NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

BRIDGE FINANCE'S THEORETICAL AND APPLIED VALUATION GAP

Joseph E. Rosebrock

Working Paper XXXXX
http://www.nber.org/papers/wXXXXX

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
February 2026

No financial support was received in the authorship of this discussion. The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

Copyright © 2026, Joseph E. Rosebrock, patent pending. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit written permission provided that the credit of Copyright © 2026, Joseph E. Rosebrock, patent pending, is given.

Bridge Finance's Theoretical and Applied Valuation Gap
Joseph E Rosebrock
NBER Working Paper No. XXXXX
February 2026
JEL Nos. E47, G12, G17, G31, G32, G34, M41

ABSTRACT

The common theme between traditional academic IRR/NPV and EBITDA valuation architectures is their disconnect is caused by subjectivity. Can an alternative valuation architecture resolve the two valuation architecture's subjectivity by using basic accounting techniques? Meaningful recognition of the universal absence of accounting equity statements in the current three prospective financial statements is limited. However, similar to the four historical primary financial statements and dissimilar to the three prospective primary financial statements, four prospective primary financial statements validate that an investment's prospective debit entries are equal to credit entries. Remedying prospective investment debit entries to equal credit entries elicits an alternative valuation architecture that necessitates a new comparative valuation metric; the metric is calculated from prospective equity statements. Combining the alternative valuation architecture with the new comparative valuation metric enhances the entire valuation spectrum. In particular, they join micro- and macroeconomic valuations, foster selection of active versus passive investments, and power entrepreneurial startup valuations while bridging the theoretical and applied valuation gap in finance.

Joseph E. Rosebrock
Unaffiliated
8176 Yorkridge Dr
Newburgh, IN 47630
joeddie8176@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Wealth never sits still. Wealth is always somewhere and is doing something, even when it is buried in a coffee can in the backyard or kept under a mattress. No place exists where one can take refuge from wealth formation choices. Wealth formation choices are often vague. Stating an investment is "high risk, high reward" does not adequately clarify a wealth formation choice. Peering inside, measuring, and assessing an investment's valuation components within a well-defined valuation architecture adequately clarifies a wealth formation choice.

This in-depth investment valuation discussion[1] employs basic double entry accounting to explain how today's investment valuations are frequently flawed. The valuation flaw manifests into misleading prospective financial statements and is resolved by an accounting centric alternative valuation architecture. Finally, accounting aids calculating a new comparative valuation metric, necessitated by the alternative architecture.

The allure of wealth formation drives marketplaces toward greater efficiency. Empirical studies are typically conducted to understand the marketplace's ever-changing facets of efficiency. However, occasionally, a discussion reveals a mechanical valuation enhancement, directly impacting "go/no go" investment decisions. An example of a mechanical valuation enhancement was presented in Bierman and Smidt's (1960) book *The Capital Budgeting Decision*. The book was a stepping stone for the adoption of the discounted cash flow valuation in corporate practice.

This discussion set out to be a straightforward pathway for upgrading valuation mechanics. The discussion instead transitioned to conceptual valuation observations and identifying structural valuation implications. The observations and structural implications highlight a need to address investment shortcomings, including the theoretical and applied valuation gap in finance.

[1] Section XV presents a comparison of valuation architectures to help align topics and a discussion summary to aid navigating the scope of the discussion.

Prospective financial statements generate the comparative valuation metrics used in "go/no go" wealth formation decisions. Recent changes in investment opportunities create a flaw in traditional discounted cash flow valuations. Misleading financial statements are an outcome of the flaw, causing comparative valuation metrics to produce suboptimal wealth formation decisions.

A symptom of the flaw is prospective financial statement's debit entries do not equal credit entries. Debits not equaling credits creates an inability to compile a prospective equity statement[2], which is the fourth of four Primary Statements Framework accounting statements. The Primary Statements Framework states equity statements are constructed from two unmodified lines of the second and third primary accounting statements. However, owing to the discounted cash flow flaw, prospective equity statements are not currently being constructed from the two lines–prospective financial statement debits are not equal to their credits. The absence of equity statements becomes more striking when recognizing the similar absence of prospective accounting trial balances.

The alternative valuation architecture's remedy for the discounted cash flow flaw procures affirming prospective equity statements, trial balances, and corroborating analytics; corroborating analytics verify whether an investment's financial statement portrayal is representative of the investment's valuation and assumptions. Combining the alternative valuation architecture with a new comparative valuation metric enhances wealth formation decisions in general. More specifically, combining the alternative architecture and the new comparative metric enhances active versus passive investment decisions and the valuation of entrepreneurial startups.

The challenging aspect of wealth formation involves valuing and comparing complex investment choices. These choices are moving in different directions and forming wealth in

[2] Within this discussion's context, a prospective equity statement's entries are limited to net income, the investment owner's equity issuances, and cash dividends.

different ways. This discussion employs basic accounting to rethink the valuing, presentation, corroboration, comparison, and decisions of wealth formation choices.

II. RECOURSE FOR A DISCOUNTED CASH FLOW FLAW

Business school curriculum calls for students to take an A101 accounting class. A prominent A101 topic is accounting debit entries should equal credit entries. Accounting A101 classes also cover the Primary Statements Framework. Adherence to the Primary Statements Framework provides accounting and financial statement debit entries to equal credit entries. For those who have never taken an A101 class or have forgotten the Primary Statements Framework, this discussion describes the framework and the framework's benefits.

The term "accounting statements" describes statements presenting balance sheet accounts at a historical point in time and past operating results over a period of time. The term "financial statements" describes historical and prospective statements used to formulate possible courses of action. Within the same setting, historical "accounting statements" can quickly and seamlessly transition into "financial statements". Both accounting and financial primary statements contain the same core balance sheet, income, cash flow, and equity statements.

However, limited meaningful recognition is placed on the universal absence of equity statements in the three existing prospective financial statements. Responses to the question of why prospective equity statements are never prepared indicate prospective equity statements are considered unnecessary[3]. Responses in practice to the follow-up question of why prospective equity statements are labeled unnecessary yields nuances of, "*Well, you see, everyone knows prospective equity statements are unnecessary–no one ever prepares them"*. Responses in academia to the follow-up question of why prospective equity statements are labelled unnecessary

[3] Author's decades long experience found in practice and academia.

yields insight of, *"Prospective equity statements are redundant and inherently subjective and thus, unnecessary"*.

It is quite puzzling why prospective equity statements are labeled unnecessary. The label contradicts the statement's dedicated validating purpose. As detailed in historical accounting trial balances, income statements transcend the period between a beginning and ending balance sheet. Validating this transition are six figurative handshakes between the beginning and ending equity account balances of three different statements: the trial balance, balance sheet, and equity statement. The handshakes affirm the beginning to ending balance sheet transition is accomplished with debits equaling credits. The role of prospective equity statements possess the same validating handshakes of historical statements. Additionally, the role of a prospective equity statement includes calculating corroborating analytics and the new comparative valuation metric.

In the late 1990's, discounted cash flow valuations began being negatively impacted by investors' acceptance of increasing degrees of deferred upside operating performance converging with the widening debt fueled point spread of equity return[4] and capital cost[5]. Operating performance is defined as operating revenues, less operating expenses. Operating performance's operating expenses exclude interest expense, income taxes, depreciation and amortization. The excluded expenses are distinguished as post asset expenses. Thus, operating performance is generated on a pre asset basis but whose purpose is to apply to post asset expenses. The top-down operating performance and the bottom-up EBITDA formula represent the same amount. Accordingly, the two terms are used interchangeably throughout the discussion.

[4] Equity return is after-tax in the discussion unless otherwise noted. The term equity return denotes a relative percentage unless otherwise noted.

[5] Capital cost refers to equity and debt's traditional weighted average capital cost (WACC). Capital cost is pre-tax in the discussion unless otherwise noted.

Until recently, the ability to quantify the negative impact did not exist. Previously, the negative impact's presence was only deduced by describing the practice used to reach "go/no go" investment decisions. Subjectivity plays a role in determining investment assumptions. Varying assumptions and their probability in various financial scenarios is imperative for determining an assumption's sensitivity to valuation outcomes. However, subjectivity should not extend to the valuation architecture within which investment assumptions operate. As an indication of the current valuation architecture subjectivity, investment decisions require creating and weighing various valuations from different valuation architectures to reach "go/no go" investment decisions. Current valuation decisions inject investment valuations with bias (Mukhlynina and Nyborg 2019). A recent practitioner survey found that most respondents subjectively weighed traditional discounted cash flow and Earnings Before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation, and Amortization (EBITDA) valuations to reach "go/no go" investment decisions (Mukhlynina and Nyborg 2019). The practical intent of subjectively weighing various valuations is to instill investment decision-makers with a level of comfort derived from no single incorrect valuation result being used. Rather, subjectively weighing multiple incorrect valuations provides a correct valuation answer.

This discussion proposes that adhering a valuation architecture to the Primary Statements Framework's principle of debits are to equal credits removes the structural subjectivity in determining an investment's valuation and eliminates the predominant practice of subjectively weighing various investment valuations to reach investment decisions. The Primary Statements Framework also addresses the trial and error IRR hurdle rate valuation metric and IRR and NPV conflicting valuations. The Primary Statements Framework is described in detail in Section IX.

III. UNIFYING ACCRUAL AND CASH VALUATION PERSPECTIVES

The unification of the accrual and cash valuation perspectives would invoke an unprecedented level of adherence to the time value of money wealth formation concept. Unifying accrual and cash combines competing valuation approaches; it mitigates an investment's possibility of manipulative cash transaction timing and questionable accrual and deferral accounting estimates driving net income[6]. Unifying accrual and cash have been hypothesized and debated (Lundholm and O'Keefe 2001), (Penman 2001); however, the debate over an investment's prospective accrual and cash unification is yet to be placed within a well-defined verification.

This discussion proposes that the unification of accrual and cash valuation perspectives is achieved when an investment's traditional cash equity IRR matches a time value accrual equity return. The new accrual equity return's calculation divides an investment's net income present value by its outstanding equity present value. Net income and outstanding equity are discounted using the comparable cash equity return. Matching accrual and cash equity return's verification of the unification of accrual and cash valuation perspectives would comprise a never before seen benchmark for adherence to the time value of money wealth formation concept. Matching accrual and cash equity returns is one of an investment's corroborating analytics.

An example of accrual versus cash issues is the net plant versus the external financing balances of an investment. The items are initiated with the same depreciable asset value[7]. During an investment opportunity's time frame the depreciation expense and principle finance reduction deliver different financial statement timing recognition. An accrual and cash balancing mechanism, demonstrated in Section XII, provide the differing balances and timing recognition

[6] Accounting's definition of "net income" and finance's nonqualified definition of "earnings" both convey the same bottom-line income statement meaning. The terms are used interchangeably throughout the discussion.

[7] For simplicity reasons, working capital requirements are considered to be zero. As a result, external financing is equal to the depreciable asset value.

with a counter compensating effect. The cash balancing mechanism supports the unification of accrual and cash perspectives.

In addition, maintaining a consistent equity/debt capital structure and thus, capital cost for an investment requires setting an equity statement's cash dividends or equity injections towards meeting that goal. As net income is the source for net equity cash flow, arranging for net income's injections and dividends of cash needs a common time value influence to accommodate the period-to-period capital structure goal.

Using matching accrual and cash equity returns—whether directly through cash dividends and equity injections or indirectly through the balance and timing recognition differences between accrual and cash—facilitate the time value influence required to transverse cash within a prospective equity statement.

Setting atop a valuation architecture is the time value of money wealth formation concept. The next level is a valuation structure, followed by a valuation method for implementing a concept and structure. These three architectural valuation levels generate an investment's valuation. Designing a valuation architecture capable of matching accrual and cash equity returns begins with exploring the current mechanical valuation structures and methods. Investment valuation mechanics are grouped into two basic architectures: iterative sigma and reciprocal peer triad. The traditional IRR and NPV valuation methods of discounted cash flow and their variations fall under the iterative sigma architecture. EBITDA valuations use the time value (non-explicit) reciprocal peer valuation architecture, as do other "peer and plug" triad based ratios (e.g. Price/Earnings).

The theoretical strength of the iterative sigma valuation approach is its recognition of the time value of the money concept through its discounting of cash flows, but the recent investment opportunity changes generate a fundamental flaw in iterative sigma's execution of discounting

cash flows. The strength of the reciprocal peer triad valuation approach is its straightforward and reciprocal but opaque interaction among investment components.

Ideal characteristics for an alternative valuation architecture should include adhering to the Primary Statement Framework, combining the strengths of the iterative sigma and reciprocal peer triad valuation architectures, addressing their shortcomings, and unifying accrual and cash perspectives.

IV. A RECIPROCAL VALUATION STRUCTURE AND A NEW COMPARATIVE INVESTMENT METRIC

Capital cost captures an investment's risk profile. Additionally, capital cost occasionally acts as a valuation metric for comparing wealth potential in the context of attracting external capital. Capital cost's paradox unfolds as the disparate risk profile valuation role and comparative metric function are applied.

An investment's given capital cost currently discounts operating performance to a risk-neutral valuation. The risk-neutral valuation describes investors' indifference between receiving operating performance's discounted present value lump sum or electing to receive the nominal stream of operating performance over the course of the investment's time frame. Investors purchase investment assets at either the operating performance's risk-neutral valuation or a lower purchase price, if possible. Generally, as a valuation function, the lower the investment's perceived risk, the lower the equity return, the lower the capital cost, and the greater present value operating performance[8]. A greater operating performance present value is favorable in deciding "go" investment decisions. Subsequently, the investor's purchased assets generate the nominal stream

[8] An investment opportunity's operating performance is assumed to generally increase over time and produce a positive present value within a reasonable range of discount rates.

of operating performance. If everything goes according to plan, the nominal stream of operating performance earns investors their requested equity return.

Regarding a different type of investment opportunity where asset value and operating performance are given assumptions, capital cost becomes the solved investment component. Solving an investment's capital cost places capital cost in an external communicative function. The external communicative function is a comparative wealth formation metric. The higher the solved capital cost, the higher the wealth potential.

Passive investments usually have readily available contractual beginning and ending asset values and contractual operating performance thus, passive investment decisions necessitate solving capital cost. The passive contractual provisions designate passive investments as exhibiting a low risk profile. Non-contractual operating performance investments define investments as active with risk profiles greater than passive investments.

When capital cost is the solved component and capital cost's comparative valuation metric is used, the competing investments are required to have approximately equal risk profiles to permit an investment choice. Thus, owing to a passive investment's unequal risk profile with active investments and the passive contractual arrangement requiring the use of the capital cost comparative metric, currently, no direct means exist to compare active versus passive investments.

Reiterating, when an investment opportunity's capital cost is a given assumption, capital cost has a risk profile role. A lower capital cost (perceived risk) raises the present value of operating performance and moves an investment toward a "go" investment decision. However, an investment with a given asset value and operating performance solves capital cost. Solving a capital cost investment decision uses capital cost's comparative metric function where higher capital cost (wealth formation) moves an investment toward "go" investment decisions. Capital

cost's risk profile role and comparative metric function, moving in opposite "go" directions, appear incompatible and are precluded from jointly residing in a reciprocal valuation structure.

A reciprocal valuation structure is a pivotal wealth formation issue. Reciprocal valuation structures continually create valuations whose financial statement debits are equal to credits. Thus, reciprocal valuation structures enable a valuation architecture to adhere to the Primary Statements Framework. A reciprocal valuation structure is defined as when an investment's given assumptions and solved valuation impartially reciprocate. Within a reciprocal homogenizing triad[9] (RHT) valuation structure, a former solved amount can rotate into an assumption status and the newly designated solved valuation is calculated as the same amount as it previously was as a given assumption. The combined presence of capital cost's disparate risk profile role and comparative metric function, moving in opposite "go" directions, is why a discounted cash flow reciprocal valuation structure does not exist today.

Thus, achieving a reciprocal valuation structure requires replacing capital cost's either risk profile role or comparative metric function. To that end, the capital cost comparative metric's requirement for approximately equal risk profiles is restrictive. Additionally, from a sequential valuation perspective, replacing the late occurring comparative metric function would be more straightforward than replacing the earlier occurring risk profile role. Therefore, considering its restrictive equal risk profile requirement and its late valuation sequencing, capital cost's comparative metric function should be the one replaced.

Replacement of capital cost's comparative metric function involves leveraging prospective equity statements. A new comparative valuation metric captures an equity statement's present value of earnings to deployed equity (EDE). An equity statement's present value of earnings is

[9] The reciprocal triad basic valuation components are asset value, capital cost and operating performance (homogenized).

calculated by discounting earnings using the investment's unified accrual and cash equity return. As the new comparative valuation metric for "go/no go" investment decisions, the EDE signals an investment's capability to provide earnings relative to deployed equity. The comparative EDE metric brings deployed equity efficiency to deciding wealth formation choices.

A passive investment's EDE calculation can be streamlined as the present value of its equity return. Demonstrating a passive EDE as equity return's present value casts EDE in the same comparative metric genre as the traditional IRR valuation metric. Section XII, Exhibit A, Example 3 demonstrates a passive EDE as a present value of equity return.

The comparative EDE metric allows business professionals to transition from selecting the highest capital cost among investments of equal risk profiles to selecting the highest EDE regardless of risk profiles, such as between active and passive investments. For active investments solving equity return, selecting the highest EDE occurs after determining whether the investment's solved equity return represents the correct risk profile. An active investment RHT solved equity return that is too low or too high requires either reevaluating the investment's assumptions or reciprocally solving another assumption after providing equity return as a given assumption.

Assets, organizations, industries, and economies are hierarchical groupings of economic activity levels. A strength of the new comparative EDE metric is the metric's applicability to the full range of economic activity levels, regardless of risk profile levels. Another strength is the metric's indifference to which reciprocal valuation component an investment opportunity is solving. An EDE metric uniqueness is its combination of both accrual and cash elements.

An investment's solved RHT valuation and its assumptions produce financial statements that adhere to the Primary Statements Framework's principle of debits are to equal credits. The RHT valuation structure signals the necessity of replacing the capital cost's comparative valuation

metric. The replacement EDE comparative metric boosts wealth formation choices as the metric operates as a single level playing field for comparing the entire valuation spectrum. The comparative EDE metric opens up a new valuation chapter for comparing investment choices, particularly between active and passive investments.

V. ACTIVE AND PASSIVE INVESTMENTS

The main inflation lever at a central bank's disposal is altering its inter-bank rates. A central bank may increase its inter-bank interest rate to encourage passive over active investments. When investors select passive investments over active ones, an economy's employment and consumer demand slow and cool inflation. Anticipating stable inflation, central banks lower their inter-bank rates to encourage active investment.

When a central bank raises inter-bank rates rate it indirectly raises its baseline target risk profile into an agent for cooling inflation. From an investor's perspective, higher inter-bank rates increase investment debt cost and create higher passive EDE. Increases in debt cost and higher passive EDE create passive wealth formation opportunities.

Managerial Involvement

Managerial involvement of an investment opportunity is defined as an investment owner's influence on an investment's operating performance and asset value outcomes after a "go" investment decision. Active investments do not typically have readily attainable contractual operating performance, whereas passive investments do. The lack of readily attainable contractual operating performance follows the managerial involvement in actively managing operating performance, particularly employment. Active investments normally generate employment opportunities, whereas passive investments usually do not directly generate employment opportunities. Active investments that generate employment opportunities induce managerial

involvement by initiating and maintaining employment. In addition, active investments are often depreciable assets that require varying degrees of management and maintenance. Passive investments are typically composed of non-depreciable assets.

Joining Micro- and Macroeconomic Valuations

The relationship between active/passive valuations and micro-/macroeconomic valuations manifests through managerial involvement. Active investment opportunities orient towards microeconomic decisions, whereas passive investment opportunities orient towards macroeconomic decisions.

RHT valuations remain reciprocal regardless of whether the valuation's operating performance or asset value are from that of a single asset or on the scale of an economy. This is indicative of joining micro- and macroeconomic valuations. Examples are the active/ microeconomic valuation of a depreciable income-producing asset versus the passive/ macroeconomic valuation of a physical commodity or a sovereign entity's debt instrument.

EBITDA exists at each of the ascending hierarchy of economic activity levels, ranging from micro- to macroeconomics. Similarly, each level of economic activity has enterprise values[10] (EV). An EBITDA Multiple (or just Multiple) is EV divided by EBITDA. Therefore, Multiples exist at each economic activity level. The strength of a Multiple is its standing as a succinct communicative platform of a market based economic influence for the range of economic activity levels. Peering inside an opaque Multiple, to expose and analyze a Multiple's assumptions, cannot help but strengthen investment decision comfort, particularly active (micro) versus passive (macro) investment decisions. Section VII discusses peering inside Multiples in greater detail.

Finite Managerial Capacity and Equity Return

[10] EV = equity marketplace value + total debt – cash and cash equivalents.

Managerial involvement executes the due diligence contemplated in an investment's equity return. Within the initial time frame of a selected investment opportunity, the selected investment changes an investment owner's capacity to successfully orchestrate the next investment's due diligence. Attracting, developing, and retaining management personnel has a direct influence on managerial involvement's due diligence capacity and thus, risk neutralizing equity return levels.

Concerning active versus passive investments, with all else being equal, a passive investment "go" decision causes a subsequent investment's equity return to rise less than selecting an active investment. The reasoning is that passive "go" decisions reflect a lower consumption of managerial capacity versus selecting an active investment.

Similarly, a small active investment "go" decision tends to reflect lower consumption of managerial capacity than large active investments. As a result, a small active investment causes the need for subsequent equity return to rise less than a large active "go" decision.

Approving capital budgeting expenditures on whether prospective investments meet incrementally rising equity returns seems less subjective than the traditional competition of investment opportunities within an arbitrarily set budget ceiling.

Does the managerial process of determining the next investment's equity return bolster an investment owner's assessment of managerial capacity and help maximize their wealth formation?

Does replacing capital cost's comparative metric function broaden the focus on its risk profile role?

VI. EBITDA MULTIPLES

Two major valuation developments recently converged to create the discounted cash flow flaw. As a response to the flaw, EBITDA valuations draw themselves into the investment valuation spotlight. First, approximately 40-45 years ago, investments' equity return and capital cost point

spreads began to widen owing to debt's increasing role in investments. Second, approximately 25-30 years ago, during the dawn of the dot.com era, investors' acceptable degree of deferred upside operating performance began increasing. As will be shown, the convergence of widening point spreads and increasing degrees of deferred operating performance create a flaw in discounted cash flow valuations. However, iterative sigma's basic valuation approach has remained unchanged since the convergence. With no sign of abating point spreads or levels of deferred upside operating performance, EBITDA valuations will continue to supplement the discounted cash flow flaw.

It does not matter whether one's valuation perspective is with EBITDA's bottom-up or operating performance's top-down approach, they both lead to the same amount. The top down and bottom up perspectives represent the same purposeful monetary amount, an asset's return "on" and return "of" amount. The "EBIT"[11] portion of EBITDA represents the return "on" portion of external equity and debt financing. The "DA" portion of EBITDA represents a return "of" of the adjoining asset. An investment's return "on" and return "of" and home/auto payments are similar in nature. They both contain a return "on" interest and a return "of" principal element.

Throughout the discussion, the term return "on and of" refers to an amount. The slightly modified term of return "on & of" refers to an investment's capital cost, number of periods (nper), and the PMT(capital cost, nper, -1) function. PMT's return "on & of" is a relative figure, relative to the other two basic valuation components amounts of asset value and operating performance.

Currently, no opportunity exists to observe, catalogue, analyze, or question a Multiple's individual assumptions. What is little understood today is EBITDA Multiples are composed of an investment's return "on & of" component and an operating performance/EBITDA growth

[11] Income taxes are associated with earnings due to earning's lack of tax deductibility.

assumption. A recently developed formula peers inside and bifurcates Multiples between the return component and the growth assumption.

Calculating a Multiple captures a peer group's[12] economic influence. The overall expectation is a peer group's market based economic influence proportionally duplicates for prospective investment opportunities. Applying a peer group Multiple to a prospective investment's period one operating performance/EBITDA creates the prospective investment's market based valuation.

Several conflicting views try describing what EBITDA is and is not. They confuse the nature of EBITDA. It is critical to understand how pre-asset operating performance/EBITDA is generated (operating revenue less operating expenses or EBITDA's bottom up formula) and clearly distinguish the generation from the purposeful post-asset application of operating performance/EBITDA. Section XII's examples illustrate operating performance/EBITDA in four primary financial statements and reveals the application purpose of return "on and of".

VII. PEERING INSIDE

Describing how investment valuation structures work and differentiating EBITDA valuations begins the process of peering inside EBITDA Multiples. The triad basic valuation components of the time value of money consist of *asset value*, capital cost's *return "on & of",* and *operating performance* for depreciating assets. Non-depreciating assets use capital cost as their *return "on*". The *return "on & of"* component recognizes the risk of generating *operating performance* for the embodiment of *asset value*. Owing to the flaw in discounted cash flow valuation approach, reciprocal basic valuation component interaction only exists in investment

[12] An EBITDA peer group is a collective of either an asset, assets, organizations, or industries similar to the economic activity level contemplated in an investment opportunity.

opportunities with non-varying *operating performance*, predominantly in passive investment opportunities and personal home and auto financing.

The reciprocal EBITDA triad is composed of *asset value,* a single period one EBITDA, and a peer group Multiple. The EBITDA triad has one significant difference from the basic valuation component triad. The EBITDA valuation triad infers an operating performance element in the EBITDA Multiple.

Discounted cash flow's traditional iterative sigma valuation approach uses IRR and NPV approaches to discount cash flows. The iterative sigma valuation approach conveys future operating performance growth expectation using individual *operating performances*. However, EBITDA's period one operating performance sets no growth expectation. To compensate, a EBITDA Multiple calculation infers operating performance growth in the Multiple.

Therefore, the first step in peering inside an EBITDA Multiple is determining the Multiple's inherent presumption of operating performance growth. However, no one knows how to definitely delineate a peer group Multiple's growth. This leaves investment opportunities to fashion their own EBITDA growth assumption, aside from the unknown Multiple's growth assumption. Being unable to gauge the investment's fashioned operating performance growth relative to the Multiple's growth is a valuation problem. Definitely delineating a peer group growth rate entails utilizing a recently developed formula to peer inside a Multiple. Removing the operating performance growth assumption from a Multiple results in a Net Multiple. Fractionally inverting Net Multiples produces an investment's *return "on & of*". A *return "on & of*", a number of periods, and the RATE(nper, *return "on & of",* -1) function generates an investment's capital cost. A Multiple's capital cost assumptions are the same assumptions as traditional capital cost:

equity return, capital structure split (adding to 100 percent), income tax rate, and debt cost. An investment's number of periods is derived from the asset in the "DA" of EBITDA.

Peering inside an EBITDA Multiple can derive the peer group's equity return. A peer group Multiple's equity return is a starting point for an investment's equity return. In addition to managerial capacity adjustments, a peer group's equity return can be further tailored to meet the circumstances of the investment. A non-inclusive list of adjustments include adjustments up, for things such as a greater degree of deferred upside operating performance than the peer group, or adjustments down, for special market insight, technological innovation, or intellectual property.

Reciprocally, an investment starting instead with capital cost, the number of periods, and the spreadsheet PMT(capital cost, nper, -1) function generates an investment's *return "on & of"* component. Inverting a *return "on & of"* produces Net Multiples. Placing an operating performance growth into a Net Multiple produces a traditional Gross EBITDA Multiple.

Peering inside and analyzing peer group Multiples allow customizing a peer group's Multiple for not only managerial capacity, equity return, and EBITDA growth, but for other assumptions such as an investment's incremental debt cost and debt weighting versus the peer group's embedded debt cost and debt weighting.

Upon transferring the growth effect from a Multiple to the *operating performance* component, the former period one operating performance transforms into an *operating performance proxy*. The non-varying *proxy* is equivalent to a PMT amount that combines return "on" interest and return "of" principal. A dominant feature of the *operating performance proxy* calculation is the time value homogenizing influence on the *proxy*. Operating performance, in practice and academia, currently uses only capital cost as a time value influence. Recognizing the need for a homogenized *operating performance proxy* and the creation of the *proxy* using equity

return rather than capital cost resolves the root problem of why an investment's prospective financial statement debits do not equal credits.

Section XII's Exhibit A, Examples 1 and 2 illustrate the bifurcating Multiple formula and the reciprocal influence among Gross Multiples, Net Multiples, and capital cost assumptions.

Calculating prospective equity statements and corroborating analytics, unifying accrual and cash valuation perspectives, using the new EDE comparative metric, peering inside EBITDA Multiples, and homogenizing *operating performance proxies* fosters active versus passive investment decisions and powers entrepreneurial startup valuations.

VIII. INVESTMENT VARIANCE EXPLANATIONS

Prospective financial statements are communicative tools to analyze investment opportunities and initially set investor wealth formation expectations. Acting as a follow-up feedback-loop to initial investor expectations are variance explanations. Variance explanations highlight the differences between an investment's subsequent historical and original prospective financial statements. Investor expectation confidence is fluid and usually accumulates over time or dissipates quickly. Minimizing the need for and the effective communication of investment variance explanations favorably influences investor confidence.

Consider, in an unlikely event, an investment's actual results match its initial prospective assumptions. As everything went according to plan, would one not expect the investment's earlier prospective statements to match its historical financial statements? Assuring a difference in the statements is when historical debits equal credits and prospective debits do not equal credits. With inevitable actual variances, one cannot entirely distinguish between a potentially actionable variance and a variance propagated by the three primary financial statement starting point. This unfavorably impacts investor confidence and equity return.

As a selected investment's accounting statements report historical operating performance, variance reporting explanations and subsequent courses of action need not focus on equity return but rather EDE.

IX.ACCOUNTING'S PRIMARY STATEMENTS FRAMEWORK ROLE

Historical accounting statements begin as a pool of transactions and accounting journal entries. An investment opportunity's prospective valuation and assumptions simulate prospective transactions and journal entries. As will be shown, the simulation of prospective transactions and journal entries reveals no reason why prospective financial statements cannot adhere to the same Primary Statements Framework as historical statements.

Primary Statements Framework

Along with the current lack of validating equity statements, the corresponding lack of prospective trial balances cause a conflict with the Primary Statements Framework.

Primary Statements Framework–Hierarchical Sequence

1. Information gathering systems capture entries of debits and credits.
2. At given reporting time intervals, trial balances are compiled from the entries of the information gathering system; when trial balances mechanically balance[13], debit entries equal credit entries.
3. The first three of the four primary accounting statements (balance sheet, income and cash flow statements) are compiled from the trial balance.
4. The net income and equity cash flow lines procure the equity statement; the equity statement integrates and provides structural validation of the first three primary statements; beginning and ending balances of the equity statement match the beginning and ending balances of the balance sheet and the trial balance equity accounts, generating six affirming handshakes.
5. Managerial analysis determines whether the statements represent fairly the financial position and results of operations; at managerial sign-off, the trial balance[14] and the primary

[13] In the event of a trial balance not balancing, sound accounting practice dictates the error is pursued until rectified.

[14] The term "trial" in trial balance continues after managerial sign-off as trial balances provide a continuing reference point in the event the accounting books are reopened and adjusted.

statements are released; the trial balance income accounts are closed to the equity account to end the current reporting time interval and prepare for the start of the next.

Four-column trial balance structure: hierarchical #2. Typical trial balances are composed of four columns. The first and fourth trial balance column lists the beginning and ending balance sheet, revenue, and expense accounts. The second trial balance column captures the revenue and expense activity of the income statement. The third column closes out the second column income activity to the equity account. To ensure (+) debits equal (-) credits, the trial balance's four columns add to zero at the beginning balance sheet (column one), during the income statement activity period (column two), during the closing entries of the income statement activity (column three), and at the ending balance sheet (column four). The period ending balance sheet is the next period's beginning balance sheet. An investment's final ending balance sheet adds vertically down and horizontally across to zero.

First three of four primary statements: hierarchical #3. The first three primary statements are sourced from the trial balance (t). The three primary statements functions are as follows: balance sheet statements (b) capture their account balances at a point in time; the beginning and ending balance sheet points of time are the beginning and ending time frame of the income statement (i); income statements (i) capture an economic activity level's revenue and expenses to generate net income (ni) over its (i) time frame; cash flow statements (c) present cash activity in balance sheet (b) accounts over the income statement (i) time frame; a cash flow statement (c) line item includes equity issuances and dividend activity (ea).

The fourth primary statement: hierarchical #4. An equity statement (e) is sourced from income's (i) net income (ni) and cash flow's (c) equity activity (ea) lines. The beginning and ending balances of the equity statement (e) are integrated with the equity accounts of the balance sheet (b) and the trial balance (t).

Closing income revenue and expense accounts: hierarchical #5. Whether the balance sheet , income , cash flow , and equity statements represent fairly the financial position (b) and results of operations (i), (c), is determined by managerial analysis. At managerial sign-off, the trial balance and statements are released and the trial balance's column two of income revenue and expense accounts is closed out to the equity account using column three. The account close out signifies the end of the current reporting time interval and preparation for the start of the next.

Prospective Primary Statements Framework's Role

Subjective risk surrounds investment assumptions. Thus, equity return and capital cost neutralize risk attributable to an investment's assumptions. However, equity return and capital cost do not neutralize the structural risk with which a valuation architecture uses to generate a valuation. A valuation architecture's adherence to the Primary Statements Framework neutralizes structural valuation risk.

Although Multiples are widely used, no one is identifying and quantifying the assumptions operating within a Multiple[15]. Without adherence to the Primary Statements Framework, the start of peering inside a Multiple indefensibly deteriorates into such a subjective array of assumptions that the initial effort quickly leads to halting further effort. Remembering outcomes of previous attempts of peering inside Multiples leads to deeming future attempts as "not worth the effort".

The afforded latitude of not peering inside a Multiple is in contrast to the necessity of reaching investment "go/no go" decisions. Unable to deem investment "go/no go" decisions "not worth the effort" creates the consequential necessity of arbitrarily qualifying "go/no go" investment decisions. The "go/no go" qualification is the aforementioned practice of subjectively weighing multiple incorrect valuations to provide a valuation answer.

[15] Author's findings in valuation practice.

Accounting's historical Primary Statements Framework has proven useful over time[16], and incorporating the Primary Statements Framework in prospective investment opportunities could compel investors' decision comfort to unaccustomed levels.

X. THE RHT STRUCTURE'S CORROBORATING ANALYTICS

Recent changes in investment valuations bring the need for corroborating analytics to the forefront. An investment's failed corroborating analytics, owing to a flaw in the investment's valuation, verify the investment's financial statements do not properly represent the investment's assumptions. Failed corroborating analytics indicate comparative valuation metrics produce suboptimal wealth formation decisions.

As verification to resolving flawed valuations corroborating analytics demonstrate an investment's:

1. Prospective equity return equals the equity return embedded in an investment's capital cost; calculating prospective equity returns use equity statements; a prospective equity return equaling the equity return in capital cost replaces the trial and error IRR hurdle rate comparative metric.
2. Matching prospective accrual and cash equity returns benchmark the unification of accrual and cash valuation perspectives; the unification of accrual and cash valuation perspectives invoke an unprecedented adherence to the time value of money concept.
3. Equity cash flow's present value, discounting using equity return, matches deployed equity; the possibility of past conflicting IRR and NPV outcomes no longer exists.
4. Capital cost equity/debt capital structure split is the same for each period of the prospective financial statements; a demonstrated capital structure affirms the period-to-period capital cost calculation and validates the ratable decline of equity and debt financing.
5. Zero-ending, self-balancing prospective equity statement's cumulative debits equal credits and highlights the final handshake between ending balances of the equity statement, trial balance, and balance sheet.

[16] Luca Pacioli published a general treatise on double entry accounting in 1494, in Florence Italy. Although he did not invent double entry accounting, his clear explanations and standardization of accounting practices, of which a substantial number are in use today, earn him the Father of Accounting designation. *Wikipedia.com*

An investment's assumptions are used in conjunction with a valuation architecture's concept, structure, method, valuation and corroborating analytics to form a prospective financial conveyance. An investment question becomes whether the equity return and its related capital cost is commensurate with that financial conveyance. If not, what investment assumptions need to change, including equity return itself, to align the risk binding of an investment's valuation with its assumptions. Further effectuating an investment's risk alignment is the alternative valuation architecture's ability to impartially reciprocate between an assumption and a solved valuation status. The EDE is now poised to facilitate comparing wealth formation choices.

XI. THE INTERACTION OF TWO RHT BASIC VALUATION COMPONENTS

Two RHT basic valuation components, while reciprocally generating the third RHT component, are also generating an investment valuation, trial balances, four primary accounting statements, corroborating analytics, and a comparative valuation metric. It is initially difficult to understand how the multiple-period interworking necessary for adherence to Section IX's Primary Statements Framework can be incorporated into just two RHT components. Additionally, it is difficult to understand how all the underlying relationships necessary for Section X's corroborating analytics can be incorporated into the same two RHT components.

The business world's current opinions on investment valuation sophistication are unparalleled in history. The overall expectation is that the state of investment practice and academic teachings will not change or be even seriously questioned in the foreseeable future even though substantial differences exist between theoretical and applied valuations.

Questioning the established investment valuation environment begins by appreciating the economic equilibrium found in quantifying prospective marketplace interaction with debits

equaling credits. Central to this appreciation is the transition of prospective equity statements from a previously unavailable status to a future of constant availability.

Adherence to the Primary Statements Framework, to generate the always-available equity statement, is a significant leap forward. The RHT architecture's prowess of encapsulating the exponential aspect of the time value of money concept into two basic valuation components and being able to peer inside the components should not be overlooked. The discussion up to this point, along with the next section's examples, provide the support necessary to begin jointly questioning both current valuation architectures.

The next section's examples illustrate the never-to-always equity statement transition.

XII. EXAMPLES OF THE RHT ARCHITECTURE'S STRUCTURE AND METHOD

Exhibit A, Example 1

Example 1, Schedule a, is an EBITDA triad valuation composed of a depreciable $1,400 *asset value*, Line [119]. *Asset value* is calculated by multiplying a given 14.0 EBITDA Gross Multiple, Line [101], times a given initial $100 EBITDA period one operating performance, Line [125]. The three EBITDA valuation components of *asset value*, period one operating performance, and Gross Multiple form a traditional EBITDA reciprocal peer triad valuation.

Example 1, Schedule a, is an RHT valuation. The RHT valuation is composed of a depreciable $1,400 *asset value*, Line [119], which is the same as EBITDA's example. The *asset value* is calculated by dividing a $131 *operating performance proxy* by a 0.093 *return "on & of*", Line [107]. Dissimilar to the $100 initial EBITDA, the $131 RHT *operating performance proxy* includes $31 of operating performance growth effect. The three RHT components of $1,400 *asset value,* 0.093 *return "on & of*", and $131 *operating performance proxy*, form the RHT's basic valuation components.

Equation (1) represents the valuation method of the RHT valuation structure for calculating a homogenized *operating performance proxy*.

Equation (1)

i. Operating Performance Proxy = PMT( ) * NPV( )
ii. Oper Perform Proxy = PMT(equity return, nper, -1) * NPV(equity return, oper perform 1, 2, . . .)
iii. $131 = PMT(8.5%, 19, -1) * NPV(8.5%,[125]:[125])

In Equation (1) the $131 RHT non-varying *operating performance proxy* is similar to that of a common numerator. Common numerators act inversely, but similar to the need for common denominators. Before adding numerical fractions, a common denominator is required. Similarly, before calculating and adding the time value impacts of operating performance, to generate *asset value*, the time value effect needs an appropriate *common numerator* for each period.

Previously, minimal traditional value misrepresentations occurred when minimal period to period variations were present in operating performance. Minimally varying operating performance had a common numerator effect on investment opportunities without using a *proxy*. During this time, the dedicated validating purpose of prospective equity statements was appropriately assumed to be unnecessary. Similarly, minimal traditional valuation misrepresentations occurred when minimal differences existed between capital cost and equity return. The IRR and NPV's single-rate iterative sigma valuation approaches worked significantly better before the divergence of capital cost and equity return converged with deferred upside operating performance.

Peering inside an EBITDA Multiple

The first step in peering inside a Gross EBITDA Multiple is to separate the inherent growth assumption of operating performance out of the Gross Multiple to form a Net Multiple. The 1.306

Gross/Net Multiple Factor, Line [105][17] separates inherent growth from the 14.0 Gross Multiple to form the 10.7 Net Multiple, Line [106]. The 1.306 Gross/Net Multiple Factor uses a given 3.8 percent operating performance growth rate, Line [104], a nper of 19, and an equity return risk profile of 8.5 percent[18], Line [118], to generate the 10.7 Net Multiple, Line [106].

Example 1 combines a 2.0 percent baseline target (stable inflation's risk-free rate of return), Line [102], with a given 1.8 percent growth other than inflation, Line [103], to calculate a 3.8 percent operating performance growth, Line [104]. The 3.8 percent is Exhibit A's illustrative operating performance growth placeholder.

Later examples, reflecting changes in the inflation assumption, do not change the operating performance growth assumption. This growth simplification assumes the baseline target inflation is an approximation inclusive of the short-term increased inflation time frames. This may or may not be the case in actual events.

Inverting the 10.7 Net Multiple produces capital cost's 0.093 *return "on & of"* basic valuation component, Line [107]. Placing the 19 nper and the 0.093 *return "on & of"* in the iterative electronic spreadsheet RATE(19, 0.093, -1) function generates a 6.5 percent capital cost, Line [108]. Removing 3.2 percent of weighted debt cost, Line [113], from the 6.5 percent of capital cost results in a weighted 3.4 percent equity return, Line [114]. Grossing the weighted equity return with its weighting generates an 11.2 percent equity return, pre-tax, Line [116]. Reducing equity return for income taxes provides an 8.5 percent equity return risk profile, Line [118].

[17] The Line [105][ref] formula, continuing after the PMT( ) function portion, is the standard PV formula of a growing annuity. The standard PV formula of a growing annuity is not yet available as a pre-programmed spreadsheet function.

[18] Calculating the Gross/Net Multiple Factor requires an iterative polynomial interaction where equity return is both an assumption, Line [105], and an outcome, Line [118]. The Gross/Net Factor's iterative solving is similar to the RATE( ) spreadsheet function's iterative process.

The 3.2 percent weighted debt cost, Line [113], is calculated from a 70 percent debt weighting, Line [109], and a 4.5 percent debt cost, Line [112]. A 2.0 percent baseline target debt cost, Line [110], and a debt-issuing institution's 2.5 percent commercial margin, Line [111], add to the 4.5 percent debt cost.

The 8.5 percent equity return, 70 percent debt capital structure, 4.5 percent debt cost, 24 percent income tax rate, 3.8 percent EBITDA growth, and 19 nper [19, 20, 21] attempt to reflect Example 1's economic influence found in the 14.0 Multiple, Lines [101]–[118].

Example 1's prospective primary financial statements are presented in Lines [119]–[140]. The $1,400 *asset value* depreciates over the 19-nper asset useful life, Lines [119]–[121]. Outstanding equity and debt decline in a ratable manner, Line [124]. The 6.5 percent capital cost, Line [108], drives the ratable decline in equity and debt.

The balance sheet recognizes the differences between net *asset value*, Line [121], and outstanding equity and debt, Line [124], through a cash balance, Line [122]. The cash balance, Line [122] and the income statement's cash return, Line [128], compensate for the depreciation and external financing timing recognition differences. The need for a balancing mechanism for accrual and cash's differing timing recognition has been identified and theorized but a time value verification of a balancing mechanism has been lacking. Matching Lines [141] and [142] verify the cash balancing mechanism is supporting the matching of accrual and cash equity returns and the unification of accrual and cash perspectives.

[19] Exhibit A's four Examples and Exhibit B's Example each have 19 investment periods. Addressing investment opportunity period length less than a depreciable asset's useful life is necessary to create the required common investment period length for comparing investment opportunities. RHT bridges address investment opportunity period length that are less than the depreciable asset's useful life; however, RHT bridges are beyond the scope of this initial discussion.

[20] The 19 periods assumption approximates the S&P 500 asset average useful life in 2024.

[21] For presentation brevity, Exhibit A, Schedule a, Columns 11-16 of 19 are not presented. The data contained in Schedule a, Columns 11-16 is available in the Example's following trial balances, Schedule b.

The $100 initial operating performance increases by the 3.8 percent growth assumption, Line [104], for each period, Line [125]. The depreciation, debt, and cash items on the balance sheet reflect income and expense activities in Lines [126], [127], and [128][22]. Income taxes are calculated on Line [129]. The cash flow statement, Lines [131]–[136], reflects period over period cash activity changes in balance sheet accounts. The equity statement, Lines [137]–[140], is constructed on the unmodified ending line of the income statement, Line [130], and the unmodified equity line of the cash flow statement, Line [136]. The equity statement self-balances to zero, Line [140][19].

In Exhibit A, Example 1's trial balances are presented on Schedule b, Lines [151]–[194] and confirm adherence to Section IX's Primary Statements Framework. Example 1's Lines [141]–[144], confirm adherence to Section X's corroborating analytics.

Exhibit A, Example 2

In Exhibit A, Example 2 presents an active depreciating asset investment opportunity initiated during increased inflation. Example 2's trial balances are presented on Schedule b, Lines [251]–[294] and confirm adherence to Section IX's Primary Statements Framework. Example 2, Lines [239]–[242], confirms adherence to Section X's corroborating analytics.

Increased inflation may induce a central bank to cool inflation through raising its inter-bank rates to drive higher debt cost. Recognizing Example 2's increased inflation is a 7.4 percent debt cost, Line [209], compared to Example 1's 4.5 percent debt cost, Line [112]. The 2.9 percent higher debt cost reflects Example 2's 4.9 percent inflation agent, Line [207], versus Example 1's

[22] For illustrative simplicity purposes cash return is designated equity return in the Exhibits. In practice, the return for cash is user designated. However, a user designated cash return other than equity return requires a RHT bridge to maintain the RHT valuation structure. RHT bridges are beyond the scope of this initial discussion.

2.0 percent stable inflation, Line [102]. For interpretive simplicity reasons, the 2.9 percent increase in debt cost matches the 2.9 percent rise in inflation.

Example 1's given 14.0 Gross Multiple, Line [101], changes to Example 2's solved 12.0 Gross Multiple, Line [216]. The lower *asset value* ($1,204 versus $1,400) reflects Example 2's higher debt cost. Typically, during increased inflation, solving a lower active investment value works toward a "no go" investment decision from a seller's perspective.

Example 2's equity return risk profile, Line [201], remains at Example 1's 8.5 percent, Line [118]. Matching Example 2's equity return with Example 1 assumes a central bank's inter-bank rate influence on an equity return risk profile is minimal. Maintaining an investment's equity return between stable and increased inflation periods may or may not match actual events.

The EDE of Example 2's active investment with increased inflation is 600, Line [243].

Exhibit A, Example 3

In Exhibit A, Example 3 presents a non-depreciating, passive investment opportunity initiated during increased inflation with contractual *operating performance* and contractual beginning and ending *asset values*. Example 3's trial balances are presented in Schedule b, Lines [351]–[394] and confirm adherence to Section IX's Primary Statements Framework. Example 3, Lines [326]–[329], confirm the adherence to Section X's corroborating analytics.

Example 3's 4.9 percent passive solved equity return, Lines [303], [326] and [327], represents a central bank's agent for cooling inflation. The 2.9 percent higher equity return than stable inflation promotes passive over active investments through higher passive EDE. Example 3's passive 4.9 percent equity return, Line [303] and Example 2's active 4.9 percent base debt cost, Line [207], are equal for illustrative purposes and may not be equal in actual events.

From a wealth formation perspective, business professionals find themselves with an indifferent decision choosing between the investments Example 3's passive 600 EDE, Line [330], and Example 2's active 600 EDE, Line [243].

As mentioned, streamlining Example 3's EDE passive investment as a present value, Line [331][ref], casts the passive EDE in the same comparative metric genre as the traditional IRR metric. Example 3's streamlined 600 passive EDE remains comparable to Example 2's more complicated (non-contractual operating performance and depreciable asset) 600 active EDE.

Examples 2 and 3's net income present value is the same $217, Lines [240][mid-page] and [327][mid-page], and initially deployed equity is the same $361, Lines [237] and [324][23]. Therefore, they both have the same 600 EDE. With that noted, Example 3's 4.9 percent equity return is lower than Example 2's 8.5 percent equity return, Line [239]. Example 3's lower equity return risk profile accommodates a higher equity outstanding present value of $4,386, Line [327][mid-page], compared to Example 2's $2,546 equity outstanding present value, Line [240][mid page]. Thus, the differences in equity outstanding support the difference between the passive and active equity return risk profiles within the context of equal EDE wealth potential.

Streamlining a passive EDE as the present value of equity return and explaining equity return risk profile differences from an equity outstanding perspective further demonstrate the viability of EDE's replacement of capital cost's comparative metric function.

Exhibit A, Example 4

In Exhibit A, Example 4 presents an active depreciating asset investment opportunity during stable inflation. Example 4's trial balances are presented in Schedule b, Lines [451]–[494]

[23] Examples 2 and 3's presentation of equal $361 deployed equity serves an illustrative purpose. In actual events, deployed equity may differ between active and passive investment opportunities. Differing deployed equity may still generate the same EDE.

and confirm adherence to Section IX's Primary Statements Framework. Example 4, Lines [437]–[440], confirm adherence to Section X's corroborating analytics.

Example 4's RHT valuation structure's basic valuation components are a $131 *operating performance proxy*, Line [401], a 0.093 *return "on & of"*, Line [413], and a $1,400 *asset value*, Line [414]. The non-varying $131 *operating performance proxy*, Line [401], homogenizes varying given operating performance, Line [421], at an 8.5 percent equity return risk profile, Line [402], using Equation (1).

The operating performance of Example 4 differ from the first three Examples in Exhibit A. Example 4's first six operating performances are negative. Initial negative operating performance is sometimes observed in investments, particularly among entrepreneurial startups.

A shortcoming of current EBITDA valuations is that EBITDA must be a satisfactory positive number. In the case of an initial unsatisfactory EBITDA, business professionals must surmise whether the investment's overall strength is sufficient to classify the investment as viable. An unsatisfactory EBITDA of a deemed viable investment receives non-transparent arbitrary amounts of operating performance transfers until a subjective satisfactory initial EBITDA appears to generate a valuation. The transfer of operating performance to period one, from later upside periods, does not have a formal time value corroborating mechanism thus, the transfer raises a possible conflict with the time value of money concept. The RHT architecture addresses Example 4's negative operating performance in a straightforward, transparent, formal time value manner.

Equity injections based on future net income

An investment's equity statement entails an initial deployed equity, possible subsequent equity injections, cash dividends, and net income. An investment owner's deployment of equity establishes the investment opportunity and creates the promise of future net income and dividends.

The matching accrual and cash equity returns of the unification of accrual and cash valuation perspectives enables an investment's promise of future net income to support an earlier equity injection of cash. Owing to the initial negative operating performance, Example 4's equity shortfall of $254, Line [432][1] is injected by the investment owner. The equity injection occurs as a "loan" at 8.5 percent, Line [437], [438]. The investor is repaid the $254 from cash dividends in the deferred operating performance upside periods. The matching equity returns contemplate neutralizing varying operating performance's correlated net income risk, a $266 net income loss, Line [426][1], and the related cash equity injections and subsequent dividend repayments.

Period one's $254 equity injection maintains a 30 percent equity capital structure weighting, Line [405]. The 30 percent is an element of Example 4's 6.5 percent capital cost, Line [412]. Example 4 continues to use additional cash equity injections up to period eight to maintain the 30 percent equity capital structure. Similarly, an investment's cash dividends are also based on maintaining the 30 percent equity capital structure. Failure to maintain the 30 percent equity capital structure each period, Line [440], invalidates the 6.5 percent capital cost, Line [412], the 0.093 *return "on & of"*, Line [413], and the $1,400 *asset value*, Line [414].

Prospective equity statements begin and end with zero, indicating an investment's encapsulating finite time frame, Line [436][19]. A zero-ending equity statement demonstrates a nominal equity statement unification of accrual net income and cash, in addition to the previously discussed time value unification. The nominal unification is demonstrated through net income's sourcing of net equity cash flow's initial deployed equity, subsequently injected equity, and cash dividends over the course of the investment time frame.

Exhibit B: –Solving the RHT Operating Performance Component, Lines [501]–[507]

Up to this point the discussion has focused on solving the RHT basic valuation components of either *asset value* or capital cost*'s return "on & of"*. When *asset value* and capital cost*'s return "on & of"* are given RHT basic valuation components, the RHT structure can also reciprocally solve an investment's *operating performance proxy*. Going beyond solving the *operating performance proxy* is solving a period one operating performance. Solving a period one operating performance requires an additional operating performance percent to period one assumption for each period.

Exhibit B uses Exhibit A, Example 4's $1,400 *asset value*, Line [414], for Line [501] and Example 4's 0.093 *return "on & of*", Line [413], for Line [502]. Additionally, Exhibit B uses Exhibit A, Example 4's operating performance, Line [421], for providing the additional operating performance percent to period one assumptions, Line [506]. Using the operating performance percent to period one assumptions, the 8.5 percent Example 4 equity return, Line [402], and Equation (1) generates the (0.560) *proxy to period one factor*, Line [504].

Exhibit B solves a ($233) period one operating performance, Line [505] using the $131 *operating performance proxy*, Line [503] and the (0.560) *proxy to period one factor*, Line [504]. The calculated operating performance of Line [507] correspondingly match the given operating performance of Example 4's operating performance, Line [421].

The RHT Structure Versus the DCF Approach: A Reconciliation of Proxies

Table 1 demonstrates how Example 4's capital cost and equity return point spread and deferred upside operating performance generate a $397, 28 percent, Lines [c] and [d], valuation difference between the $1,400 RHT and the $1,797 traditional discounted cash flow valuation. Table 1's valuation difference illustrates the traditional discounted cash flow's previously mentioned flaw in investment valuations. Table 1's 6.5 percent single capital cost, Line [412], in

Line [a], and the two discount rates in Line [b] of 8.5 percent equity return, Line [402], and 6.5 percent capital cost, Line [412], signify the functional difference between the traditional discounted cash flow approach and the RHT valuation method.

Table 1's $131 equity return generated *operating performance proxy*, Line [f], facilitates a reciprocal RHT interaction as presented in Exhibit A, Example 4. However, with a $168 capital cost generated operating performance proxy, Line [e], a $37 operating performance time value distortion, Line [g], fuels the $397 discounted cash flow valuation flaw, Line [i] [24].

TABLE 1
RHT AND TRADITIONAL DCF VALUATION:
A RECONCILIATION
EXHIBIT A, EXAMPLE 4

			ref
VALUATION DIFFERENCE:			
[a]	Traditional discounted cash flow valuation PV of operating performance at capital cost	$1,797	NPV([412],[421]:[421])
[b]	RHT valuation *Operating performance proxy* (Equation 1) divided by capital cost's *return "on & of"*	1,400	PMT([402],19, -1)*NPV([402],[421]:[421]) /PMT([412], 19, -1)
[c]	Traditional DCF & RHT valuation difference	$397	[a]–[b]
[d]	Percent Difference	28%	[c]/[b]
VALUATION RECONCILIATION:			
[e]	A traditional DCF Operating Perform Proxy	$168	PMT([412],19,-1)*NPV([412],[421]:[421])
[f]	RHT Operating Performance Proxy	131	PMT([402],19,-1)*NPV([402],[421]:[421])
[g]	Traditional DCF and RHT Proxy Difference	$37	[e]–[f]
[h]	Return "On & Of'	0. 093	PMT([412], 19, -1)
[i]	Traditional DCF & RHT valuation difference	$397	[g]/[h] & [c]

[24] In Exhibit A, Example 4's 70% debt capital structure, Line [410], creates a 200 point difference between the 8.5% equity return, Line [402] and the 6.5% capital cost, Line [412]. An Example 4 investment changing to a 40% debt capital structure creates a zero difference between capital cost and equity return. The formula for calculating the 40% is 24% /(1 - 4.5%*(1-24%) / 8.5%) where 24% is the income tax rate, 4.5% is the debt cost and 8.5% is the equity return. *Observation*: an Example 4 investment changing to a debt capital structure less than 40% will generate a traditional discounted cash flow valuation less than the RHT valuation.

From a practical implementation perspective, it is important to recognize how the spreadsheet calculation overhead for the RHT method, Table 1, Line [b][ref], compares to a traditional discounted cash flow valuation, Line [a][ref]. The incremental Equation (1) RHT method spreadsheet calculation overhead is minimal and straightforward for replacing discounted cash flow's iterative sigma and EBITDA's reciprocal peer triad valuation architectures.

In summary, (1) reconciling the new valuation architecture's RHT valuation with discounted cash flow's valuation in Table 1, (2) unifying accrual and cash valuation perspectives by matching accrual and cash equity returns, (3) demonstrating the new architecture's reciprocal valuation ability to solve all three RHT basic valuation components in Exhibit B, (4) showing the ability to peer inside EBITDA Multiples in Section XII's Exhibit A, Examples 1 and 2, (5) displaying the new valuation architecture's operating performance flexibility over EBITDA demonstrated in Exhibit A, Example 4, (6) joining micro- to macroeconomic ranges of *operating performance* and *asset value* in Section V, (7) describing the Primary Statements Framework in Section IX, (8) describing corroborating analytics in Section X, (9) applying Section IV's new EDE valuation comparison metric in Exhibit A, Example 3, and (10) exhibiting the new valuation architecture's minimal additional computational overhead found in Table 1, Line [b] versus [a], create an attractive replacement valuation architecture that meld the strengths of the current theoretical (iterative sigma) and applied (reciprocal peer triad) valuation architectures while addressing their shortcomings.

XIII. EXHIBIT C: –EBITDA MULTIPLE ASSUMPTION SENSITIVITY SCENARIOS

Now that adhering investments to the Primary Statements Framework helps establish a pragmatic reciprocal valuation structure, the feasibility of peering inside a Multiple for its assumptions' sensitivity is now "worth the effort".

Possibly the three most dynamic investment opportunity assumptions are operating performance growth, equity return, and *asset value*. Usually, raising the operating performance growth assumption increases the need to raise equity return's risk neutralization. Raising both the growth assumption and equity return risk profile produces a countering influence on *asset value*.

Understandably, moving the growth assumption and equity return risk profile in opposite directions has an impact on *asset value*. From an Exhibit A sensitivity perspective, lowering Example 1's risk profile of 8.5 percent equity return, Line [118], to a given 6.5 percent equity return, Exhibit C, Line [608], scenarios [i] and [ii], increases the EBITDA Multiple to 15.2, Exhibit C, Line [601], scenario [i]. Additionally, increasing Example 1's operating performance growth from 3.8 percent to 9.2 percent, Line [602], scenario [ii], generates a 24.0 EBITDA Multiple, Line [601], scenario [ii]. The 9.2 percent operating performance growth is facilitated by increasing Example 1's 1.8 percent assumption of growth other than inflation, Line [103], to 7.2 percent, Line [609][ii]. The assumption sensitivity of lowering equity return and increasing operating performance growth increases Multiples, *asset values*, and "go" investment decisions, all other things being equal.

Does a particularly high or low delineated operating performance growth level create measurable feedback insight into a given Multiple's possible overvaluation or undervaluation of an economic activity level?

XIV. ACADEMIC VALUATION RESEARCH MODELS

Academic valuation research models adhere to the iterative sigma valuation approach. The five predominant academic models are DDM (Dividend Discount), DCF (Discounted Cash Flow), ECM (Earnings Capitalization), RIM (Residual Income) and OJM (Abnormal Earning Growth).

As iterative sigma models, existing valuation research models possess the same fundamental discounted cash flow flaw as discussed earlier. No academic reciprocal triad research models exist.

Below is an excerpt (Huefner and Rueenaufer 2021) recognizing the current models.

> Footnote 26: We do not formally derive the different models in this paper, because that has been done extensively in other contributions to the literature. For formal derivations of the DDM, see Gordon & Shapiro (1956) and Gordon (1959). For the DCF, see Rappaport (1986) and Penman (2015). For (variations of) the ECM, see Fairfield (1994) and Penman (1996). For the RIM, see Edwards & Bell (1961), Peasnell (1982) and Ohlson (1995). For the OJM, see Ohlson & Juettner-Nauroth (2005). For the OHJO, see Ohlson & Johannesson (2016). For contributions that perform comparative derivations of multiple models, see Penman & Sougiannis (1998), Christensen & Feltham (2009), Easton (2009), Heinrichs et al. (2013) and Penman (2015).

Academic's asset ownership models are active/microeconomic. However, academic valuation model execution consider their investments as passive/macroeconomic. Most valuation models in academic research address the passive/macroeconomic aspects of readily available future valuations by oversimplifying asset reinvestment. This misguided oversimplification goes to the point where it appears to be a future contractual arrangement. Oversimplifying the modeling of depreciating active/microeconomic investment valuations as passive runs counter to the managerial involvement of active investment opportunities.

XV. REFLECTION AND SUMMARY

Reflection

The significance of double entry bookkeeping's debit entries equaling credit entries was foretold by economist Irving Fisher nearly a hundred years ago:

> The bookkeeping implications of such couples of items were discovered by accountants long ago and are the basis of their double entry bookkeeping, though its economic significance has been largely overlooked. One important significance is that this double entry prevents double counting–Fisher, Irving, The Theory of

Interest as Determined by Impatience to Spend Income and Opportunity to Invest It, p. 20 (Chapter 1, Section 12), 1930, Macmillan, New York.

Summary

The discussion covers a wide range of investment valuation topics, issues, and implications. The condensed summary below and Table 2 present summaries that aid comparing the alternative and today's valuation architectures.

A Condensed Summary of the Discussion:

1. Investment opportunities' prospective financial statements generate comparative valuation metrics used in deciding wealth formation's "go/no go" investment decisions.
2. Today's investment assumptions and their flawed valuations form misleading prospective financial statements and subsequent suboptimal investment decisions.
   a. Owing to the debt fueled widening of equity return and capital cost point spreads converging with investment owners' acceptance of greater deferred upside operating performance, the discounted cash flow valuation approach generates flaws in valuations.
   b. Owing to a Multiple's opaqueness, the unmeasurable difference between an investment's fashioned and the peer group equity return and operating performance growth, the incremental versus imbedded peer group debt cost and capital structure and, any initial unsatisfactory EBITDA, the EBITDA valuation approach generates flaws in valuations.
   c. In practice today, multiple flawed valuations are subjectively weighed to form an investment's flawed valuation, misleading financial statements, failed corroborating analytics and suboptimal comparative metrics and investment decisions.
3. Misleading financial statements correspond with the current inability to construct prospective equity statements and accounting trial balances.
   a. Historical and prospective equity statements are constructed from an income statement's net income and a cash flow statement's equity cash flow lines.
   b. The equity statement's validating handshakes affirm an investment's debits equal credits.
   c. A universal absence of prospective equity statements is evident in an investment's prospective financial statements, deducing that debits do not equal credits.
4. An alternative valuation architecture resolves valuation flaws using the reciprocal valuation structure's components of *asset value*, capital cost's *return 'on & of'*, and an equity return homogenized *operating performance proxy* to generate investment valuations.
   a. Matching accrual and cash equity returns verify unification of accrual and cash valuation perspectives and benchmark adherence to the time value of money concept.

b. The alternative architecture's valuations and financial statements are validated when they create an investments' trial balances, equity statements, and corroborating analytics, deducing that debits equal credits.
c. The alternative architecture combines the strength of existing valuation architectures and addresses their shortcomings while bridging the theoretical and applied valuation gap in finance.

5. The alternative reciprocal valuation architecture necessitates a new earnings to deployed equity comparative metric for deciding wealth formation's "go/no go" investment decisions; the metric brings a deployed equity efficiency to wealth formation.
6. The RHT alternative valuation architecture combined with the EDE comparative valuation metric enhance the entire investment opportunity valuation spectrum. In particular, active versus passive investment decisions and entrepreneurial startup valuations are enhanced.

Table 2: COMPARING ARCHITECTURES & METRICS:

	Current	This Discussion
Architecture:		
Concept	Time Value of Money	Time Value of Money
Structure	Iterative Sigma & Reciprocal Peer Triad	Reciprocal Homogenizing Triad (RHT)
Infrastructure:		
Three Reciprocal Basic Valuation Components of: *asset value, return "on & of", & operating performance proxy*	No	Yes
Accounting's Primary Statements Framework	No	Yes
Corroborating Analytics	No	Yes
Method	DCF's IRR, NPV & EBITDA	PMT( )*NPV( ) homogenizing operating performance proxy
Comparative Metric	Weigh IRR/NPV and EBITDA	EDE earnings to deployed equity

XVI. CONCLUSIONS

An investment opportunity's financial statements generate comparative valuation metrics to decide wealth formation's "go/no go" investment decisions. Flaws in investment opportunity valuations create misleading financial statements. The flaws are evident by an investment's inability to procure prospective trial balances and equity statements. The lack of prospective trial balances and equity statements indicates prospective debits do not equal credits. The root problem of debits not equaling credits is caused by the traditional individual discounting of varying operating performances with capital cost. Resolving debits not equaling credits elicits an alternative valuation architecture. The alternative architecture's valuation method homogenizes a non-varying *operating performance proxy* with equity return. The *proxy* subsequently combines with a capital cost *return 'on & of'* and *asset value* to form a reciprocal triad valuation structure. The financial statement debits of a reciprocal valuation structure's valuation equal its credits.

Capital cost's three previous uses are either eliminated, revised or upgraded. Capital cost's comparative valuation metric function is eliminated; capital cost's role of homogenizing an *operating performance proxy* is revised to use equity return alone; capital cost's risk profile role is unchanged but upgraded into the *return "on & of"* basic valuation component.

The discussion contemplates three areas of risk surrounding the time value of money concept. First, the discussion proposes resolving structural valuation risk by adhering prospective financial statements to the Primary Statements Framework. Second, the discussion proposes homogenizing varying operating performance to create the *operating performance proxy* basic valuation component. The *proxy's* homogenizing time value influence is the matched accrual and cash equity return of the unified accrual and cash valuation perspectives. Lastly, the discussion proposes neutralizing the general business risk of generating *operating performance proxies* using

capital cost's *return "on & of"* (RORO). Beyond addressing these risks, the discussion introduces the verification of corroborating analytics and creates a new earnings to deployed equity efficiency metric for deciding "go/no go" investment decisions.

In general, the RHT architecture and more specifically, its unification of accrual and cash valuation perspectives invoke an unprecedented level of adherence to the time value of money wealth formation concept. Matching accrual and cash equity returns act as a benchmark for indicating the adherence. The RHT infrastructure of reciprocal valuation components, the Primary Statements Framework, and the corroborating analytics coalesce into the alternative valuation architecture. The alternative architecture, combined with the comparative EDE metric create viable financial roadmaps that enhance investment decisions, better maximizes wealth formation, and increases marketplace efficiency.

For prospective investment collectives of non-mutually exclusive investment opportunities, when a collective's individual equity returns and capital costs bind each investment's valuation and assumptions and the collective's EDE exceeds other collectives, that investment collective should receive a "go" investment decision.

The examples in the discussion portray an overly simplified, but fundamentally sound and conceptually coherent reciprocal valuation architecture. The breadth and depth of the alternative valuation architecture envelops the current theoretical and applied valuation strengths and addresses their shortcomings to bridge their differences.

A proclaimed "high risk, high reward" investment opportunity now has distinct complementary measures. Equity return and capital cost neutralize "high risk" and the new EDE comparative metric measures "high reward" while accounting's Primary Statements Framework addresses structural valuation risks in the background. The valuation clarity with which the measures bring to investment opportunities is significant.

Within the context of basic double entry accounting, the alternative valuation architecture's attractiveness of replacing IRR/NPV and EBITDA's valuation architectures becomes pronounced.

References

Bierman, Harold Jr. and Smidt, Seymour. 1960. The Capital Budgeting Decision, Economic analysis of investment projects, first edit., Macmillan, New York.

Christensen, P.O. & Feltham, G.A., 2009. Equity Valuation. *Foundations and Trends in Accounting*, 4(1), pp.1-112.

Easton, P.D., 2009. Estimating the Cost of Capital Implied by Market Prices and Accounting Data. *Foundations and Trends in Accounting*, 2(4), pp.241-364.

Edwards, E.O. & Bell, P.W., 1961. *The Theory and Measurement of Business Income.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fairfield, P.M., 1994. P/E, P/B and the Present Value of Future Dividends. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 50(4), pp.23-31.

Gordon, M.J., 1959. Dividends, Earnings, and Stock Prices. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 41(2), pp.99-105.

Gordon, M.J. & Shapiro, E., 1956. Capital Equipment Analysis: The Required Rate of Profit. *Management Science*, 3(1), pp.102-10.

Heinrichs, N. et al., 2013. Extended Dividend, Cash Flow, and Residual Income Valuation Models: Accounting for Deviations from Ideal Conditions. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 30(1), pp.42-79.

Huefner, Bernd and Rueenaufer, Marcel. 2021. A Fundamentalist Perspective on Reverse Engineering in Equity Valuation, *SSRN 3542496,* 13-14.

Lundholm, R., O'Keefe, T., 2001. Reconciling Value Estimates from the Discounted Cash Flow Model and the Residual Income Model. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 18(2), pp. 311-35. https://doi.org/10.1506/W13B-K4BT-455N-TTR2

Lundholm, R., O'Keefe, T., 2001. On Comparing Cash Flow and Accrual Accounting Models for Use in Equity Valuation: A Response to Penman. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 18(4), 693-96. https://doi.org/10.1506/Y51R-C3YF-MT0T-BWE2

Mukhlynina, Lilia. and Kjell G. Nyborg 2019. The Choice of Valuation Techniques in Practice: Education Versus Profession. *Critical Finance Review*: Vol. 9-1/2, Page 33.

http://dx.doi.org/10. 1561/104.00000088

Ibid., Page 8.

Ohlson, J.A., 1995. Earnings, Book Values, and Dividends in Equity Valuation. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 11(2), pp.661-87.

Ohlson, J.A. & Johannesson, E., 2016. Equity Value as a Function of (eps1, eps2, dps1, bvps, beta): Concepts and Realities. *ABACUS*, 50(1), pp.70-99.

Ohlson, J.A. & Juettner-Nauroth, B., 2005. Expected EPS and EPS Growth as Determinants of Value. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 10, pp.349-65.

Peasnell, K.V., 1982. Some Formal Connections Between Economic Values and Yields and Accounting Numbers. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 9(3), pp.361-82.

Penman, S.H., 1996. The Articulation of Price-Earnings Ratios and Market-to-Book Ratios and the Evaluation of Growth. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 34(2), pp.235-59.

Penman, S.H., 2001. On Comparing Cash Flow and Accrual Accounting Models for Use in Equity Valuation: A Response to Lundholm and O'Keefe. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 18(4), pp.681-92. https://doi.org/10.1506/DT0R-JNEG-QL60-7CBP

Penman, S.H., 2015. *Valuation Models: An Issue of Accounting Theory*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Penman, S.H. & Sougiannis, T., 1998. A Comparison of Dividend, Cash Flow, and Earnings Approaches to Equity Valuation. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 15(3), pp.343-83.

Rappaport, A., 1986. *Creating shareholder value: The new standard for business performance*. New York: Free Press.

PEER INSIDE AN EBITDA MULTIPLE DURING STABLE INFLATION — Exhibit A

Example 1, Schedule a — Lines [101]–[144]

A GROSS MULTIPLE'S EQUITY RETURN:

[101]	Gross Multiple	[ref] [G]				14.0											
[102]	Baseline Target - (Stable Inflation)	[G]		2.0%													
[103]	Growth Other Than Inflation	[G]		1.8%													
[104]	Operating Perform Growth	SUM([102]:[103])			3.8%												
[105]	Gross/Net Multiple Factor	PMT(8.5%,19,-1) * (1-(1+3.8%)^19/(1+8.5%)^19)/(8.5%-3.8%)				1.306											
[106]	Net Multiple	[101]/[105]					10.7										
[107]	Return "On & Of" (RORO)	1/[106]					0.093										
[108]	Capital Cost	RATE(19, [107], -1)						6.5%									
[109]	Debt Weighting	[G]					70%										
[110]	Debt Cost - Baseline Target	[102]				2.0%											
[111]	Commercial Margin	[G]				2.5%											
[112]	Debt Cost	SUM([110]:[111])					4.5%										
[113]	Weighted Debt Cost	[109]*[112]						3.2%									
[114]	Weighted Equity return	[108]–[113]							3.4%								
[115]	Equity Weighting	1-[109]							30%								
[116]	Equity return - pre-tax	[114]/[115]								11.2%							
[117]	Income Tax rate	[G]								24%							
[118]	Equity return	[116]*(1-[117])] & [141]									8.5%						

PRIMARY ACCOUNTING STATEMENTS:

	BALANCE SHEET		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	17	18	19
[119]	Asset Value	[101]*[125]	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$0
[120]	Accumulated Depreciation	[120]+[126]		(74)	(147)	(221)	(295)	(368)	(442)	(516)	(589)	(663)	(737)	(1,253)	(1,326)	0
[121]	Net Asset	SUM([119]:[120])	1,400	1,326	1,253	1,179	1,105	1,032	958	884	811	737	663	147	74	0
[122]	Cash	[124]–[121]		34	66	95	121	144	164	180	193	201	205	90	49	0
[123]	Assets	SUM([121]:[122])	$1,400	$1,361	$1,319	$1,274	$1,227	$1,176	$1,122	$1,064	$1,003	$938	$869	$238	$123	$0
[124]	Equity & Debt	[124]*(1+[108])-PMT([108], 19,-[$124])	$1,400	$1,361	$1,319	$1,274	$1,227	$1,176	$1,122	$1,064	$1,003	$938	$869	$238	$123	$0
	INCOME STATEMENT															
[125]	Oper Performance $131 proxy	[G] and then [125]*(1+3.8%)		$100	$104	$108	$112	$116	$120	$125	$130	$135	$140	$182	$189	$196
[126]	Depreciation	-$1,400/19		(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)
[127]	Interest Expense	-[124]*70%*4.5%		(44)	(43)	(42)	(40)	(39)	(37)	(35)	(34)	(32)	(30)	(11)	(7)	(4)
[128]	Cash Return	[122]*8.5%		0	3	6	8	10	12	14	15	16	17	11	8	4
[129]	Income Tax	-SUM([125]:[128])*24%		4	2	0	(1)	(3)	(5)	(7)	(9)	(11)	(13)	(26)	(28)	(30)
[130]	Net Income	SUM([125]:[129])		($13)	($7)	($1)	$5	$11	$17	$23	$29	$35	$41	$82	$87	$93
	CASH FLOW STATEMENT															
[131]	Net Income	[130]		($13)	($7)	($1)	$5	$11	$17	$23	$29	$35	$41	$82	$87	$93
[132]	Add Back: Depreciation	-[126]		74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74
[133]	Cash	[122]–[122]		(34)	(32)	(29)	(26)	(23)	(20)	(16)	(12)	(8)	(4)	34	41	49
[134]	Debt Issuance/(Repurchase)	([124]–[124])*70%	$980	(28)	(29)	(31)	(33)	(35)	(38)	(40)	(43)	(46)	(49)	(76)	(81)	(86)
[135]	Asset Purchase	-[119]	(1,400)													
[136]	Equity (Deploy/Inject)/Dividend	SUM([131]:[135])	($420)	($2)	$5	$12	$19	$26	$33	$40	$47	$54	$62	$114	$122	$130
	EQUITY STATEMENT															
[137]	Beginning Equity	[140]		$420	$408	$396	$382	$368	$353	$337	$319	$301	$281	$104	$71	$37
[138]	Net Income	[130]		(13)	(7)	(1)	5	11	17	23	29	35	41	82	87	93
[139]	Equity Deploy/Inject/(Dividend)	-[136]	$420	2	(5)	(12)	(19)	(26)	(33)	(40)	(47)	(54)	(62)	(114)	(122)	(130)
[140]	Ending Equity	SUM([137]:[139])	$420	$408	$396	$382	$368	$353	$337	$319	$301	$281	$261	$71	$37	$0

CORROBORATING ANALYTICS:

[141]	Equity Return - discounted cash flow		8.5%	IRR([139]:[139])												
[142]	Equity Return - accrual net income		8.5%	Net Income PV $244 divided by Equity Outstand PV $2,869					$244	NPV([141],[138]:[138])		$2,869	NPV([141],[137]:[137])			
[143]	Equity Present Value - discounted cash flow		$420	-NPV([141],[139]:[139])												
[144]	Equity Capital Structure	[140]/[124]	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	

PEER INSIDE AN EBITDA MULTIPLE DURING STABLE INFLATION – TRIAL BALANCES

Exhibit A

Example 1, Schedule b

Lines [151]–[194]

Example 1 Trial balances 0 - 5	ref	0	Activity	Close	1	Activity	Close	2	Activity	Close	3	Activity	Close	4	Activity	Close	5
[151] Asset Value	[101]*[156]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400
[152] Accumulated Depreciation	[152]+[157]		(74)		(74)	(74)		(147)	(74)		(221)	(74)		(295)	(74)		(368)
[153] Cash	-SUM([151]:[152],[154]:[160])		34		34	32		66	29		95	26		121	23		144
[154] Debt	(([154]+[155])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[109]	(980)	28		(952)	29		(923)	31		(892)	33		(859)	35		(823)
[155] Equit	(([154]+[155])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[115]	(420)	(2)	13	(408)	5	7	(396)	12	1	(382)	19	(5)	(368)	26	(11)	(353)
[156] Operating Perform	[G] and then [156]*(1+3.8%)		(100)	100	0	(104)	104	0	(108)	108	0	(112)	112	0	(116)	116	0
[157] Depreciation	[151]/19		74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0
[158] Interest Expense	-[154]*4.5%		44	(44)	0	43	(43)	0	42	(42)	0	40	(40)	0	39	(39)	0
[159] Cash Return	-[153]*8.5%		0	0	0	(3)	3	0	(6)	6	0	(8)	8	0	(10)	10	0
[160] Income Tax	-SUM([156]:[159])*24%		(4)	4	0	(2)	2	0	(0)	0	0	1	(1)	0	3	(3)	0
[161] Total	SUM([151]:[160])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 1 Trial balances 6 – 10	ref	5	Activity	Close	6	Activity	Close	7	Activity	Close	8	Activity	Close	9	Activity	Close	10
[162] Asset Value	[151]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400
[163] Accumulated Depreciation	[163]+[168]	(368)	(74)		(442)	(74)		(516)	(74)		(589)	(74)		(663)	(74)		(737)
[164] Cash	-SUM([162]:[163],[165]:[171])	144	20		164	16		180	12		193	8		201	4		205
[165] Debt	(([165]+[166])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[109]	(823)	38		(785)	40		(745)	43		(702)	46		(657)	49		(608)
[166] Equit	(([165]+[166])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[115]	(353)	33	(17)	(337)	40	(23)	(319)	47	(29)	(301)	54	(35)	(281)	62	(41)	(261)
[167] Operating Performance	[167]*(1+3.8%)	0	(120)	120	0	(125)	125	0	(130)	130	0	(135)	135	0	(140)	140	0
[168] Depreciation	[151]/19	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0
[169] Interest Expense	-[165]*4.5%	0	37	(37)	0	35	(35)	0	34	(34)	0	32	(32)	0	30	(30)	0
[170] Cash Return	-[164]*8.5%	0	(12)	12	0	(14)	14	0	(15)	15	0	(16)	16	0	(17)	17	0
[171] Income Tax	-SUM([167]:[170])*24%	0	5	(5)	0	7	(7)	0	9	(9)	0	11	(11)	0	13	(13)	0
[172] Total	SUM([162]:[171])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 1 Trial balances 11 – 15	ref	10	Activity	Close	11	Activity	Close	12	Activity	Close	13	Activity	Close	14	Activity	Close	15
[173] Asset Value	[151]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400
[174] Accumulated Depreciation	[174]+[179]	(737)	(74)		(811)	(74)		(884)	(74)		(958)	(74)		(1,032)	(74)		(1,105)
[175] Cash	-SUM([173]:[174],[176]:[182])	205	(0)		205	(5)		200	(10)		190	(16)		174	(22)		152
[176] Debt	(([176]+[177])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[109]	(608)	52		(556)	55		(501)	59		(442)	63		(380)	67		(313)
[177] Equit	(([176]+[177])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[115]	(261)	69	(47)	(238)	76	(53)	(215)	84	(59)	(190)	91	(64)	(163)	99	(70)	(134)
[178] Operating Performance	[178]*(1+3.8%)	0	(145)	145	0	(151)	151	0	(156)	156	0	(162)	162	0	(169)	169	0
[179] Depreciation	[151]/19	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0
[180] Interest Expense	-[176]*4.5%	0	27	(27)	0	25	(25)	0	23	(23)	0	20	(20)	0	17	(17)	0
[181] Cash Return	-[175]*8.5%	0	(17)	17	0	(17)	17	0	(17)	17	0	(16)	16	0	(15)	15	0
[182] Income Tax	-SUM([178]:[181])*24%	0	15	(15)	0	17	(17)	0	19	(19)	0	21	(21)	0	22	(22)	0
[183] Total	SUM([173]:[182])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 1 Trial balances 16 - 19	ref	15	Activity	Close	16	Activity	Close	17	Activity	Close	18	Activity	Close	19
[184] Asset Value	[151]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400		(1,400)	0
[185] Accumulated Depreciation	[185]+[190]	(1,105)	(74)		(1,179)	(74)		(1,253)	(74)		(1,326)	(74)	1,400	0
[186] Cash	-SUM([184]:[185],[187]:[193])	152	(28)		125	(34)		90	(41)		49	(49)		0
[187] Debt	(([187]+[188])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[109]	(313)	71		(242)	76		(166)	81		(86)	86		0
[188] Equit	(([187]+[188])*(1+[108])+PMT([108], 19,-[151]))*[115]	(134)	106	(76)	(104)	114	(82)	(71)	122	(87)	(37)	130	(93)	0
[189] Operating Performance	[189]*(1+3.8%)	0	(175)	175	0	(182)	182	0	(189)	189	0	(196)	196	0
[190] Depreciation	[151]/19	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0
[191] Interest Expense	-[187]*4.5%	0	14	(14)	0	11	(11)	0	7	(7)	0	4	(4)	0
[192] Cash Return	-[186]*8.5%	0	(13)	13	0	(11)	11	0	(8)	8	0	(4)	4	0
[193] Income Tax	-SUM([189]:[192])*24%	0	24	(24)	0	26	(26)	0	28	(28)	0	30	(30)	0
[194] Total	SUM([184]:[193])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

all transactions occur at period end

CREATE AN ACTIVE INVESTMENT EDE DURING INCREASED INFLATION

Exhibit A

Example 2, Schedule a

Lines [201]–[243]

		ref															
	GROSS MULTIPLE CALCULATION:	ref															
[201]	Equity return (Example 1)	[118]	8.5%														
[202]	Income Tax rate	[G]	24%														
[203]	Equity return - pre-tax	[201]/(1-[202])		11.2%													
[204]	Equity Weighting	1-[206]		30%													
[205]	Weighted Equity return	[203]*[204]			3.4%												
[206]	Debt Weighting (Example 1)	[109]		70%													
[207]	Inflation Agent (Increased Inflation)	[303]	4.9%														
[208]	Commercial Margin (Example 1)	[111]	2.5%														
[209]	Debt Cost	SUM([207]:[208])		7.4%													
[210]	Weighted Debt	[206]*[209]			5.2%												
[211]	Capital Cost (Increased Inflation)	SUM([205]:[210])				8.6%											
[212]	Return "On & Of" (RORO)	PMT([211],19,-1)				0.108											
[213]	Net Multiple	1/[212]					9.2										
[214]	Operating Performance Growth (Example 1)	[104]				3.8%											
[215]	Gross/Net Multiple Factor (Example 1)	[105]					1.306										
[216]	Gross Multiple (Increased Inflation)	[213]*[215] going to [217]						12.0									
	PRIMARY ACCOUNTING STATEMENTS:																
	BALANCE SHEET		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	17	18	19	
[217]	Asset Value	[216]*[223]	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$1,204	$0	
[218]	Accumulated Depreciation	[218]+[224]		(63)	(127)	(190)	(253)	(317)	(380)	(444)	(507)	(570)	(634)	(1,077)	(1,140)	0	
[219]	Net Asset	SUM([217]:[218])	1,204	1,140	1,077	1,014	950	887	824	760	697	634	570	127	63	0	
[220]	Cash	[222]–[219]		36	70	101	129	154	177	195	210	220	226	104	57	0	
[221]	Assets	SUM([219]:[220])	$1,204	$1,176	$1,147	$1,115	$1,080	$1,042	$1,000	$955	$907	$854	$797	$231	$120	$0	
[222]	Equity & Debt	[222]*(1+[211])-PMT([211],19,-$[222])	$1,204	$1,176	$1,147	$1,115	$1,080	$1,042	$1,000	$955	$907	$854	$797	$231	$120	$0	
	INCOME STATEMENT																
[223]	Oper Performance	[G] and then [223]*(1+3.8%)		$100	$104	$108	$112	$116	$120	$125	$130	$135	$140	$182	$189	$196	
[224]	Depreciation	-1204/ 19		(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	(63)	
[225]	Interest Expense	-[222]*70%*7.4%		(63)	(61)	(60)	(58)	(56)	(54)	(52)	(50)	(47)	(44)	(17)	(12)	(6)	
[226]	Cash Return	[220]*8.5%		0	3	6	9	11	13	15	17	18	19	12	9	5	
[227]	Income Tax	-SUM([223]:[226])*24%		6	4	2	0	(2)	(4)	(6)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(27)	(30)	(32)	
[228]	Net Income	SUM([223]:[227])		($20)	($13)	($7)	($1)	$6	$12	$19	$25	$32	$39	$86	$92	$99	
	CASH FLOW STATEMENT																
[229]	Net Income	[228]		($20)	($13)	($7)	($1)	$6	$12	$19	$25	$32	$39	$86	$92	$99	
[230]	Add Back: Depreciation	-[224]		63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	
[231]	Cash	[220]–[220]		(36)	(34)	(31)	(28)	(25)	(22)	(19)	(15)	(11)	(6)	39	47	57	
[232]	Debt Issuance/(Repurchase)	([222]–[222])*70%	$843	(19)	(21)	(23)	(25)	(27)	(29)	(31)	(34)	(37)	(40)	(71)	(78)	(84)	
[233]	Asset Purchase	-[217]	(1,204)														
[234]	Equity (Deploy/Inject)/Dividend	SUM([229]:[233])	($361)	($12)	($5)	$3	$10	$17	$25	$32	$40	$48	$56	$116	$126	$135	
	EQUITY STATEMENT																
[235]	Beginning Equity	[238]		$361	$353	$344	$334	$324	$312	$300	$287	$272	$256	$100	$69	$36	
[236]	Net Income	[228]		(20)	(13)	(7)	(1)	6	12	19	25	32	39	86	92	99	
[237]	Equity Deploy/Inject/(Dividend)	-[234]	$361	12	5	(3)	(10)	(17)	(25)	(32)	(40)	(48)	(56)	(116)	(126)	(135)	
[238]	Ending Equity	SUM([235]:[237])	$361	$353	$344	$334	$324	$312	$300	$287	$272	$256	$239	$69	$36	$0	
	CORROBORATING ANALYTICS:																
[239]	Equity Return - discounted cash flow		8.5%	IRR([237]:[237])													
[240]	Equity Return - accrual net income		8.5%	Net Income PV $217 divided by Equity Outstand PV $2,546				$217	NPV([239],[236]:[236])			$2,546	NPV([239],[235]:[235])				
[241]	Equity Present Value - discounted cash flow		$361	-NPV([239],[237]:[237])													
[242]	Equity Capital Structure	[238]/[222]	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%		
[243]	**EDE (EARNINGS to DEPLOYED EQUITY)**		600	NPV([239],[236]:[236])/[237] * 1000													

CREATE AN ACTIVE INVESTMENT EDE DURING INCREASED INFLATION – TRIAL BALANCES

Exhibit A

Example 2, Schedule b

Lines [251]–[294]

Example 2 Trial balances 0 - 5		ref	0	Activity	Close	1	Activity	Close	2	Activity	Close	3	Activity	Close	4	Activity	Close	5
[251]	Asset Value	[201]*[256]	1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204
[252]	Accumulated Depreciation	[252]+[257]		(63)		(63)	(63)		(127)	(63)		(190)	(63)		(253)	(63)		(317)
[253]	Cash	-SUM([251]:[252],[254]:[260])		36		36	34		70	31		101	28		129	25		154
[254]	Debt	(([254]+[255])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[206]	(843)	19		(824)	21		(803)	23		(780)	25		(756)	27		(729)
[255]	Equit	(([254]+[255])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[204]	(361)	(12)	20	(353)	(5)	13	(344)	3	7	(334)	10	1	(324)	17	(6)	(312)
[256]	Operating Perform	[G] and then [256]*(1+3.8%)		(100)	100	0	(104)	104	0	(108)	108	0	(112)	112	0	(116)	116	0
[257]	Depreciation	[251]/19		63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0
[258]	Interest Expense	-[254]*4.5%		63	(63)	0	61	(61)	0	60	(60)	0	58	(58)	0	56	(56)	0
[259]	Cash Return	-[253]*8.5%		0	0	0	(3)	3	0	(6)	6	0	(9)	9	0	(11)	11	0
[260]	Income Tax	-SUM([256]:[259])*24%		(6)	6	0	(4)	4	0	(2)	2	0	(0)	0	0	2	(2)	0
[261]	Total	SUM([251]:[260])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 2 Trial balances 6 – 10		ref	5	Activity	Close	6	Activity	Close	7	Activity	Close	8	Activity	Close	9	Activity	Close	10
[262]	Asset Value	[251]	1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204
[263]	Accumulated Depreciation	[263]+[268]	(317)	(63)		(380)	(63)		(444)	(63)		(507)	(63)		(570)	(63)		(634)
[264]	Cash	-SUM([262]:[263],[265]:[271])	154	22		177	19		195	15		210	11		220	6		226
[265]	Debt	(([265]+[266])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[206]	(729)	29		(700)	31		(669)	34		(635)	37		(598)	40		(558)
[266]	Equit	(([265]+[266])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[204]	(312)	25	(12)	(300)	32	(19)	(287)	40	(25)	(272)	48	(32)	(256)	56	(39)	(239)
[267]	Operating Performance	[267]*(1+3.8%)	0	(120)	120	0	(125)	125	0	(130)	130	0	(135)	135	0	(140)	140	0
[268]	Depreciation	[251]/19	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0
[269]	Interest Expense	-[265]*4.5%	0	54	(54)	0	52	(52)	0	50	(50)	0	47	(47)	0	44	(44)	0
[270]	Cash Return	-[264]*8.5%	0	(13)	13	0	(15)	15	0	(17)	17	0	(18)	18	0	(19)	19	0
[271]	Income Tax	-SUM([267]:[270])*24%	0	4	(4)	0	6	(6)	0	8	(8)	0	10	(10)	0	12	(12)	0
[272]	Total	SUM([262]:[271])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 2 Trial balances 11 – 15		ref	10	Activity	Close	11	Activity	Close	12	Activity	Close	13	Activity	Close	14	Activity	Close	15
[273]	Asset Value	[251]	1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204
[274]	Accumulated Depreciation	[274]+[279]	(634)	(63)		(697)	(63)		(760)	(63)		(824)	(63)		(887)	(63)		(950)
[275]	Cash	-SUM([273]:[274],[276]:[282])	226	1		227	(4)		223	(10)		213	(16)		197	(23)		174
[276]	Debt	(([276]+[277])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[206]	(558)	44		(514)	47		(467)	51		(415)	56		(360)	61		(299)
[277]	Equit	(([276]+[277])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[204]	(239)	64	(45)	(220)	72	(52)	(200)	81	(59)	(178)	89	(65)	(154)	98	(72)	(128)
[278]	Operating Performance	[278]*(1+3.8%)	0	(145)	145	0	(151)	151	0	(156)	156	0	(162)	162	0	(169)	169	0
[279]	Depreciation	[251]/19	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0
[280]	Interest Expense	-[276]*4.5%	0	41	(41)	0	38	(38)	0	35	(35)	0	31	(31)	0	27	(27)	0
[281]	Cash Return	-[275]*8.5%	0	(19)	19	0	(19)	19	0	(19)	19	0	(18)	18	0	(17)	17	0
[282]	Income Tax	-SUM([278]:[281])*24%	0	14	(14)	0	17	(17)	0	19	(19)	0	21	(21)	0	23	(23)	0
[283]	Total	SUM([273]:[282])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 2 Trial balances 16 - 19		ref	15	Activity	Close	16	Activity	Close	17	Activity	Close	18	Activity	Close	19
[284]	Asset Value	[251]	1,204			1,204			1,204			1,204		(1,204)	0
[285]	Accumulated Depreciation	[285]+[290]	(950)	(63)		(1,014)	(63)		(1,077)	(63)		(1,140)	(63)	1,204	0
[286]	Cash	-SUM([284]:[285],[287]:[293])	174	(31)		143	(39)		104	(47)		57	(57)		0
[287]	Debt	(([287]+[288])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[206]	(299)	66		(233)	71		(162)	78		(84)	84		0
[288]	Equit	(([287]+[288])*(1+[211])+PMT([211], 19,-[251]))*[204]	(128)	107	(79)	(100)	116	(86)	(69)	126	(92)	(36)	135	(99)	0
[289]	Operating Performance	[289]*(1+3.8%)	0	(175)	175	0	(182)	182	0	(189)	189	0	(196)	196	0
[290]	Depreciation	[251]/19	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0	63	(63)	0
[291]	Interest Expense	-[287]*4.5%	0	22	(22)	0	17	(17)	0	12	(12)	0	6	(6)	0
[292]	Cash Return	-[286]*8.5%	0	(15)	15	0	(12)	12	0	(9)	9	0	(5)	5	0
[293]	Income Tax	-SUM([289]:[292])*24%	0	25	(25)	0	27	(27)	0	30	(30)	0	32	(32)	0
[294]	Total	SUM([284]:[293])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

all transactions occur at period end

CREATE A PASSIVE INVESTMENT EDE DURING INCREASED INFLATION

Exhibit A

Example 3, Schedule a

Lines [301]–[331]

		ref														
	OPERATING PERFORMANCE:															
[301]	Passive Operating Performance	[G]	$18													
[302]	Asset Value (beginning and ending)	[G]	361													
[303]	Equity Return "On" (inflation agent)	[301]/[302]		4.9%												
	PRIMARY ACCOUNTING STATEMENTS:															
	BALANCE SHEET		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	17	18	19
[304]	Passive Investment	[302]	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$0
[305]	Accumulated Depreciation	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[306]	Net Asset	SUM([304]:[305])	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	0
[307]	Cash	[309]-[306]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[308]	Assets	SUM([306]:[307])	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$0
[309]	Equity	[302]	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$0
	INCOME STATEMENT															
[310]	Operating Performance	[301]		$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18
[311]	Depreciation	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[312]	Interest Expense	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[313]	Cash Return	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[314]	Income Tax	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[315]	Net Income	SUM([310]:[314])		$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18
	CASH FLOW STATEMENT															
[316]	Net Income	[315]		$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18
[317]	Add Back: Depreciation	-[311]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[318]	Cash	[307]-[307]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[319]	Debt Issuance/(Repurchase)	[N/A]	$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[320]	Asset Purchase/Sale	- +[302]	(361)													361
[321]	Equity (Deploy)/Dividend	SUM([316]:[320])	($361)	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$18	$379
	EQUITY STATEMENT															
[322]	Beginning Equity	[325]		$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361
[323]	Net Income	[315]		18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
[324]	Equity Deploy/(Dividend)	-[321]	$361	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(379)
[325]	Ending Equity	SUM([322]:[324])	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$361	$0

	CORROBORATING ANALYTICS:															
[326]	Equity Return - discounted cash flow		4.9%	IRR([324]:[324])												
[327]	Equity Return - accrual net income		4.9%	Net Income PV $217 divided by Equity Outstand PV $4,386							$217	NPV([326],[323]:[323])	$4,386	NPV([326],[322]:[322])		
[328]	Equity Present Value - discounted cash flow		$361	-NPV([326],[324]:[324])												
[329]	Equity Capital Structure	[325]/[309]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

[330]	**EDE (EARNINGS to DEPLOYED EQUITY)**	600	NPV([326],[323]:[323])/[324] * 1000
[331]	**EDE AS A PRESENT VALUE OF EQUITY RETURN**	600	PV(4.9%, 19, -4.9%, 0) * 1000 = 4.940761418%

CREATE A PASSIVE INVESTMENT EDE DURING INCREASED INFLATION – TRIAL BALANCES

Exhibit A

Example 3, Schedule b

Lines [351]–[394]

Example 3 Trial balances 0 - 5		ref	0	Activity	Close	1	Activity	Close	2	Activity	Close	3	Activity	Close	4	Activity	Close	5
[351]	Asset Value	[237]	361			361			361			361			361			361
[352]	Accumulated Depreciation	[N/A]		0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[353]	Cash	-SUM([351]:[352],[354]:[360])		0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[354]	Debt	[N/A]	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[355]	Equity	[237]	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)
[356]	Operating Perform	[301]		(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0
[357]	Depreciation	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[358]	Interest Expense	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[359]	Cash Return	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[360]	Income Tax	[N/A]		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[361]	Total	SUM([351]:[360])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 3 Trial balances 6 – 10		ref	5	Activity	Close	6	Activity	Close	7	Activity	Close	8	Activity	Close	9	Activity	Close	10
[362]	Asset Value	[237]	361			361			361			361			361			361
[363]	Accumulated Depreciation	[N/A]	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[364]	Cash	-SUM([362]:[363],[365]:[371])	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[365]	Debt	[N/A]	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[366]	Equity	[237]	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)
[367]	Operating Perform	[301]	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0
[368]	Depreciation	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[369]	Interest Expense	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[370]	Cash Return	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[371]	Income Tax	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[372]	Total	SUM([362]:[371])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 3 Trial balances 11 – 15		ref	10	Activity	Close	11	Activity	Close	12	Activity	Close	13	Activity	Close	14	Activity	Close	15
[373]	Asset Value	[237]	361			361			361			361			361			361
[374]	Accumulated Depreciation	[N/A]	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[375]	Cash	-SUM([373]:[374],[376]:[382])	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[376]	Debt	[N/A]	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[377]	Equit	[237]	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)
[378]	Operating Perform	[301]	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0
[379]	Depreciation	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[380]	Interest Expense	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[381]	Cash Return	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[382]	Income Tax	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[383]	Total	SUM([373]:[382])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 3 Trial balances 16 - 19		ref	15	Activity	Close	16	Activity	Close	17	Activity	Close	18	Activity	Close	19
[384]	Asset Value	[237]	361			361			361			361		(361)	0
[385]	Accumulated Depreciation	[N/A]	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0
[386]	Cash	-SUM([384]:[385],[387]:[393])	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	(361)	361	0
[387]	Debt	[N/A]	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
[388]	Equit	[237]	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	18	(18)	(361)	379	(18)	0
[389]	Operating Perform	[301]	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0	(18)	18	0
[390]	Depreciation	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[391]	Interest Expense	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[392]	Cash Return	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[393]	Income Tax	[N/A]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[394]	Total	SUM([384]:[393])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

all transactions occur at period end

ACTIVE INITIAL NEGATIVE OPERATING PERFORMANCE DURING STABLE INFLATION

Exhibit A

Example 4, Schedule a

Lines [401]–[441]

		ref															
	INVESTMENT VALUATION:																
[401]	Oper Perform Proxy	PMT(8.5%,19,-1)*NPV(8.5%,[421]:[421])					$131										
[402]	Equity return	[G]	8.5%														
[403]	Income Tax rate	[G]	24%														
[404]	Equity return - pre-tax	[402]/(1-[403])		11.2%													
[405]	Equity Weighting	1-[410]		30%													
[406]	Weighted Equity return	[404]*[405]			3.4%												
[407]	Baseline Target - (Debt Cost)	[G]	2.0%														
[408]	Commercial Margin	[G]	2.5%														
[409]	Debt Cost	SUM([407]:[408])		4.5%													
[410]	Debt Weighting	[G]		70%													
[411]	Weighted Debt Cost	[409]*[410]			3.2%												
[412]	Capital Cost	SUM([406]:[411])				6.5%											
[413]	Return "On & Of" (RORO)	PMT([412], 19, -1)					0.093										
[414]	Asset Value	[401]/[413]						$1,400									
	PRIMARY ACCOUNTING STATEMENTS:																
	BALANCE SHEET		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	17	18	19	
[415]	Asset Value	[414]	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$1,400	$0	
[416]	Accumulated Depreciation	[416]+[422]		(74)	(147)	(221)	(295)	(368)	(442)	(516)	(589)	(663)	(737)	(1,253)	(1,326)	0	
[417]	Net Asset	SUM([416]:[417])	1,400	1,326	1,253	1,179	1,105	1,032	958	884	811	737	663	147	74	0	
[418]	Cash	[420]–[417]		34	66	95	121	144	164	180	193	201	205	90	49	0	
[419]	Assets	SUM([417]:[418])	$1,400	$1,361	$1,319	$1,274	$1,227	$1,176	$1,122	$1,064	$1,003	$938	$869	$238	$123	$0	
[420]	Equity & Debt	[420]*(1+[412])-PMT([412], 19,-[414])	$1,400	$1,361	$1,319	$1,274	$1,227	$1,176	$1,122	$1,064	$1,003	$938	$869	$238	$123	$0	
	INCOME STATEMENT																
[421]	Operating Performance	$131 proxy [G]		($233)	($204)	($171)	($134)	($93)	($48)	$118	$(67)	$121	$190	$944	$1,105	$1,283	
[422]	Depreciation	-[415]/19		(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	(74)	
[423]	Interest Expense	-[420]*70%*4.5%		(44)	(43)	(42)	(40)	(39)	(37)	(35)	(34)	(32)	(30)	(11)	(7)	(4)	
[424]	Cash Return	[418]*8.5%		0	3	6	8	10	12	14	15	16	17	11	8	4	
[425]	Income Tax	-SUM([421]:[424])*24%		85	77	68	58	47	35	(6)	38	(8)	(25)	(210)	(249)	(293)	
[426]	Net Income	SUM([421]:[425])		($266)	($240)	($212)	($182)	($148)	($111)	$17	$(120)	$24	$79	$660	$782	$917	
	CASH FLOW STATEMENT																
[427]	Net Income	[426]		($266)	($240)	($212)	($182)	($148)	($111)	$17	$(120)	$24	$79	$660	$782	$917	
[428]	Add Back: Depreciation	-[422]		74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	
[429]	Cash	[418]–[418]		(34)	(32)	(29)	(26)	(23)	(20)	(16)	(12)	(8)	(4)	34	41	49	
[430]	Debt Issuance/(Repurchase)	([420]–[420])*70%	980	(28)	(29)	(31)	(33)	(35)	(38)	(40)	(43)	(46)	(49)	(76)	(81)	(86)	
[431]	Asset Purchase	-[415]	(1,400)														
[432]	Equity (Deploy/Inject)/Dividend	SUM([427]:[431])	($420)	($254)	($228)	($199)	($167)	($133)	($95)	$35	$(102)	$44	$99	$692	$816	$954	
	EQUITY STATEMENT																
[433]	Beginning Equity	[436]		$420	$408	$396	$382	$368	$353	$337	$319	$301	$281	$104	$71	$37	
[434]	Net Income	[426]		(266)	(240)	(212)	(182)	(148)	(111)	17	(120)	24	79	660	782	917	
[435]	Equity Deploy/Inject/(Dividend)	-[432]	$420	254	228	199	167	133	95	(35)	102	(44)	(99)	(692)	(816)	(954)	
[436]	Ending Equity	SUM([433]:[435])	$420	$408	$396	$382	$368	$353	$337	$319	$301	$281	$261	$71	$37	$0	
	CORROBORATING ANALYTICS:																
[437]	Equity Return - discounted cash flow		8.5%	IRR([435]:[435])													
[438]	Equity Return - accrual net income		8.5%	Net Income PV $244 divided by Equity Outstand PV $2,869				$244	NPV([437],[435]:[435])			$2,869	NPV([437],[434]:[434])				
[439]	Equity Present Value - discounted cash flow		$420	-NPV([437],[435]:[435])													
[440]	Equity Capital Structure	[436]/[420]	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%		
[441]	Balance Sheet Ending Equity	[420]*(1-[410])	$420	$408	$396	$382	$368	$353	$337	$319	$301	$281	$261	$71	$37	$0	

ACTIVE INITIAL NEGATIVE OPERATING PERFORMANCE DURING STABLE INFLATION – TRIAL BALANCES

Exhibit A

Example 4, Schedule b

Lines [451]–[494]

Example 4 Trial balances 0 - 5		ref	0	Activity	Close	1	Activity	Close	2	Activity	Close	3	Activity	Close	4	Activity	Close	5
[451]	Asset Value	[414]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400
[452]	Accumulated Depreciation	[452]+[457]		(74)		(74)	(74)		(147)	(74)		(221)	(74)		(295)	(74)		(368)
[453]	Cash	-SUM([451]:[452],[454]:[460])		34		34	32		66	29		95	26		121	23		144
[454]	Debt	(([454]+[455])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[410]	(980)	28		(952)	29		(923)	31		(892)	33		(859)	35		(823)
[455]	Equit	(([454]+[455])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[405]	(420)	(254)	266	(408)	(228)	240	(396)	(199)	212	(382)	(167)	182	(368)	(133)	148	(353)
[456]	Operating Performance	[G]		233	(233)	0	204	(204)	0	171	(171)	0	134	(134)	0	93	(93)	0
[457]	Depreciation	[451]/19		74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0
[458]	Interest Expense	-[454]*4.5%		44	(44)	0	43	(43)	0	42	(42)	0	40	(40)	0	39	(39)	0
[459]	Cash Return	-[453]*8.5%		0	0	0	(3)	3	0	(6)	6	0	(8)	8	0	(10)	10	0
[460]	Income Tax	-SUM([456]:[459])*24%		(85)	85	0	(77)	77	0	(68)	68	0	(58)	58	0	(47)	47	0
[461]	Total	SUM([451]:[460])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 4 Trial balances 6 – 10		ref	5	Activity	Close	6	Activity	Close	7	Activity	Close	8	Activity	Close	9	Activity	Close	10
[462]	Asset Value	[414]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400
[463]	Accumulated Depreciation	[463]+[468]	(368)	(74)		(442)	(74)		(516)	(74)		(589)	(74)		(663)	(74)		(737)
[464]	Cash	-SUM([462]:[463],[465]:[471])	144	20		164	16		180	12		193	8		201	4		205
[465]	Debt	(([465]+[466])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[410]	(823)	38		(785)	40		(745)	43		(702)	46		(657)	49		(608)
[466]	Equit	(([465]+[466])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[405]	(353)	(95)	111	(337)	35	(17)	(319)	(102)	120	(301)	44	(24)	(281)	99	(79)	(261)
[467]	Operating Performance	[G]	0	48	(48)	0	(118)	118	0	67	(67)	0	(121)	121	0	(190)	190	0
[468]	Depreciation	[451]/19	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0
[469]	Interest Expense	-[465]*4.5%	0	37	(37)	0	35	(35)	0	34	(34)	0	32	(32)	0	30	(30)	0
[470]	Cash Return	-[464]*8.5%	0	(12)	12	0	(14)	14	0	(15)	15	0	(16)	16	0	(17)	17	0
[471]	Income Tax	-SUM([467]:[470])*24%	0	(35)	35	0	6	(6)	0	(38)	38	0	8	(8)	0	25	(25)	0
[472]	Total	SUM([462]:[471])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 4 Trial balances 11 – 15		ref	10	Activity	Close	11	Activity	Close	12	Activity	Close	13	Activity	Close	14	Activity	Close	15
[473]	Asset Value	[414]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400
[474]	Accumulated Depreciation	[474]+[479]	(737)	(74)		(811)	(74)		(884)	(74)		(958)	(74)		(1,032)	(74)		(1,105)
[475]	Cash	-SUM([473]:[474],[476]:[482])	205	(0)		205	(5)		200	(10)		190	(16)		174	(22)		152
[476]	Debt	(([476]+[477])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[410]	(608)	52		(556)	55		(501)	59		(442)	63		(380)	67		(313)
[477]	Equit	(([476]+[477])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[405]	(261)	161	(139)	(238)	229	(205)	(215)	304	(279)	(190)	387	(360)	(163)	478	(450)	(134)
[478]	Operating Performance	[G]	0	(266)	266	0	(352)	352	0	(447)	447	0	(552)	552	0	(669)	669	0
[479]	Depreciation	[451]/19	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0
[480]	Interest Expense	-[476]*4.5%	0	27	(27)	0	25	(25)	0	23	(23)	0	20	(20)	0	17	(17)	0
[481]	Cash Return	-[475]*8.5%	0	(17)	17	0	(17)	17	0	(17)	17	0	(16)	16	0	(15)	15	0
[482]	Income Tax	-SUM([478]:[481])*24%	0	44	(44)	0	65	(65)	0	89	(89)	0	115	(115)	0	143	(143)	0
[483]	Total	SUM([473]:[482])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Example 4 Trial balances 16 - 19		ref	15	Activity	Close	16	Activity	Close	17	Activity	Close	18	Activity	Close	19	
[484]	Asset Value	[414]	1,400			1,400			1,400			1,400		(1,400)	0	
[485]	Accumulated Depreciation	[485]+[490]	(1,105)	(74)		(1,179)	(74)		(1,253)	(74)		(1,326)	(74)	1,400	0	
[486]	Cash	-SUM([484]:[485],[487]:[493])	152	(28)		125	(34)		90	(41)		49	(49)		0	
[487]	Debt	(([487]+[488])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[410]	(313)	71		(242)	76		(166)	81		(86)	86		0	
[488]	Equit	(([487]+[488])*(1+[412])+PMT([412], 19,-[414]))*[405]	(134)	580	(549)	(104)	692	(660)	(71)	816	(782)	(37)	954	(917)	0	
[489]	Operating Performance	[G]	0	(799)	799	0	(944)	944	0	(1,105)	1,105	0	(1,283)	1,283	0	
[490]	Depreciation	[451]/19	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	
[491]	Interest Expense	-[487]*4.5%	0	14	(14)	0	11	(11)	0	7	(7)	0	4	(4)	0	
[492]	Cash Return	-[486]*8.5%	0	(13)	13	0	(11)	11	0	(8)	8	0	(4)	4	0	
[493]	Income Tax	-SUM([489]:[492])*24%	0	175	(175)	0	210	(210)	0	249	(249)	0	293	(293)	0	
[494]	Total	SUM([484]:[493])	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	all transactions occur at period end

SOLVING THE OPERATING PERFORMANCE BASIC VALUATION COMPONENT

Exhibit B

Solving an Operating Performance Proxy and Period One

Lines [501]–[507]

		ref			
[501]	Asset Value [414]	[G]	$1,400		
[502]	Return 'On & Of' [413]	[G]	0.093		
[503]	Oper Performance proxy	[501]*[502]		$131	
[504]	Proxy to Period One Factor	Equation 1		(0.560)	
[505]	Period One Oper Perform	[503]/[504]			($233)

Equation 1: PMT(8.5%, 19, -1)*NPV(8.5%, [506]:[506])

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
[506]	Operating Perform to Period One	[G]	100%	87%	73%	57%	40%	21%	-51%	29%	-52%	-81%	-114%	-151%	-191%	-237%	-287%	-343%	-405%	-474%	-550%

Cross Check with Exhibit A, Example 4, Line [421]:

[507]	Operating Performance	[505]*[506]	($233)	($204)	($171)	($134)	($93)	($48)	$118	($67)	$121	$190	$266	$352	$447	$552	$669	$799	$944	$1,105	$1,283

all transactions occur at period end

EBITDA Multiple Sensitivity Scenarios

Exhibit C
Lines [601]–[614]

			Exhibit A Examples		Sensitivity Scenarios	
			1	2	C [i]	C [ii]
[601]	EBITDA Multiple	ref [606]*[607]	14.0	12.0	15.2	24.0
[602]	Operating Performance Growth	[609]+[610]	3.8%	3.8% (1)	3.8%	9.2%
[603]	Debt Cost	[610]+[611]	4.5%	7.4%	4.5%	4.5%
[604]	Capital Cost	[Note 2]	6.5%	8.6%	5.7%	5.7%
[605]	Return 'On & Of'	PMT([604],[614], -1)	0.093	0.108	0.088	0.088
[606]	Net Multiple	1/[605]	10.7	9.2	11.4	11.4
[607]	Gross/Net Multiple Factor	[Note 3]	1.306	1.306	1.332	2.104
[608]	Equity Return Risk Profile	[118] & [G]	8.5%	8.5%	6.5%	6.5%
[609]	Growth Other Than Inflation	[103] & [G]	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	7.2%
[610]	Inflation	[102], [207] & [G]	2.0%	4.9%	2.0%	2.0%
[611]	Commercial Debt Margin	[111] & [G]	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
[612]	Income Tax	[117] & [G]	24%	24%	24%	24%
[613]	Debt Capital Structure	[109] & [G]	70%	70%	70%	70%
[614]	Investment Period Length (npr)	[G]	19	19	19	19

Note 1: Exhibit A, Example 1

Note 2: [608]/(1-[612])*(1-[613])+[603]*[613]

Note 3: PMT([608],[614],-1) * (1-(1+[602])^[614]/(1+[608])^[614])/([608]-[602])

all transactions occur at period end