financial Buyers Value a Business

*The LBO model, debt capacity, IRR/MOIC mechanics, and the PE value creation playbook
— with complete worked LBO example*

PART III — CHAPTER 6

Chapter 6: The LBO Model — IRR, MOIC, and the Entry Multiple Decision

The Leveraged Buyout (LBO) model is the financial buyer's core analytical tool — the framework that connects the entry price, the financing structure, the expected operational performance, and the exit assumptions into a single, integrated returns calculation. Unlike the strategic buyer's valuation (which builds up from DCF to synergy-adjusted value), the LBO model works backwards: the question is not 'what is this business worth?' but 'what price can I pay given the returns I need?'

Building an LBO model is not just a PE skill — it is essential for anyone who wants to understand the floor of what a financial buyer will pay for a business. In a dual-track process, knowing the LBO-implied entry price for your target tells you whether the financial buyers in your process are price-relevant or just providing a competitive appearance.

6.1 The LBO Model — Structure and Logic

Snapshot 6.1 — LBO Model Architecture

The Five Building Blocks of an LBO Model:

1. ENTRY: Purchase price, sources and uses of funds, opening balance sheet
2. OPERATIONS: Revenue, EBITDA, FCF projection over 5 years
3. DEBT: Debt schedule — interest, amortisation, cash sweep
4. EXIT: Exit multiple, exit enterprise value, exit equity value
5. RETURNS: Equity proceeds to PE fund; IRR and MOIC calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Entry Equity} &= \text{Enterprise Value} - \text{Net Debt at Entry} \\ \text{Exit Equity} &= \text{Exit Enterprise Value} - \text{Net Debt at Exit} \\ \text{MOIC} &= \text{Exit Equity} / \text{Entry Equity} \\ \text{IRR} &= (\text{Exit Equity} / \text{Entry Equity})^{(1/\text{Hold Period})} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

6.2 Worked LBO — Step by Step

We will work through a complete illustrative LBO of IndustrialMid Pvt Ltd to show how each component is built and how the entry multiple decision is derived.

Snapshot 6.2 — LBO Step 1: Entry Assumptions

Target: IndustrialMid Pvt Ltd — FY26 Data

Revenue:	Rs. 600 Crore
Normalised EBITDA:	Rs. 90 Crore (15.0% margin)
D&A:	Rs. 15 Crore
EBIT:	Rs. 75 Crore
CapEx (maintenance):	Rs. 12 Crore
ΔWorking Capital (annual):	Rs. 8 Crore (outflow)
Cash Tax (at 25%):	Rs. 18.75 Crore
Unlevered FCF (Year 0):	Rs. 75 – Rs. 18.75 + Rs. 15 – Rs. 12 – Rs. 8 = Rs. 51.25 Crore

Assumed Entry Multiple: 9.0x EV/EBITDA

$$\text{Purchase Price (EV): } 9.0x \times \text{Rs. 90 Cr} = \text{Rs. 810 Crore}$$

Net Debt (acquired): Rs. 50 Crore (to be repaid at closing)

$$\text{Equity Required (approx.): Rs. 810 – Net Debt at Entry (PE debt added)}$$

Snapshot 6.3 — LBO Step 2: Debt Structure (Sources and Uses)

Sources of Funds:

Senior Secured Debt: Rs. 360 Crore (4.0x EBITDA)

Mezzanine / Sub-Debt: Rs. 90 Crore (1.0x EBITDA)

PE Equity: Rs. 360 Crore (4.0x EBITDA)

Total Sources: Rs. 810 Crore

Uses of Funds:

Purchase of Target Equity: Rs. 760 Crore (EV – net debt acquired)

Repay Acquired Net Debt: Rs. 50 Crore

Total Uses: Rs. 810 Crore

Total Leverage: 5.0x EBITDA (Rs. 450 Cr total debt)

Interest Cost (blended 10%): Rs. 45 Crore/year initially

Annual Debt Service Check: EBITDA Rs. 90 Cr – Interest Rs. 45 Cr = Rs. 45 Crore available for debt repayment

Snapshot 6.4 — LBO Step 3: 5-Year Operating Projection

IndustrialMid — Operating Assumptions:

Revenue CAGR: 12%

EBITDA Margin (target Y5): 17% (up from 15% via operational improvements)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Revenue (Cr):	672	753	843	944	1,057
EBITDA (Cr):	101	113	127	151	180
Interest (Cr):	42	39	34	28	22 (debt reduces)
Debt Repaid (Cr):	35	40	46	50	60
Net Debt (Cr):	415	375	329	279	219

Year 5 Net Debt: Rs. 219 Crore (down from Rs. 450 Crore at entry)

Snapshot 6.5 — LBO Step 4: Exit and Returns Calculation

Exit Assumptions (Year 5):

Exit Multiple: 10.0x EBITDA (multiple expansion from 9.0x entry)

Exit EBITDA: Rs. 180 Crore

Exit EV = 10.0x × Rs. 180 Cr = Rs. 1,800 Crore

Exit Equity = Exit EV – Net Debt at Exit = Rs. 1,800 – Rs. 219 = Rs. 1,581 Crore

Returns to PE Fund:

Entry Equity Invested: Rs. 360 Crore

Exit Equity: Rs. 1,581 Crore

MOIC = Rs. 1,581 / Rs. 360 = 4.4x

IRR = (4.4)^(1/5) – 1 = 34.5%

Value Creation Bridge:

EBITDA Growth contribution: $(180/90 - 1) \times 9x \times Rs. 360/Rs. 810 = \sim 57\%$ of gain

Multiple Expansion (9→10x): $\sim 15\%$ of gain

Debt Paydown (Rs. 231 Cr): $\sim 28\%$ of gain

KEY INSIGHT

We model the LBO value creation bridge for every financial buyer engagement — it is one of the most illuminating outputs of the analysis because it forces an explicit conversation about where the return is actually coming from. In many Indian mid-market LBO deals we have analysed, debt paydown contributes 35–45% of total equity return — a larger proportion than either EBITDA growth or multiple expansion. This is important context: if a deal's return is predominantly driven by debt paydown rather than operational improvement, the PE fund is effectively a leveraged bond investor. This is not inherently bad, but it means the deal's success is more sensitive to the interest rate environment and refinancing risk than to management execution.

6.3 Sensitivity Analysis — The Entry Multiple Decision

Snapshot 6.6 — LBO IRR Sensitivity Table (Entry Multiple vs. Exit Multiple)

IRR % — IndustrialMid LBO (5-Year Hold, same operating assumptions)

	Exit Multiple: 8x	9x	10x	11x	12x
Entry Multiple 7x:	40%	46%	52%	57%	62%
Entry Multiple 8x:	31%	37%	42%	47%	51%
Entry Multiple 9x:	22%	28%	35%	40%	44%
Entry Multiple 10x:	14%	20%	26%	32%	37%
Entry Multiple 11x:	7%	13%	19%	25%	30%

Highlighted: Fund requires minimum 25% IRR → 9x entry only works if exit ≥ 10x

At 9x entry and 9x exit (no multiple expansion): IRR = 28% — at the margin

Maximum Entry Multiple at 25% IRR hurdle (9x exit): ~9.5x

PRO TIP

The sensitivity table is the most important analytical output in an LBO model for pricing purposes. Build it as a standard output: IRR as a function of entry multiple (rows) vs. exit multiple (columns), with a third version showing the same for MOIC. The cells that meet both the IRR hurdle and the MOIC hurdle define the 'buy zone' — the range of entry multiples that produce an acceptable deal for the PE fund given conservative exit assumptions. For a seller running a competitive process, understanding where the financial buyers' buy zone begins and ends tells you exactly how much room you have to push the price before financial buyers drop out of the process.

PART III — CHAPTER 7

Chapter 7: Debt Capacity, Returns Mechanics, and the PE Value Creation Playbook

The financial buyer's ability to pay a given entry multiple is directly determined by how much debt they can put on the business — because debt is cheaper than equity and therefore increases equity returns. Understanding debt capacity — the maximum sustainable leverage a target company can support — is as fundamental to LBO valuation as EBITDA analysis. A business that generates Rs. 100 Crore of EBITDA but has lumpy capital expenditures, heavy working capital requirements, and significant maintenance CapEx has lower effective debt capacity than a business generating Rs. 100 Crore EBITDA with light CapEx needs and negative working capital.

7.1 Debt Capacity — The Critical Constraint

Snapshot 7.1 — Debt Capacity Assessment

Debt Capacity Framework — Key Tests:

Test 1: Leverage Ratio (Debt / EBITDA)

Maximum acceptable (senior): 3.5–4.0x EBITDA

Maximum acceptable (total debt): 4.5–5.5x EBITDA

Stressed scenario (20% EBITDA decline): still < 6.0x EBITDA required

Test 2: Interest Coverage Ratio (EBITDA / Interest)

Minimum acceptable: 2.5–3.0x

$$\text{Interest Coverage} = \text{EBITDA} / \text{Annual Interest Expense}$$

Example: Rs. 90 Cr EBITDA, Rs. 30 Cr interest → 3.0x coverage (acceptable)

Test 3: Debt Service Coverage (DSCR)

$$\text{DSCR} = (\text{EBITDA} - \text{CapEx} - \text{Taxes}) / (\text{Interest} + \text{Amortisation})$$

Minimum acceptable: 1.2–1.5x

Test 4: Free Cash Flow Yield on Debt

Annual FCF should comfortably exceed annual interest + scheduled amortisation

Rule of thumb: FCF / Total Debt > 10–15%

Debt Type	Seniority	Typical Rate (India 2026)	Security	Amortisation
Senior Secured Term Loan A	1st lien	9–11%	All assets pledge	Amortising — 15–20% per year
Senior Secured Term Loan B	1st lien	10–12%	All assets pledge	Bullet with modest amortisation
Second Lien / Unitranche	2nd lien / blended	13–15%	Second charge or unsecured	Mostly PIK; bullet maturity
Mezzanine Debt / Sub-Debt	Junior / subordinated	15–18% (cash + PIK blend)	Subordinated; equity kicker	PIK + bullet; often with warrants

Vendor / Seller Loan	Junior to all institutional debt	Negotiated	Subordinated; deferred	Bullet; often deferred 1–2 years
----------------------	----------------------------------	------------	------------------------	----------------------------------

Exhibit 7.1: LBO Debt Stack — Indian PE Context (2026 Rates)

7.2 The PE Value Creation Playbook

Financial buyers create returns through three distinct mechanisms — EBITDA growth (improving the operating performance of the portfolio company), multiple expansion (exiting at a higher EV/EBITDA multiple than the entry multiple), and leverage (the use of debt, which amplifies equity returns because debt is paid off with operating cash flows, leaving more equity value at exit). Understanding which lever a specific PE deal relies upon is essential for assessing its risk/reward profile.

Snapshot 7.2 — Value Creation Bridge: Three Sources of PE Returns

IndustrialMid — Where Did the 4.4x MOIC Come From?

Entry Equity:	Rs. 360 Crore
Exit Equity:	Rs. 1,581 Crore
Total Return:	Rs. 1,221 Crore gain (4.4x MOIC)

Attribution of Returns:

1. EBITDA Growth (Rs. 90 Cr → Rs. 180 Cr, held at 9x):
 Additional EV from growth: Rs. 90 Cr × 9x = Rs. 810 Crore (attributable EV increase)
 Equity share: Rs. 810 Cr × (360/810) [entry equity %] = Rs. 360 Crore
 Approx. % of total gain from EBITDA: ~52%

2. Multiple Expansion (9x → 10x exit):
 Incremental EV: Rs. 180 Cr × 1x = Rs. 180 Crore additional EV
 Equity share: ~Rs. 180 Crore (already low-leveraged at exit)
 Approx. % of total gain from multiple expansion: ~15%

3. Debt Paydown (Rs. 450 Cr → Rs. 219 Cr = Rs. 231 Cr paid off):
 Debt paid with operating cash flows = Rs. 231 Crore equity uplift
 Approx. % of total gain from leverage: ~33%

Total Return Attributed: 52% + 15% + 33% = 100%

7.3 Management Incentive Plans — Aligning with PE Returns

Every PE buyout includes a management incentive plan (MIP) — a structure that gives the management team a meaningful equity stake in the portfolio company's upside. Without management alignment, PE value creation is nearly impossible — the PE fund's board representatives are not running the business on a daily basis. The MIP design is therefore both a retention tool and a value creation mechanism.

In India, the most common management incentive structure in PE buyouts is a combination of sweat equity and ESOP grants, typically giving the management team 5–15% of the fully diluted equity on a waterfall basis — meaning management only participates in value above a specified return hurdle (usually the PE fund's cost of equity or a specified MOIC threshold).

Snapshot 7.3 — Management Ratchet Structure

Management Ratchet — IndustrialMid Buyout:

Management equity pool:	10% of fully diluted equity
Entry cost:	Nominal (token Rs. 10 per share)

Ratchet Waterfall (Management participates above PE IRR hurdle):

If PE IRR < 20%: Management earns 5% of proceeds

If PE IRR 20–30%: Management earns 10% of proceeds (standard)

If PE IRR > 30%: Management earns 12% of proceeds (upside bonus)

Worked Example at 4.4x MOIC / 34.5% IRR:

Exit Equity (before MIP): Rs. 1,581 Crore

Management participation (12%): Rs. 190 Crore

PE Fund net equity: Rs. 1,391 Crore

Revised PE MOIC: Rs. 1,391 / Rs. 360 = 3.86x (still well above 3x target)

PRO TIP

In a PE deal, the management incentive plan should be negotiated before the deal closes — not after. The PE fund will always want to set the hurdle rate (the minimum return before management participates) as high as possible; management will want it as low as possible. The market-standard range for the hurdle in Indian PE buyouts is 20–25% IRR. If the hurdle is above 25%, management essentially needs the deal to be a home run before they earn anything — which misaligns incentives in the middle scenarios where most deals actually close. If the hurdle is below 20%, management participates even in mediocre outcomes — which reduces the PE fund's already-leveraged return.

PART IV

Deal Structures and Their Valuation Impact

How the consideration structure affects value — and who benefits from each structure

PART IV — CHAPTER 8

Chapter 8: Cash, Stock, and Mixed Consideration — What Each Choice Really Means

The deal consideration structure — how the acquisition price is paid — is not just a financing decision. It is a risk allocation mechanism that determines how valuation risk, post-closing integration risk, and performance risk are shared between buyer and seller. For a seller, all-cash is the safest outcome; for a buyer, deferring consideration (through earn-outs, stock, or seller loans) reduces the immediate cash burden. The negotiation of consideration structure is often as consequential as the headline price negotiation.

8.1 The All-Cash Acquisition

All-cash is the cleanest structure: the seller receives 100% of the consideration at closing in cash, with no post-closing exposure to the acquirer's performance, stock price, or earn-out achievement. The seller's primary tax event is the capital gains tax on the difference between proceeds and cost basis, arising in the year of closing.

For unlisted Indian companies, the capital gains tax on an all-cash acquisition is computed under Section 50CA (for shares transferred at below FMV) and Section 48 (indexed cost of acquisition for LTCG calculation). The tax rate is 20% with indexation for long-term capital gains (held > 24 months) or slab rate for short-term.

Snapshot 8.1 — All-Cash Deal: Capital Gains Tax Calculation

Seller: Promoter family; Target: PrivateCo Pvt Ltd

Sale Price (per share): Rs. 800 per share

Shares Sold: 10,00,000 shares

Gross Proceeds: Rs. 80 Crore

Original Cost (per share): Rs. 10 (face value, Year 2009)

Indexed Cost (CII adjustment FY09 to FY26): $\text{Rs. } 10 \times (363/137) = \text{Rs. } 26.5$

Total Indexed Cost: Rs. 2.65 Crore

LTCG = Rs. 80 Crore – Rs. 2.65 Crore = Rs. 77.35 Crore

LTCG Tax @ 20% = Rs. 15.47 Crore

Net After-Tax Proceeds: Rs. 64.53 Crore

Key: Seller should compute after-tax proceeds, not headline price, when comparing all-cash vs. other deal structures.

8.2 The Stock-for-Stock Transaction

In a stock-for-stock transaction, the seller receives shares of the acquirer (or a new holding company) rather than cash. This structure is particularly common in public company M&A, where the acquirer uses its own listed shares as currency to avoid depleting cash reserves or taking on acquisition debt. For the seller, the stock-for-stock structure offers the potential for tax deferral — the exchange of shares in the target for shares in the acquirer can be structured as a tax-neutral exchange under Section 47(vii) of the Income Tax Act (for amalgamations) or similar provisions, deferring capital gains until the acquired shares are eventually sold.

Consideration Type	Seller Risk	Buyer Risk	Tax Efficiency (Seller)	When Preferred
All-Cash	None — certain value	Full acquisition risk	Taxable immediately (capital gains)	Seller's preference; certainty of value
All-Stock (listed acquirer)	Market risk post-close	Dilution to existing shareholders	Tax-deferred (Section 47 exchange)	Buyer preference; preserves cash; tax benefit to seller
Mixed Cash + Stock	Partial market risk	Partial dilution	Partially taxable; stock portion deferred	Compromise; common in public M&A
Earn-Out	Performance risk — depends on post-close results	Integration disruption risk	Taxable as received	Bridges valuation gap; seller confident in future
Deferred Cash	Credit risk on acquirer	Working capital deferral	Partially deferred if structured correctly	Bridge financing constraint; price stretching
Seller Loan / Vendor Financing	Credit risk (acquirer defaults)	No upfront cash burden	Taxable as interest + principal	Acquirer constrained on upfront; seller has confidence in recovery

Exhibit 8.1: Consideration Structures — Risk and Benefit Comparison

Snapshot 8.2 — Exchange Ratio Calculation (Stock-for-Stock)

Exchange Ratio = FMV per Target Share / FMV per Acquirer Share

Target FMV per share (unlisted, DCF-based): Rs. 800

Acquirer share price (listed, 30-day VWAP): Rs. 1,200

Exchange Ratio = Rs. 800 / Rs. 1,200 = 0.667 acquirer shares per target share

Seller holds 10,00,000 target shares

Seller receives: 10,00,000 × 0.667 = 6,67,000 acquirer shares

Value of acquirer shares received: Rs. 80 Crore (same as cash deal)

Tax Treatment (if structured as amalgamation under Sec 47(vii)):

No capital gains tax at exchange — DEFERRED until acquirer shares are sold

Cost basis of acquirer shares = original cost basis of target shares

Future CGT will apply when acquirer shares are eventually sold

Seller risk: Acquirer share price falls post-close → realised value < Rs. 80 Cr

Seller upside: Acquirer share price rises → realised value > Rs. 80 Cr

KEY INSIGHT

We have modelled the after-tax economics of all-cash vs. stock-for-stock for several promoter families in the context of acquisition offers from listed acquirers. The most instructive finding: at high historical capital gains tax rates, the stock deferral advantage of a share-for-share exchange can be worth 3–7 percentage points of additional effective deal value to the seller — enough to justify accepting a lower headline price in exchange for a stock deal. For a promoter family whose cost basis is very low (early-stage investment), the embedded capital gains tax liability is a large fraction of their deal economics,

and tax deferral through a stock exchange is genuinely valuable. This calculation should be part of every sell-side advisory mandate where a listed acquirer is involved.

8.3 The Cash + Stock Mix — Finding the Optimal Split

Most large acquisitions use a mix of cash and stock — the buyer provides some immediate liquidity (cash) while deferring the remainder in the form of stock, thereby managing the acquisition's cash and dilution impacts. For the seller, the split determines the immediate liquidity and the residual market risk.

Snapshot 8.3 — Mixed Consideration: After-Tax Proceeds Analysis

Deal: Rs. 80 Crore total consideration, 60% cash / 40% stock

Cash consideration: Rs. 48 Crore (certain, taxable immediately)

Stock consideration: Rs. 32 Crore (market risk; tax deferred)

After-Tax Economics:

CGT on cash portion (LTCG @ 20%):

Cash proceeds Rs. 48 Cr – proportionate indexed cost (Rs. 1.59 Cr) = Rs. 46.41 Cr gain

CGT: Rs. 9.28 Crore

After-tax cash received: Rs. 38.72 Crore

Stock: No immediate tax — Rs. 32 Crore in acquirer shares received
(future tax when sold; acquirer share price risk applies)

**Total immediate after-tax value: Rs. 38.72 Cr (cash) + Rs. 32 Cr (stock, unrisked)
= Rs. 70.72 Crore (vs. Rs. 64.53 Crore in all-cash)**

Tax saving from stock component: Rs. 6.19 Crore

(This savings is real — but subject to future stock price performance)

PRO TIP

When advising a seller on consideration structure, always present the analysis on a risk-adjusted, after-tax basis — not on a headline price basis. A seller who accepts a Rs. 75 Crore all-cash deal instead of a Rs. 80 Crore cash + stock deal may actually be making the superior economic choice on an after-tax basis (Rs. 60 Crore after-tax cash vs. Rs. 70.72 Crore with stock market risk). Build the comparison model explicitly: probability-weighted after-tax proceeds under each structure, sensitised to key assumptions (acquirer share price, tax rate, timing of stock sale). This analysis is the most practically valuable deliverable in any deal structure advisory conversation.

PART IV — CHAPTER 9

Chapter 9: Earn-Outs, Escrows, and Deferred Consideration — Bridging the Valuation Gap

Earn-outs are one of the most powerful — and most litigated — tools in M&A deal structuring. They allow a buyer and seller to close a transaction despite a valuation gap by making part of the consideration contingent on post-closing performance. In theory, an earn-out bridges the disagreement: the seller gets more if the company performs as they projected; the buyer pays more only if the value is there. In practice, earn-outs generate disputes, misaligned incentives, and accounting complexity that make them one of the most technically demanding elements of deal structuring.

9.1 When Earn-Outs Make Sense — and When They Do Not

Earn-outs are appropriate in specific situations: where the seller has near-term revenue visibility (a pipeline) that the buyer cannot verify through historical data; where the business is early-stage and valuation is dominated by forward projections rather than historical earnings; where the business is in a transition year (revenue or EBITDA temporarily depressed) that distorts the trailing multiple; or where there is a key-person risk and the earn-out is designed to retain the seller in the business post-closing.

Earn-outs are a poor substitute for genuine valuation agreement. If the buyer and seller simply disagree about the sustainable growth rate of the business, an earn-out does not resolve the disagreement — it defers it to a more adversarial context (post-closing dispute resolution) when the parties no longer need each other's goodwill to close a transaction.

Snapshot 9.1 — Earn-Out Valuation (NPV Approach)

Deal: Rs. 500 Crore upfront + earn-out based on FY28 EBITDA

Earn-Out Formula:

If FY28 EBITDA \geq Rs. 80 Crore: Additional payment = Rs. 100 Crore

If FY28 EBITDA Rs. 65–80 Crore: Additional payment = $(\text{EBITDA} - 65) / 15 \times \text{Rs. } 100 \text{ Cr}$

If FY28 EBITDA $<$ Rs. 65 Crore: No additional payment

Probability-Weighted Earn-Out Value (Seller's Analysis):

Scenario A: EBITDA \geq Rs. 80 Cr (40% probability): Rs. 100 Crore

Scenario B: EBITDA Rs. 72.5 Cr (35% probability): Rs. 50 Crore

Scenario C: EBITDA $<$ Rs. 65 Cr (25% probability): Rs. 0 Crore

Expected Earn-Out = $0.40 \times \text{Rs. } 100 + 0.35 \times \text{Rs. } 50 + 0.25 \times 0 = \text{Rs. } 57.5 \text{ Crore}$

Discounted to today (2 years, 12% discount rate):

PV of Earn-Out = $\text{Rs. } 57.5 / (1.12)^2 = \text{Rs. } 45.9 \text{ Crore}$

Total Expected Deal Value = $\text{Rs. } 500 + \text{Rs. } 45.9 = \text{Rs. } 545.9 \text{ Crore}$

Seller should compare this to an all-upfront offer of, say, Rs. 530 Crore.

9.2 The Earn-Out Negotiation — Six Critical Parameters

The economic value of an earn-out depends entirely on six structural parameters. Getting each one right requires careful negotiation:

Snapshot 9.2 — Six Earn-Out Parameters to Negotiate

Parameter 1: METRIC — What is the earn-out based on?

Revenue: Seller prefers (harder for buyer to manipulate post-close)
 EBITDA: Buyer prefers (reflects profitability, not just growth)
 EBIT / Net Profit: Avoid (subject to depreciation / interest policy changes)
 Practical rule: Use revenue for growth-stage companies; EBITDA for mature businesses

Parameter 2: PERIOD — How long?

Standard: 1–3 years. Longer earn-outs are increasingly uncertain and disputed.
 Seller prefers shorter (more certain); buyer prefers longer (more time to watch performance)

Parameter 3: THRESHOLD — What is the minimum to trigger payment?

Set at a level the seller is confident of achieving; buyer wants it higher

Parameter 4: FORMULA — Linear vs. cliff?

Cliff (binary): All or nothing at threshold — creates artificial gaming
 Linear/sliding: Pro-rated between floor and cap — more fair, less gameable

Parameter 5: ACQUIRER CONDUCT COVENANTS

Critical: How is the seller protected against buyer interfering with performance?
 Must include: minimum investment level, prohibition on cutting sales headcount, ring-fenced budget, no change of business strategy without seller consent

Parameter 6: DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Who determines the earn-out achievement? Independent accountant preferred.
 Timeline for dispute resolution — must be specified in the agreement.

KEY INSIGHT

We have been engaged to provide expert valuation in earn-out disputes more often than we would like. The disputes almost always centre on one of two issues: the buyer interfered with the business post-closing in ways that depressed the earn-out metric (cutting marketing budget, diverting a key customer to a related entity, attributing shared costs to the earn-out business); or the earn-out metric was not clearly defined in the agreement and the parties disagree on the accounting treatment. Both categories of dispute are largely preventable with clear drafting. Earn-out agreements should be written as if you expect a dispute — because a meaningful proportion of them result in one.

9.3 Escrows and Holdbacks — The Post-Closing Protection Mechanism

An escrow is an amount withheld from the seller at closing and held in a third-party account to cover potential post-closing claims — warranty breaches, indemnification obligations, or working capital adjustments. Unlike an earn-out (which is forward-looking), an escrow is backward-looking: it protects the buyer against problems that already existed but were not discovered before closing.

Snapshot 9.3 — Escrow / Holdback Structure

Standard Escrow Mechanics:

Deal Size:	Rs. 600 Crore
Escrow Amount:	10% = Rs. 60 Crore
Escrow Period:	18 months from closing
Escrow Conditions:	Released minus any warranty claims

Seller's After-Tax View:

Received at closing:	Rs. 540 Crore (90%)
----------------------	---------------------

Tax payable at closing (on full Rs. 600 Cr): Full LTCG tax due at closing
(Seller pays tax on the full Rs. 600 Cr even if Rs. 60 Cr is in escrow)
→ Seller has a cash flow gap: tax on escrowed amount before it is released

Working Capital Adjustment:

$$\text{WC Adjustment} = \text{Actual WC at Close} - \text{Target WC (agreed at signing)}$$

If actual WC is lower than target → buyer receives payment from escrow

If actual WC is higher than target → buyer pays seller additional consideration

PRO TIP

Negotiate the working capital target (the 'peg') with extreme care — it is the most frequently disputed post-closing adjustment in Indian M&A transactions. The WC peg should be based on a 12-month trailing average of actual working capital, with clear accounting policy definitions (what is included, what is excluded, how inventory is valued, how disputed receivables are treated). Sellers who allow buyers to set the WC peg at year-end (when WC is typically at its lowest due to seasonality or year-end collections) and then measure actual WC at a mid-year closing will systematically pay more to buyers via WC adjustments than the deal economics intended.

PART IV — CHAPTER 10

Chapter 10: Management Rollover, Ratchets, and Seller Financing

Three additional deal structure components — management rollover, equity ratchets, and seller financing — complete the toolkit of acquisition deal structuring. Each of these is used in specific situations to align incentives, bridge price gaps, or solve financing constraints. Understanding each from both the buyer's and seller's perspective allows practitioners to structure deals that work for both parties rather than requiring one side to simply accept the other's preferred terms.

10.1 Management Rollover — The Alignment Mechanism

In a PE buyout, management rollover refers to the portion of the acquisition proceeds that the management team (and sometimes the selling founder) reinvests into the new equity structure alongside the PE fund, rather than receiving in cash at closing. A rollover aligns the management team's incentives with the PE fund's by ensuring that management has personal capital at risk in the new structure — they lose money if the business underperforms.

Snapshot 10.1 — Management Rollover Mechanics

IndustrialMid Buyout — Management Rollover

Deal Structure: Rs. 810 Crore EV; Rs. 360 Crore PE equity

Selling Founders' Holding:	30% of pre-deal equity
Cash proceeds at deal price:	$30\% \times \text{Rs. } 760 \text{ Cr} = \text{Rs. } 228 \text{ Crore (equity value)}$

Rollover Option:

Founders roll over 25% of their proceeds = Rs. 57 Crore
 Rolled equity % in new structure: $\text{Rs. } 57 / \text{Rs. } 417 \text{ (PE equity + rollover)}$
 = 13.7% of total equity in new structure
 Cash received at closing: Rs. 171 Crore (75% of equity proceeds)

Why Founders Agree to Rollover:

1. PE fund values management alignment — may offer better price in exchange
2. Founders believe in upside beyond current deal — want to participate
3. Tax deferral: rolled equity not taxed until subsequent sale
4. Rollover often comes with equity ratchet / upside participation rights

10.2 Equity Ratchets — Incentivising Outperformance

An equity ratchet is a mechanism that increases the management team's equity percentage in the holding company (or the PE fund's MOIC share that accrues to management) if the company exceeds specified performance thresholds at exit. Ratchets are designed to supercharge management incentives for exceptional performance — they are the deal structure component that allows management to earn a disproportionate share of the upside if they deliver a home-run result.

Snapshot 10.2 — Equity Ratchet Table

Management Ratchet Design — IndustrialMid PE Buyout:

Management starting equity: 10% of new structure (Rs. 36 Crore invested at nominal cost)

Ratchet Table (% of Exit Equity Management Receives):

PE Fund MOIC < 2.0x: Management earns 10% (base)
 PE Fund MOIC 2.0–3.0x: Management earns 12% (1.2x base)
 PE Fund MOIC 3.0–4.0x: Management earns 15% (1.5x base)
 PE Fund MOIC > 4.0x: Management earns 18% (1.8x base)

Worked Example at 4.4x PE MOIC:

Exit Equity (total): Rs. 1,581 Crore
 Management ratchet applies at 18%: Rs. 284.6 Crore to management
 PE Fund equity (after ratchet): Rs. 1,296.4 Crore

Revised PE MOIC: Rs. 1,296 / Rs. 360 = 3.6x (still above 3x hurdle)
Management MOIC: Rs. 284.6 / Rs. 36 = 7.9x (exceptional outcome)

KEY INSIGHT

We have observed that the equity ratchet — more than any other deal structure component — determines whether the management team is genuinely excited about the PE partnership or merely tolerating it. A management team that sees a path to a 5–8x personal MOIC if the company hits its ambitious plan is a management team that will work extraordinary hours and make bold strategic decisions. A management team with 5% flat equity and no upside leverage is a management team that is effectively working for salary. In our deal advisory work, we consistently advocate for meaningful management equity and well-designed ratchets as value creation tools — not just retention mechanisms. The incremental return given to management through ratchets typically returns multiples of its cost through superior operating performance.

10.3 Seller Financing — When the Seller Becomes a Lender

Seller financing (also called vendor financing or a vendor note) is a structure where the seller accepts a portion of the acquisition price in the form of a loan from the acquirer rather than immediate cash payment. The seller note is typically subordinated to all senior debt in the capital structure, bears a negotiated interest rate, and matures 2–5 years after closing.

Snapshot 10.3 — Seller Note: Economics and Risk

Scenario: Rs. 810 Crore acquisition; buyer short Rs. 80 Crore equity

Standard structure without seller note:

Senior Debt: Rs. 360 Cr (4.0x EBITDA)
 Mezzanine: Rs. 90 Cr (1.0x EBITDA)
 PE Equity: Rs. 360 Cr (45% equity)
 Total: Rs. 810 Cr

Structure with Rs. 80 Cr seller note:

Senior Debt: Rs. 360 Cr
 Mezzanine: Rs. 90 Cr
 Seller Note (sub.): Rs. 80 Cr @ 12% p.a., 3-year bullet
 PE Equity: Rs. 280 Cr (PE reduces equity by Rs. 80 Cr)
 Total: Rs. 810 Cr

Seller Risk Assessment:

Seller receives Rs. 80 Crore in 3 years plus Rs. 28.8 Cr interest (total Rs. 108.8 Cr)

Risk: If IndustrialMid defaults, seller note is paid after all senior/mez debt

→ Seller is the last in line; recovery could be partial or zero

Seller's effective yield: 12% (vs. 6.5% risk-free GOI bond)

Seller should demand: governance covenants, performance triggers, collateral

PRO TIP

Never accept a seller note without conducting a rigorous assessment of the acquirer's ability to service their full debt load — including the seller note — under a stressed scenario (20–30% EBITDA decline from base case). Use the DSCR and leverage ratio tests from Chapter 7 to verify that the debt structure remains serviceable under stress. A seller note that is structurally impaired by the acquisition debt load above it is not a deferred payment — it is a loan that may never be repaid. If the seller note represents a significant portion of the deal proceeds, insist on a personal guarantee from the PE fund (not just the portfolio company) or a step-in right that returns ownership to the seller if covenants are breached.

PART V

Practical Application

Running a dual-track process; from LOI to closing and how valuation moves through the deal lifecycle

PART V — CHAPTER 11

Chapter 11: Running a Dual-Track Process — Managing Strategic and Financial Buyers Side by Side

A dual-track M&A process is one where the seller simultaneously pursues strategic acquirers and financial buyers (PE funds) in parallel, using the competition between the two tracks to maximise both the price achieved and the quality of terms obtained. The dual-track is now standard in any well-advised sell-side mandate for a business of meaningful size — it prevents the seller from being cornered by a single buyer type and provides genuine information about the market value of the business from both valuation paradigms.

11.1 Why Dual-Track Maximises Seller Value

The strategic buyer ceiling and the financial buyer floor define the negotiating range. Running both tracks simultaneously does three things: it prevents the seller from inadvertently selling at the financial buyer floor (which happens when only PE funds are approached); it creates genuine competitive tension (PE funds bid more aggressively when they know strategic buyers are in the room); and it provides a fallback if one track produces disappointing results.

Snapshot 11.1 — The Dual-Track Value Dynamics

FastLogistics — Dual-Track Price Range Analysis:

Standalone valuation: Rs. 480–550 Crore

Financial Buyer Track (PE Funds):

LBO-constrained range (25% IRR floor): Rs. 520–590 Crore

Based on: 9.5–10.5x normalised EBITDA of Rs. 55 Crore

Strategic Buyer Track (3 shortlisted acquirers):

Acquirer X (logistics platform): Synergies Rs. 45 Cr → bid Rs. 650–700 Cr

Acquirer Y (ecommerce company): Synergies Rs. 70 Cr → bid Rs. 700–780 Cr

Acquirer Z (international player): Synergies Rs. 90 Cr → bid Rs. 780–850 Cr

Dual-Track Range: Rs. 520 Cr (PE floor) to Rs. 850 Cr (strategic ceiling)

Achieving Rs. 780–800 Cr requires: Acquirer Z in the process AND PE track creating pressure

Achieving Rs. 650 Cr without PE track: likely outcome (no competitive pressure)

Value created by dual-track: Rs. 130–150 Crore additional consideration

Process Stage	Strategic Track Activity	Financial Track Activity	Seller Management Priority
NDA / Teaser	Signed by strategic partners; limited info shared	Signed by shortlisted PE funds; more financial detail	Manage information asymmetry carefully
Management Presentation	Synergy discussion; strategic rationale; integration vision	EBITDA quality; growth drivers; debt capacity; management retention	Different presentations — not same deck
Data Room Access	Synergy-relevant data (procurement volumes, customer lists)	Financial model; normalised EBITDA; WC analysis; CapEx schedule	Track data room access; note what each buyer focuses on

Preliminary Bid (IOI)	Typically range-based; synergy-dependent	LBO-constrained range; often tighter band	Assess seriousness and price gap
Confirmatory Due Diligence	Integration risk assessment; regulatory / competition check	Quality of Earnings (QoE); management checks; legal DD	Control timeline; avoid fatigue
Final Bid / Binding Offer	Strategic value quantified; clean vs. dirty price clarified	Fully committed; debt financing confirmed; management plan confirmed	Evaluate total value, not just headline
Negotiation / Exclusivity	SPA terms; reps and warranties; integration commitments	Debt documentation; SPA terms; earn-out / rollover negotiation	Grant exclusivity only after bid is binding and final

Exhibit 11.1: Dual-Track Process Timeline — Strategic vs. Financial Track Activities

11.2 Managing Information Flow — The Confidentiality Challenge

The most operationally sensitive aspect of a dual-track process is managing what information is shared with whom and when. Strategic buyers — particularly competitors — may use the information in the data room for competitive purposes even if they do not ultimately acquire the business. PE funds are generally safer recipients of competitively sensitive information, but they may share information with their portfolio companies that are competitors.

The practical solution is a layered information access protocol: all initial bidders receive a teaser and a limited CIM (no customer names, no technology details); after NDA signing, bidders receive a standard data room with financial and operational information; only shortlisted bidders who submit preliminary bids above a threshold receive access to the clean room (customer lists, technology architecture, employee details).

✓ Dual-Track Process Checklist — Sell-Side Preparation

- Build two versions of the data room: one synergy-enhanced for strategic buyers; one EBITDA-quality focused for PE buyers
- Prepare separate management presentation decks: strategic vision narrative for strategics; financial model walk-through for PE funds
- Establish a competition / regulatory risk matrix: which strategic bidders raise competition authority issues?
- Prepare a management retain plan: who in management will stay; what are their incentive terms in each scenario?
- Build the EBITDA bridge before marketing: normalise to a defensible, auditable number that will survive QoE
- Establish the earn-out / rollover positions in advance: what is the minimum upfront cash; maximum earn-out the seller will accept?
- Identify the preferred buyer profile (beyond price): cultural fit, management autonomy, brand retention
- Set a realistic indicative bid deadline: 3–4 weeks from data room access for preliminary bids
- Determine exclusivity trigger: the price and terms at which you will grant exclusivity and take the business off the market

KEY INSIGHT

We have managed sell-side processes where the seller received final bids that were Rs. 200 Crore apart — the highest strategic bid vs. the best PE bid. At that spread, it would seem obvious to take the strategic bid. But in two of those situations, the seller ultimately chose the PE bid — once because the strategic acquirer would have absorbed the business into a larger platform and destroyed the brand, and once because the strategic acquirer's board had recently announced a strategic pivot away from the sector. The 'best deal' is not always the highest headline price. The seller's decision framework

should include price, certainty (how likely is the deal to close?), consideration structure (cash upfront vs. deferred), post-closing fit (management autonomy, brand, culture), and regulatory risk (timing and probability of approval).

PRO TIP

Run the dual-track with a hard bid deadline — a specific date by which all final bids must be submitted, no exceptions. Buyers who miss the deadline are out. This discipline prevents the process from dragging indefinitely as different buyers move at different speeds, and it creates the impression (accurate or not) that the seller is moving to exclusivity promptly. An indefinite process loses momentum, leaks information, and gives buyers time to lower their bids as market conditions change. A 16–20 week total process timeline from formal kick-off to exclusivity is achievable for a well-prepared sell-side mandate.

PART V — CHAPTER 12

Chapter 12: From LOI to Closing — How Valuation Moves During the Deal

The signed term sheet or Letter of Intent (LOI) does not mark the end of valuation negotiation — it marks the beginning of a new, more granular valuation process driven by confirmatory due diligence. Understanding how valuation moves from the initial bid through to final closing — and why it almost always moves downward from the IOI to the signed SPA — prepares both buyers and sellers for the reality of deal execution.

12.1 The Quality of Earnings (QoE) Report — The Most Important Post-LOI Valuation Event

A Quality of Earnings (QoE) report is an independent analysis, typically conducted by an accounting firm engaged by the buyer, that validates the target's reported EBITDA and constructs an adjusted, sustainable EBITDA figure that forms the basis for the final acquisition price. The QoE is the due diligence process's financial centrepiece — it either confirms the seller's EBITDA representations or discovers adjustments that reduce the deal price.

Snapshot 12.1 — QoE EBITDA Bridge (Buy-Side)

ManufactureTech — Quality of Earnings Findings:

Management Reported / Normalized EBITDA: Rs. 38.7 Crore

QoE Adjustments (Buyer's Accounting Firm):

- Revenue recognised before customer acceptance (Rs. 3.2 Cr pulled forward): –Rs. 3.2 Crore
- Inventory write-down deferred past FY26 year-end: –Rs. 1.8 Crore
- Related party service fees below market rate (ongoing cost, not NR): –Rs. 2.0 Crore
- Pro-forma adjustment: accelerated hiring costs (sustainable going-fwd): –Rs. 1.5 Crore
- + One-time professional fees NOT added back by seller (one-time confirmed): +Rs. 0.8 Crore

QoE Adjusted EBITDA: Rs. 31.0 Crore (down from Rs. 38.7 Crore = –20%)

Impact on Deal Price (8x multiple):

Seller's implied EV: $8x \times \text{Rs. } 38.7 \text{ Cr} = \text{Rs. } 309.6 \text{ Crore}$

Buyer's implied EV: $8x \times \text{Rs. } 31.0 \text{ Cr} = \text{Rs. } 248.0 \text{ Crore}$

QoE-driven price reduction: Rs. 61.6 Crore (–20%)

Deal Phase	Typical Valuation Event	Direction of Movement	Key Driver
Marketing / Teaser	Management estimate; broad range	Anchored high by seller	Seller positioning
Preliminary Bid (IOI)	Buyer's indicative range	Typically below seller expectation	Buyer caution; limited info
Data Room / Management Presentation	Buyer refines model with better info	Converges — may go up or down	Data quality; management credibility
Quality of Earnings (QoE)	Independent accountant validates EBITDA	Often moves DOWN 5–15%	Normalisation adjustments discovered

Confirmatory Diligence	Legal, regulatory, commercial DD	May move DOWN further on risk items	Risk discovery; reps & warranties cost
Final Bid	Buyer's committed price	May differ from IOI by 10–25%	Full picture; competitive dynamics
SPA Negotiation	Pricing adjustments (WC, escrow)	Often moves DOWN slightly	Reps, warranties, indemnity scope
Closing Adjustment	Working capital true-up	May go either direction	Actual vs. estimated WC at close

Exhibit 12.1: How Valuation Moves Through the Deal — Direction and Drivers

KEY INSIGHT

We have prepared Vendor Due Diligence (VDD) reports for sell-side mandates — an independent QoE commissioned by the seller before going to market. The VDD almost always reduces the initial listed price surprise at the buyer's QoE stage, because it forces the seller to confront normalisation adjustments before the buyer does. In deals where we have prepared the VDD, the gap between the seller's IOI expectation and the buyer's final bid is typically 5–10%; in deals without a VDD, that gap is typically 15–25%. The VDD investment (paying for an independent EBITDA analysis before marketing) consistently produces a better deal outcome because it removes the single largest source of late-stage price renegotiation.

12.2 Representations, Warranties, and Indemnities — Valuation Risk Post-Closing

After the price is agreed and the SPA is signed, one final valuation risk remains: indemnification claims from the buyer for losses arising from breaches of representations and warranties made by the seller. These claims can reduce the seller's effective deal proceeds by 2–8% in complex transactions.

Snapshot 12.2 — Indemnity Cap and Basket Mechanics

Standard Indemnity Structure in Indian M&A (Private Company):

Indemnity Cap (max seller liability): 20–30% of deal value

Basket / Deductible (minimum threshold for claims):

Mini-basket: Rs. 50–100 Lakh per claim

General basket: 1–2% of deal value (aggregate before seller pays)

Survival Period: 18–24 months for general reps; 3–5 years for tax reps

Worked Example:

Deal value: Rs. 500 Crore

Escrow (10% holdback): Rs. 50 Crore

General basket: $1.5\% \times \text{Rs. } 500 \text{ Cr} = \text{Rs. } 7.5 \text{ Crore}$

Cap: $25\% \times \text{Rs. } 500 \text{ Cr} = \text{Rs. } 125 \text{ Crore}$

Buyer discovers post-close tax liability of Rs. 12 Crore

Buyer's recovery: Rs. 12 Cr – Rs. 7.5 Cr basket = Rs. 4.5 Crore from escrow

Net seller proceeds: Rs. 500 Cr – Rs. 4.5 Cr claim = Rs. 495.5 Crore

12.3 Closing Price Adjustments — Working Capital True-Up

The final pricing event in any M&A transaction is the closing working capital adjustment — the true-up between the estimated working capital at signing (which informed the deal price) and the actual working capital at closing. A working capital adjustment that favours the buyer is effectively a price reduction; one that favours the seller is a price increase.

 **Snapshot 12.3 — Working Capital True-Up Mechanics****WC Adjustment Formula:**

$$\text{WC Adjustment} = \text{Actual WC at Close} - \text{Target WC (agreed at signing)}$$

Positive adjustment → Buyer pays seller additional consideration

Negative adjustment → Seller pays buyer (from escrow or separately)

Worked Example:

Target WC agreed at signing: Rs. 85 Crore

Actual WC at closing (measured): Rs. 78 Crore

WC deficiency: Rs. 7 Crore

Seller pays buyer Rs. 7 Crore → Deal price effectively Rs. 493 Crore

Common causes of WC deficiency at close:

1. Seller accelerates cash collections before closing (draws down receivables)
2. Seasonality (closing at low WC point in the cycle)
3. Accounting methodology differences (how reserves are computed)

PRO TIP

The most practical advice for sellers approaching closing: do not change your working capital management behaviour in the 3 months before closing. The buyer's team will compare WC metrics at closing to the trailing 12-month average — any sudden improvement in collections or payables extension will be identified as an attempt to game the WC peg and will either be adjusted out or create adversarial negotiations. Run the business normally, close the books cleanly, and document any WC movements with business-as-usual explanations. A clean, consistent WC position at closing is a sign of a well-managed business and a well-managed deal process.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion: Putting It All Together in a Live Deal

The Deal Valuation Workflow — Integrated Summary

Every M&A transaction benefits from the same structured valuation workflow, regardless of whether the buyer is strategic or financial. That workflow, synthesised from the twelve chapters of this guide, is:

1. Build the EBITDA bridge — Normalise reported earnings to sustainable, recurring EBITDA. This is the foundation of everything.
2. Compute standalone value — DCF anchored to trading multiples cross-check. This is the floor that any rational acquirer must exceed.
3. Identify and size synergies (for strategic deals) — Bottom-up, probability-weighted, time-phased. Not top-down percentages.
4. Build the LBO model (for PE deals or to understand the financial buyer floor) — Full sources/uses, 5-year operating projection, debt schedule, exit, returns.
5. Map the dual-track range — Financial buyer floor to strategic buyer ceiling. This is the negotiating field.
6. Design the deal structure — Cash vs. stock vs. earn-out; rollover; escrow; seller note. Structure affects economics as much as price.
7. Stress test everything — QoE adjustments, working capital sensitivity, earn-out achievement probability, LBO IRR under conservative assumptions.

The Single Most Important Lesson

Every concept in this guide reduces to one practical principle: value is context-dependent. The same company is worth different amounts to different buyers because different buyers bring different capabilities to the table — different synergies, different debt capacity, different portfolio value, different strategic necessity. The role of the valuation analyst, the M&A advisor, or the CFO is to understand who is the buyer, what is that buyer's specific value calculus, and how the deal structure can be designed to capture the maximum share of that buyer's value for the seller.

The strategic buyer who understands that their synergy analysis is the primary justification for their bid — and who communicates that analysis credibly — will win competitive processes against PE funds that can only bid to a return constraint. The PE fund that builds the most rigorous LBO model, understands exactly where their returns come from, and designs a management incentive plan that maximises value creation will generate superior returns versus funds that price deals on feel or market precedent alone. The sell-side advisor who runs a genuine dual-track process, prepares a Vendor Due Diligence report, and goes into every buyer conversation with both the standalone value and the synergy ceiling pre-computed will consistently achieve better outcomes than one who simply markets and waits.

QUICK REFERENCE

All Key Formulas & Snapshots — Quick Reference

Core M&A Formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Enterprise Value (DCF)} &= \Sigma[\text{FCFF} / (1+\text{WACC})^t] + \text{TV} / (1+\text{WACC})^n \\ \text{FCFF} &= \text{EBIT}(1-t) + \text{D\&A} - \Delta\text{WC} - \text{CapEx} \\ \text{Terminal Value (GGM)} &= \text{FCFF}_n \times (1+g) / (\text{WACC} - g) \\ \text{Control Premium} &= (\text{Transaction Multiple} / \text{Trading Multiple}) - 1 \\ \text{Synergy Value (NPV)} &= \text{Annual Synergy EBITDA} \times \text{Multiple} - \text{Integration Costs} \\ \text{Strategic Premium} &= \text{Standalone Value} + \text{Synergy Premium} + \text{Control Premium} \end{aligned}$$

LBO Core Formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Entry Equity} &= \text{Enterprise Value} - \text{Net Debt at Entry} \\ \text{Exit Equity} &= \text{Exit EV} - \text{Net Debt at Exit} \\ \text{MOIC} &= \text{Exit Equity} / \text{Entry Equity} \\ \text{IRR} &= (\text{MOIC})^{(1 / \text{Hold Period})} - 1 \\ \text{Max Entry Multiple} &= f(\text{IRR hurdle, exit multiple, EBITDA growth, leverage}) \\ \text{DSCR} &= (\text{EBITDA} - \text{CapEx} - \text{Tax}) / (\text{Interest} + \text{Amortisation}) \text{ [target} \geq 1.25\text{x]} \\ \text{Interest Coverage} &= \text{EBITDA} / \text{Interest} \text{ [target} \geq 2.5\text{x]} \end{aligned}$$

Deal Structure Formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Exchange Ratio} &= \text{FMV per Target Share} / \text{FMV per Acquirer Share} \\ \text{WC Adjustment} &= \text{Actual WC at Close} - \text{Target WC} \\ \text{EPS Accretion/Dilution} &= (\text{Post-Deal EPS} / \text{Pre-Deal EPS}) - 1 \\ \text{Earn-Out NPV} &= \Sigma[\text{Probability} \times \text{Earn-Out Payment}] / (1+r)^t \\ \text{Management MOIC} &= \text{Exit Equity to Mgmt} / \text{Mgmt Equity Invested} \end{aligned}$$

Key Benchmarks — Indian M&A Context (2026)

WACC for Indian mid-market targets: 14–20% |

PE IRR hurdle: 25–35% | PE MOIC target: 3–4x |

LBO leverage: 4–5.5x EBITDA |

Typical hold period: 4–6 years |

Cost synergy realisation: 70–80% |

Revenue synergy realisation: 20–35% |

Typical escrow: 8–12% of deal value |

How We can Help

ELITE VALUATION

How Elite Valuation Can Help

If you have read this guide this far, you already understand more about strategic vs. financial buyer valuation than the majority of business owners, CFOs, and first-time deal participants in India today. But understanding the theory and executing a live transaction are two very different challenges. In a live deal, every decision carries real financial consequences — and the difference between a well-advised transaction and a poorly advised one is regularly measured in tens or hundreds of crores of rupees.

Elite Valuation was built specifically for practitioners who need that execution-grade valuation support: analysis that is technically defensible, commercially grounded, and delivered by someone who has sat across the table from both the strategic acquirer's M&A team and the PE fund's investment committee. Below is a plain-language description of exactly how we can add value at each stage of your transaction.

IF YOU ARE SELLING — OR PREPARING TO SELL

You do not know what your business is worth — and neither does your buyer.

This is not a criticism. It is the reality of almost every business sale. The seller thinks they know what the business is worth because they built it. The buyer thinks they know because they have seen twenty similar businesses. Both are wrong in important ways — and the gap between their mental models is almost always where money is left on the table or lost unnecessarily.

We close that gap. Before you speak to a single buyer, we construct a rigorous standalone valuation — with a properly normalised EBITDA bridge, a DCF cross-checked against trading and transaction multiples, and a clear, documented range that you can defend in any conversation. And we build the LBO model so you know exactly how much a PE fund can rationally pay, and what that implies for the competitive dynamics of your process.

The result: you never accept a lowball bid because you did not know better. You never miss a premium because you did not frame the synergy story for the right buyer. And you never stall a deal because your EBITDA representations could not survive a Quality of Earnings review.

Our sell-side services include:

- **Standalone Valuation Report** — A formal, IBBI-compliant valuation of your business using DCF, comparable company analysis, and transaction multiples, with a fully documented EBITDA bridge. This is the document your board relies on, your legal counsel refers to, and your buyer's QoE team will try to challenge. We build it to withstand that challenge.
- **Vendor Due Diligence (VDD) / Sell-Side QoE** — An independent Quality of Earnings analysis commissioned by you, before going to market. This proactively identifies and resolves normalisation adjustments that a buyer's QoE team would later use to chip your price. VDD-supported processes consistently close 15–25% faster and with significantly less late-stage price erosion.
- **Synergy Map for Strategic Buyers** — A buyer-by-buyer analysis of the specific cost synergies, revenue synergies, and strategic premiums available to each category of potential acquirer. We size each opportunity bottom-up, apply probability-of-realisation discounts, and compute the NPV of synergies available to the most logical strategic acquirer in your sector. This analysis directly informs your price expectations and your management presentation narrative.
- **LBO Analysis** — Understanding the Financial Buyer Floor — A complete LBO model for your business, showing what a PE fund can pay at various entry multiples while meeting a 25%+ IRR and 3x+ MOIC. This tells you whether financial buyers are genuinely price-relevant in your

process or simply providing competitive theatre. It also tells you what operational improvements would most increase a PE buyer's entry price.

- **Deal Structure Advisory** — Cash vs. stock vs. earn-out vs. seller note analysis, modelled on an after-tax basis. We show you exactly what each consideration structure is worth to you in after-tax proceeds, risk-adjusted. This analysis regularly shifts sellers toward different structures than their initial instinct — because the after-tax, risk-adjusted picture looks very different from the headline price.
- **Earn-Out Design and Valuation** — If an earn-out is part of your deal, we design it so it is genuinely achievable, not gameable by the buyer post-closing. We value the earn-out on a probability-weighted NPV basis and advise on the six structural parameters (metric, period, threshold, formula, acquirer conduct covenants, dispute resolution) that determine whether an earn-out is a genuine value-sharing mechanism or a deferred price reduction.

IF YOU ARE BUYING — STRATEGIC OR FINANCIAL

The most expensive mistake in M&A is paying the right price for the wrong analysis.

Most acquisition overpayments are not caused by reckless bidding. They are caused by synergy analyses that were too optimistic, EBITDA bridges that missed important normalisation items, LBO models that used the wrong discount rate, or deal structures that transferred more risk to the buyer than intended. The consequence is a deal that looked justified at signing and destroys value in the three years after closing.

We are the independent analytical check that prevents this. We build or review the valuation from first principles, challenge every assumption with market data, and stress-test the deal economics under scenarios that are more conservative than management's base case. We tell you what the business is genuinely worth — including the ceiling you should not cross — before you commit to a price.

Our buy-side services include:

- **Buy-Side Fairness Opinion** — An independent valuation of the target business that your board of directors relies on to confirm that the acquisition price is fair from a financial point of view. For listed company acquirers, the fairness opinion is a governance obligation under SEBI LODR. For unlisted company acquirers, it is the most powerful board-level protection against a future allegation that the company overpaid.
- **Synergy Valuation and Validation** — We build the synergy model for your acquisition using the bottom-up methodology described in this guide — identifying specific cost overlaps, specific cross-sell opportunities, and specific financial synergies, and applying probability-of-realisation haircuts to each. We also review and challenge synergy models that your internal M&A team or investment banker has already built, providing the independent perspective that prevents synergy optimism from inflating the bid beyond a rational ceiling.
- **LBO Model Build and Entry Multiple Analysis** — For PE funds and financial buyers, we construct the full LBO model, run the entry multiple sensitivity table, and identify the maximum price consistent with your IRR and MOIC hurdles under a range of exit multiple assumptions. We also build the management incentive plan and ratchet structure that aligns the management team's interests with your return requirements.
- **Quality of Earnings (QoE) Support** — We do not replace the buy-side accounting firm's QoE process, but we work alongside it to ensure the financial valuation model is updated in real time as QoE adjustments are identified. The most dangerous gap in many acquisition processes is the delay between the QoE finding a normalisation adjustment and the valuation model being updated to reflect it. We eliminate that gap.

- **Debt Capacity Analysis** — We assess the target's sustainable debt capacity using the leverage ratio, interest coverage, DSCR, and free cash flow yield tests, sensitised to a 20–30% EBITDA stress scenario. This analysis determines the maximum leverage the target can support at your entry price — a fundamental constraint on LBO returns and on the feasibility of the debt-financed acquisition structure.
- **Purchase Price Allocation (PPA)** — Post-closing, Ind AS 103 requires that the acquisition price be allocated across all identifiable assets and liabilities of the acquired business at fair value. This PPA process identifies and values every intangible asset — customer relationships, trade names, technology, non-compete agreements — that was not separately recognised in the target's pre-acquisition financial statements. The resulting intangible asset values and goodwill figure directly affect the acquirer's post-acquisition P&L through amortisation charges. We conduct PPAs that are technically rigorous, auditor-defensible, and prepared in the timeline that post-closing financial reporting requires.

IF YOU ARE A BOARD MEMBER OR CFO OVERSEEING A TRANSACTION

Your fiduciary duty requires independent analysis — not just the investment banker's recommendation.

A board of directors approving a significant acquisition or sale — whether as a listed company under SEBI governance requirements or as an unlisted company with institutional investors — has a fiduciary duty to understand the financial basis of that decision. The investment banker advising the transaction has a structural interest in the deal closing. The independent valuation advisor has no such interest — our mandate is to tell you what the business is worth and whether the proposed transaction price is fair.

We serve as the independent financial expert that boards rely on for fairness opinions, SEBI LODR-mandated RPT valuations, scheme of arrangement share exchange ratios, and any transaction where the board needs a valuation perspective that is independent of the transaction advisors who benefit from the deal closing.

Our board and CFO services include:

- **Independent Fairness Opinion** — A signed, professionally certified opinion confirming that the financial terms of a proposed transaction are fair from a financial point of view. Covers acquisitions, demergers, schemes of arrangement, RPTs, and management buyouts. Prepared to the standard required by SEBI, the NCLT, and institutional investor governance expectations.
- **Scheme of Arrangement Valuation** — Share exchange ratio determination for mergers and demergers under Sections 230–232 of the Companies Act, with a registered valuer report compliant with Section 247 and the NCLT's procedural requirements. We prepare these reports with the methodology transparency and sensitivity analysis that prevents NCLT queries and SEBI Observation Letter delays.
- **Related Party Transaction Valuation** — Independent fairness opinion for material RPTs under SEBI LODR Regulation 23, covering asset transfers, service agreements, licensing arrangements, and financing transactions between a listed company and its related parties. Our opinions are prepared with the genuine independence that makes them meaningful governance documents rather than rubber stamps.
- **Strategic Review and Value Maximisation Advisory** — For boards considering whether to pursue a sale, a capital raise, a strategic partnership, or continued independence, we prepare a comprehensive strategic alternatives analysis — comparing the value of each path to shareholders under realistic assumptions. This analysis forms the factual foundation for a board's strategic decision-making process.

WHY ELITE VALUATION — WHAT MAKES US DIFFERENT

India has no shortage of valuation professionals. What is scarce is the combination of deep technical competence, M&A transaction experience, and the independence and intellectual honesty to tell clients what they need to hear rather than what they want to hear.

- We are practitioners, not academics. Every methodology in this guide — the EBITDA bridge, the LBO model, the synergy NPV calculation, the earn-out probability weighting — is something we apply in live transactions, not something we teach from a textbook. When we say a typical Indian manufacturing sector LBO trades at 9–11x EBITDA with 5.0x leverage, we are telling you what we observe in actual deal data, not what a textbook says.
- We are genuinely independent. We do not advise both the buyer and the seller in the same transaction. We do not receive success fees that create an incentive for the deal to close at any price. Our only financial interest is in the quality of our analysis — and our only reputational interest is in being the advisor whose valuation stands up when the other side challenges it.
- We are IBBI Registered, CA qualified, and CS credentialed. Our valuations satisfy every regulatory requirement: FEMA Regulation, SEBI LODR Regulation 23, Companies Act Section 247, Income Tax Rule 11UA, and NCLT petition requirements. In an Indian regulatory environment where every transaction has a compliance dimension, this matters — a valuation report that satisfies the commercial objective but fails the regulatory test is a document that creates more problems than it solves.
- We work at the speed of deals. M&A transactions do not run on academic timelines. When a deal is in motion, valuation deliverables are needed in days, not weeks. We structure our practice to deliver without compromising quality — because a fast, wrong analysis is worse than no analysis at all, but a slow, right analysis misses the deal.
- We have done this across 200+ engagements. We have seen every sector, every deal structure, every investor type, and every regulatory complication that the Indian M&A market produces. That pattern recognition — knowing that this particular EBITDA normalisation situation appears in 40% of manufacturing acquisitions, or that this earn-out structure will almost certainly generate a dispute — is worth as much as the technical analysis.

READY TO TALK? START WITH A CONVERSATION.

We work with founders preparing for their first institutional capital raise, with PE funds building LBO models for mid-market buyouts, with listed company CFOs managing SEBI-mandated fairness opinions, with boards navigating complex scheme of arrangement valuations, and with M&A teams that need an independent technical check before they commit to a bid. If you are working on a transaction that involves valuation — as a buyer, a seller, a board member, or an advisor — we would like to hear about it.

CONTACT ELITE VALUATION

Independent Valuation & Boutique Advisory | Pan-India

Sagar Shah | CA · CS · IBBI Registered Valuer · All India Rank Holder · Ex-EY

+91 7600008550

sagarrvshah@elitevaluation.in

www.EliteValuation.in

15 Years of Experience · 500+ Valuation Engagements · Pan-India Practice