

Perception Versus Reality: *Why Differing Views of Risk Matter*

Daniel Wagner
Senior Cofinancing Specialist

Office of Cofinancing Operations
Asian Development Bank

The Risk Assessment Challenge

- ◆ Getting good data is relatively easy
- ◆ Assessing data involves more than just collecting information
- ◆ Accurate interpretation of the data is the challenge
- ◆ Perception of risk versus reality of risk

Sound Risk Assessment

- ◆ Subjective process
- ◆ Qualitative in its orientation
- ◆ Analytical process varies by organization
- ◆ Spread of Risk concept
- ◆ Common Sense
- ◆ Gut Feeling/Smell Test

Information Resources

- ◆ On-site data collection
- ◆ Newspapers, magazines, newsletters
- ◆ Specialty publications
- ◆ Internet search engines
- ◆ Embassies-Departments of Commerce/State
- ◆ EIU, Control Risks, Kroll
- ◆ ADB/World Bank/IMF Reports

Common Investor Misperceptions

- ◆ “It’s a slam dunk”
- ◆ It won’t happen to me
- ◆ If it happens, there will be an easy solution
- ◆ If there isn’t an easy solution, I can ‘buy’ my way out of it
- ◆ Once the problem is solved, it’s solved for good

International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes

- ◆ 86 cases concluded between 1972 and 2003
- ◆ 86 cases pending
- ◆ 15% increase in cases over 2003
- ◆ 50% of these are infrastructure-related
- ◆ Conclusion: More disputes remain unresolved, and more deal with infrastructure than ever before

Common Insurer *Misperceptions*

- ◆ It can't be done
- ◆ You've got to be crazy?! Are you out of your mind?! He's gone bonkers!!
- ◆ There will be hell to pay

Misperception 1: Pakistan

- ◆ ADB's Terrorism Guarantee Facility For Pakistan
- ◆ Presumption going in was that:
 - Pakistan was uninsurable against terrorism/political violence risk
 - Few insurance underwriters would want to co/re-insure because of the perceived risk
 - Few entities would want to invest in Pakistan in the first place

Reality 1: Pakistan

- ◆ Commercial loss due to acts of terrorism in Pakistan is actually very low
- ◆ Lots of insurers want to participate in the program
- ◆ Plenty of entities want to invest there

Misperception 2: Israel

- ◆ U.S.-based major fast food franchise opens franchise in what they believe is Israel
- ◆ It turns out to have been the West Bank
- ◆ It asks the local franchiser to remove the company's name brand from the premises and stop serving kosher hamburgers
- ◆ Franchiser refuses to do so
- ◆ Arab-American groups protest establishment of the franchise on the West Bank

Misperception 2: Israel

- ◆ Issue becomes international incident
- ◆ Threatened boycott of franchise in Arab world follows
- ◆ Franchise is closed
- ◆ Jewish groups accuse company of capitulating to Arab pressure, promising their own boycott

Reality 2: West Bank

- ◆ Franchise home office did not perform a site visit
- ◆ A company inspector subsequently viewed the premises, but was unaware its was located on the West Bank
- ◆ Investment should never have been made. Adequate due diligence was not performed. Common sense was not utilized.

Misperception 3: Korea

- ◆ Korea's leading software maker was near bankruptcy
- ◆ U.S. company sees golden opportunity, proposes to save it by making a \$20 million investment
- ◆ Korean company has to in return agree to stop producing a highly popular Korea language processing software (80% of the market) and start selling US company's version of the software (15% of the market)

Reality 3: Korea

- ◆ U.S. company didn't do its homework and take into account Korean nationalism
- ◆ Korean press got hold of the story, local company pulls out of the deal and accepts a smaller bailout from a local firm
- ◆ Korean company ends up filing charges against U.S. company accusing it of attempting to gain market share illegally

Misperception 4: Russia

- ◆ Russia's largest foreign investor, a U.S. oil company, felt it had the knowledge and experience necessary to maneuver its way through the Russian political system
- ◆ It invests \$500 million in a Russian oil company, with plans to invest another \$3 billion in time
- ◆ U.S. company accuses local company's rival of tampering with Russia's court system to gain control of its partner's main production facility

Misperception 4: Russia

- ◆ Rival's objective was to force U.S. company's partner to have to declare bankruptcy
- ◆ Rival purchases part of U.S. partner's debt, becoming a part-owner in it
- ◆ As a result, the rival votes against an amicable settlement with creditors, forcing bankruptcy
- ◆ U.S. company is forced to write off \$200 million

Reality 4: Russia

- ◆ U.S. company started with too small of an ownership stake in the local company (just 10%)
- ◆ It had little decision-making influence
- ◆ Two lenders were not properly registered as creditors, preventing them from supporting the U.S. company
- ◆ The owner of the U.S. company's partner lost his political influence in the government
- ◆ The U.S. company was forced to make its own way through the court system

Some General Guidelines

- ◆ Does it smell right?
- ◆ Does it 'feel' right?
- ◆ Does it make sense?
- ◆ Can you afford to have something go wrong?
- ◆ Do you have any protection if things go wrong?
- ◆ Has a scenario analysis been completed?

Some Specific Guidelines

- ◆ Get Political Risk Insurance
- ◆ Ensure you know your business partner, and have them checked out first by an independent party
- ◆ Ensure arbitration takes place outside the host country, preferably in a neutral forum
- ◆ Ensure third country rule of law
- ◆ Ensure the host government waives its right to sovereign immunity
- ◆ Develop relationships with key government officials

Loss Mitigation

Keys to low loss ratios:

- ◆ Know when to say “no”
- ◆ Ensure that there is a means of recovery:
 - Subrogation rights
 - Pari Passu rights vis-à-vis senior lenders
 - Leverage with host government
- ◆ Don't be afraid to be bold

Perception Versus Reality: *Why Differing Views of Risk Matter*

Daniel Wagner
Senior Cofinancing Specialist

Office of Cofinancing Operations
Asian Development Bank