Marriot corporation

2. Is the proposed restructuring consistent with management’s duty? 3. The instance describes two constructs of managers’ fiducial responsibility (p. 9) . Which do you prefer: the stockholder construct or the corporate construct? Does your stance make a difference in this instance? 4. Should Mr. Marriott recommend the proposed restructuring to the board? Marriott Corporation (A)

1. Why is Marriott’s main fiscal officer suggesting Project Chariot? What is your appraisal of MC’s fiscal status? Is this undertaking necessary for the company’s endurance? . 2. Is Project Chariot consistent with management’s duties? To bondholders? To stockholders? To the populace? 3. The instance describes two constructs of manager’s fiducial responsibility. Which do you prefer: the stockholder construct or the corporate construct? Does your stance make a difference in this instance? 4. Should Mr. Marriott recommend the proposed restructuring to the board? 5. Who will be affected by Project Chariot? Should MC do any grants to the bondholders?

——–

Ans. 1

Project Chariot involves a struggle of involvement between the stockholders and the bondholders since in this instance the debt being held by Marriott Corporation (MC) is hazardous. Undertaking Chariot aims to make MII with low debt and HMC with high debt. Thus bondholders will happen that their investing gets tied to risky existent estate assets whose grasp is unsure. Food direction which is a major section of MC remains with MII. Thus Project

Chariot aims to give stockholders the concern top and bondholders the real-estate downside. Hence this appears to be a instance of hazard shifting. Stockholders stand to derive while bondholders will lose if Project Chariot is implemented.

Ans. 2

This seems to be a instance of ‘ Cashing out’/’Wealth Transfer’ where the ‘ overall’ wealth is being transferred from the bond holders to the equity holders. The undermentioned points lead us to the way of it being a ‘ wealth transfer’ type of struggle: * Chariot will ensue in a loss to bondholders and a addition to stockholders as the bonds will be downgraded by evaluation bureaus and the returns of the bondholders will be attached to a to a great extent indebted responsibility * Total Debt will go more hazardous. and bonds will be downgraded to ‘ below investing grade’ degree

* MC would be divided into two separate companies. MII would make MC’s lodging. nutrient. and installations direction concerns. whereas HMC would retain MC’s existent estate retentions and its grants on toll roads and in airdromes. Hence bond holders will now hold a claim on merely the final payments of HMC and non MII. So. because of the above grounds ‘ Project Chariot’ seems like a instance of ‘ Wealth Transfer’ struggle of involvement.

Ans. 3

We believe in the wide position of director duty. We think that directors should non merely see the involvements of stockholders but besides the involvements of bondholders. employees. and other related parties. This duty is even more of import in the instance of a B2C company like Marriott. If they get…

1. If the Project Chariot is implemented i. e. Marriott is divided into 2 companies Marriott International (MI) with the hazard free net income bring forthing runing hotel and service concern while the other Host Marriott (HM) a would ain Marriott’s hotel and undeveloped existent estate concerns and other non service concerns. this will impact the undermentioned participants:

a) Stockholders:

Stockholder now have bulk interest in a corporation with a lower chance of default while all the hazard is transferred to debt holders. So all the hazardous investings are extremely leveraged with bond holders exposed to the hazard. On the other manus MI backed chiefly by stockholders equity and executing assets and therefore would be able to publish new debt increasing value for both stockholders and the corporation. Thus the stockholders would derive at the disbursal of bond holders and the equity value of the company would increase.

B) Bondholders

Bondholders had a batch to lose as harmonizing to Project Chariot about all the debt would be assigned to HM. Give the jobs in existent estate and hotel markets at that place was a concern of HM’s ability to run into its debt payment and there was a high chance of default. This meant that the hazard was issued at investing class but now was non backed by valuable assets of the companies which were to be spun off to MI which was to be backed by equity. The value of the bonds would worsen well and the bond holders would free a batch of their investing.

degree Celsius) Management (The Mariott brothers)

The direction additions from the spin off since it is able to divide its hard-pressed assets from the net income drive assets and there was a new company which was non under hurt therefore assisting them retain their direction places and start from abrasion. They can concentrate on nucleus concerns therefore bettering efficiency and value. vitamin D) The value of the whole company:

The spin off does non make value for the company as a whole but merely distributes the…

What: Under Project Chariot. Marriott Corporation (MC) would go two separate companies. The new company. Marriott International Incorporated (MII) . would dwell of MC’s lodging. nutrient. and installations direction concerns. every bit good as the direction of its life-care installations. The bing company. renamed Host Marriott Corporation (HMC) . would retain all MC’s existent estate retentions and its grants on toll roads and airdromes. Why: This undertaking is being proposed because the economic lag in the late eightiess and the 1990 existent estate market clang left MC having many freshly developed belongingss for which there were no purchasers. together with a monolithic load of debt. The new company (MII) would hold the fiscal strength to raise capital in order to take advantage of investing chances. The bing company (HMC) would take on the freshly developed belongingss and most of the bing debt.

HMC would be valued for the opportunity of grasp in the belongings retentions when the existent estate market recovered. non on the footing of net incomes. thereby cut downing the force per unit area to sell belongingss at down monetary values. 2- The fiducial responsibility of direction is to the stockholders because they are more than creditors ; they are the existent proprietors of the house. Management is entrusted with the duty to increase stockholder value and their chief focal point should be on puting in undertakings that accomplish that undertaking. As stated in the instance: " U. S. tribunals had held that corporations have no duties to safeguard the involvements of bondholders other than those spelled out by the footings of the bond indenture" .

3- I foremost looked at the initial market reaction ; the alteration ensuing from October 2. 1992 (pre-announcement) through October 7. 1992 (post-announcement) . I used October 7 for my initial market reaction because in 1992 many people may hold still relied on newspapers for investing information. In add-on. I assessed this narrow sum of clip individually because widening the scope of day of the months used to measure the alteration in monetary values may let other variables outside of Project Chariot to come into drama. However. I besides looked at a wider scope of clip [October 2. 1992 (pre-announcement) through December 31. 1992] . If you can reasonably presume no immaterial variables affected the monetary values during this clip. widening the scope of day of the months assessed can give an thought of the impact to monetary values after the initial market over/under-re…