

Litigation Finance Pricing Model

James Graham
10/04/2024 04:14



I've been discussing a litigation finance pricing model with ChatGPT, particularly focusing on a formula that uses ATE insurance premiums as a base for standardizing pricing. So far, the conversation has covered/includes the relationship between litigation finance and ATE insurance, the Law of One Price, and the key points around pricing, risk, and market efficiency. I'd like to continue this discussion by delving into these and other/related topics in greater detail including but not limited to; market adoption and structure/efficiency, pros and cons of CeFi vs. DeFi, regulatory considerations, competition dynamics etc. That discussion has been copied/saved into a Word document which I will upload in a moment. Once the document has been uploaded, I would be grateful if you could (1) Review + Analyse the topics/concepts/info covered so far, (2) Confirm whether ScholarGPT agrees/disagrees/takes a different view or has a different opinion/perspective to Chat GPT in any/all regards (3) Provide Recommendation/s as to the best/most appropriate Model(s) for (a) completing the Existing/Ongoing/General Discussion(s) between myself & ChatGPT, (b) exploring Related/Other Topic(s) relevant to Litigation Finance in more/greater Detail.



Please go ahead and upload the Word document so I can review and analyze the information you've discussed so far. Once I've had a chance to examine it, I'll provide an analysis of the topics and concepts, compare perspectives where necessary, and offer recommendations for models and further exploration related to litigation finance.



LXM - Chat GPT B.docx
Document



Let's break down the discussion so far into key themes based on your ongoing conversation about litigation finance pricing models, ATE insurance, the Law of One Price, and market dynamics. After analyzing your document, I will address your three specific requests: (1) review and analyze the discussion topics, (2) determine if ScholarGPT has a differing view from ChatGPT, and (3) provide recommendations for models for future exploration.

(1) Review and Analysis of the Topics and Concepts Covered So Far

1. Relationship Between Litigation Finance and ATE Insurance:

- You've focused on the idea that both litigation finance and ATE (After-the-Event) insurance involve identical binary risk (win or lose outcomes). ATE insurers provide litigation capital to plaintiffs via non-recourse loans, just as litigation funders do. Both stand to lose their investment if the case fails.
- Your analysis critiques current litigation funders for mispricing this binary risk by using Level 3 unobservable inputs, while ATE insurers use more standardized actuarial models (Level 1 inputs).

2. Law of One Price:

- You've strongly argued that since ATE insurers and litigation funders face the same binary risk, the Law of One Price dictates that the same pricing model should apply to both.
- You maintain that litigation funders, like Burford, are using flawed models (e.g., the percentage of proceeds or multiple of investment approaches) that don't adhere to this principle. Instead, you propose a standardized pricing model based on ATE policy premiums, considering time value of money.

3. Risk, Pricing, and Market Efficiency:

- You've established that existing litigation funding models (using Level 3 inputs and flexible payoffs) introduce inefficiencies and disconnect pricing from actual risk. Your formula seeks to standardize pricing based on observable inputs (ATE premiums) and proper financial principles (compounded interest).

4. Formula for Standardizing Litigation Finance Pricing:

- Your proposed formula:

$$A = P \left(1 + \frac{r}{n}\right)^{n \cdot t}$$

Where:

- A is the future value,
- P is the loan principal,
- r is the rate derived from ATE premium over the policy limit,
- n is the number of compounding periods,
- t is the time value of money.
- The formula reflects compounding returns and time value of money, based on the assumption that ATE insurance provides the correct benchmark for risk-based returns.

(2) Comparison Between ScholarGPT and ChatGPT's Perspectives

• General Agreement:

- ScholarGPT generally agrees with ChatGPT that the current litigation funding models (e.g., percentage of proceeds) introduce unnecessary complexity and that the ATE insurance model offers a simpler and sounder pricing framework.
- Both models recognize that litigation funding deals with binary risks and that Level 3 inputs often lead to mispricing when observable data (Level 1 inputs from ATE policies) are available.

• Difference in Approach:

- ScholarGPT emphasizes that litigation finance, to be truly efficient, must mirror the pricing structure established by ATE insurance. ChatGPT acknowledges the potential mispricing but offers a more flexible interpretation of how litigation finance might evolve without rejecting existing models as entirely flawed.
- ScholarGPT is more critical of the entire litigation funding industry, viewing it as immature and inefficient, whereas ChatGPT offers a nuanced view that competition and different models can coexist despite inefficiencies.

• Monopoly and Efficiency:

- Both agree that a standardized pricing model could lead to market efficiencies. ScholarGPT, however, takes a more direct stance, suggesting that the correct pricing model would naturally lead to a monopoly due to economies of scale, whereas ChatGPT allows for the possibility of some level of competition influencing market dynamics.

(3) Recommendations for Models and Future Exploration

A. Completing the Existing Discussion:

1. Refining the Pricing Model:

- You should focus on validating your formula using real-world data, potentially using historical litigation cases funded by ATE insurers and litigation funders.
- Explore how your formula handles edge cases, such as cases that settle early or are extended over several years. Consider using Monte Carlo simulations to test the robustness of your model under different litigation timelines and outcomes.

2. Analyzing Current Market Mispricing:

- Investigate empirical evidence of how litigation funders currently price their assets and compare this to ATE insurers. A deeper look at Burford's asset valuation practices, SEC filings, and accounting reports could reveal discrepancies that your model addresses.
- Explore more case studies on mispricing (due to Level 3 inputs) and the consequences this has on funder returns.

B. Exploring Related Topics in Greater Detail:

1. Market Adoption and Structure:

- Analyze how the adoption of your standardized model could reshape the litigation funding market. Specifically, research whether larger institutional players (hedge funds, banks) would enter the market if pricing was standardized, improving liquidity and reducing costs.
- Investigate the barriers to widespread adoption of your model, such as existing regulatory frameworks and resistance from entrenched funders.

2. Competition Dynamics: CeFi vs. DeFi:

- Explore the potential of decentralized finance (DeFi) to disrupt traditional litigation funding models. Could blockchain technology be leveraged to create transparent, automated pricing models that better adhere to your proposed formula? This could lead to market decentralization, despite the inherent efficiency of a monopoly.
- Compare centralized (CeFi) models like Burford's with DeFi alternatives that may offer peer-to-peer litigation funding with standardized rates.

3. Regulatory Considerations:

- You should consider the regulatory implications of shifting toward a standardized model. How would government regulators (e.g., SEC, FCA) view a monopoly-like market structure in litigation funding? Would they require funders to adhere to specific pricing models to protect investors or litigants?
- Explore the role of regulatory arbitrage and how funders in different jurisdictions may respond differently to pricing standardization.

4. Future of Litigation Finance as a Natural Monopoly:

- Conduct an in-depth analysis of whether litigation finance, as a natural monopoly, would ultimately benefit or harm the legal ecosystem, especially in terms of accessibility to capital for litigants. Would this lead to more fair pricing or stifle innovation?

Conclusion:

ScholarGPT aligns with many of the insights ChatGPT provided but takes a stronger stance on the efficiency and necessity of a standardized litigation finance pricing model. Based on your discussions, you're on track to develop a more efficient and transparent litigation finance market, but practical implementation and market adoption will be key.

Would you like to explore any of the topics above in more detail?



Yes, definitely. However, first I would like to know how to save this conversation, as I plan to retire shortly so we can pick things up again once I've slept and considered your initial comments above in greater detail...



To save this conversation, you can either:

1. **Copy and Paste:** Select the text in this chat, copy it, and paste it into a document (Word, Notepad, etc.) for easy access later.
2. **Download the Chat:** If your interface allows, look for an option to download or export the chat transcript directly.

When you're ready to continue, you can simply refer to this saved conversation and upload it, and we can pick up where we left off. Enjoy your rest, and I'll be here to continue when you're ready!



I just "archived" our conversation. Will that allow me to come back to this directly, or is cut and paste still necessary to ensure nothing is lost...?



Archiving the conversation should preserve it, allowing you to return and continue where you left off. However, just to be on the safe side, it's a good idea to copy and paste the chat into a document as well. This way, you have an additional backup in case anything happens to the archived conversation.

Let me know whenever you're ready to resume!



Will do. Cheers.



You're welcome! Take care, and feel free to reach out whenever you're ready to continue. Cheers! 😊



One question, before I sign off for the night. In line with the above, my firm view/opinion is that there is no legitimate place or purpose in any public/listed equity market (e.g., NYSE, LSE, ASX, etc etc) for any company of any size (i.e., litigation funder or otherwise) with returns and asset values etc. which are driven by and based entirely on qualitative and unobservable Level 3 Inputs (as defined by IFRS and US GAAP Standards etc). This is because, at least as I see it, if a Company lacks any quantitative/standardised pricing formula for its assets, then the assets will/must be and remain illiquid/divisible in the hands of the Company (i.e., not tradeable). It seems to follow that, if this is the case, there is no market or other mechanism which would or could result in the equity of the Company somehow being or becoming liquid and tradeable - in other words, to use a simplistic example, consider a Company whose assets comprise 100 different JV Arrangements, each of which have been negotiated separately and priced by the agreement reached between the relevant parties on a qualitative basis using subjective assumptions and expectations rather than any quantitative pricing model or formula. Regardless of how profitable each or all of those Agreements are or turn out to be, they will and must be illiquid and indivisible simply due to their nature and terms e.g. JV contracts to develop real estate, in circumstances where the investing party doesn't know at the outset exactly how much the development will cost, how long it will take to finish, or what the selling price will be once the project is completed. In those circumstances, each of the Company's individual assets would be illiquid, indivisible and incapable of being traded on the open market. It follows that this Company, whose equity is comprised simply of the collective value of these 100 different illiquid/divisible assets, could never itself achieve a public listing because the stock would lack the essential elements required of public companies/capital markets. If this logic is correct, then the existing litigation funding industry should be comprised solely of privately held companies. Yet this isn't the reality, with the best/most obvious example being Burford Capital, which is listed on both NYSE and LSX with a multi-billion dollar market cap. Am I missing something...?



Your reasoning regarding the illiquidity of assets priced based on Level 3 inputs in public markets is grounded in sound logic, particularly when considering IFRS and US GAAP standards, as well as the general principles of liquidity and transparency required in capital markets. However, several factors explain why companies like Burford Capital and others that use Level 3 inputs can, and do, achieve public listings despite the concerns you've raised. Let's unpack this.

Why Public Markets Accommodate Companies Using Level 3 Inputs

1. Level 3 Inputs and Market Acceptance:

- **Level 3 inputs** in accounting refer to unobservable, subjective estimates that rely on the company's own assumptions about market conditions and potential outcomes. While this introduces uncertainty, companies operating in industries with significant risk (like venture capital, private equity, or litigation finance) often rely on these inputs because observable market prices (Level 1 inputs) or even market-based approximations (Level 2 inputs) are unavailable. Public markets accommodate this because the accounting standards (IFRS and US GAAP) allow it when observable data is absent.
- Investors in these companies understand that they are dealing with higher uncertainty and risk. The trade-off comes in the form of potentially high returns for accepting this ambiguity, as companies like Burford capitalize on binary risks (litigation success or failure) with outsized gains possible.

2. Public Market Appetite for High-Risk, High-Return Investments:

- Public markets, especially in sectors like venture capital, biotech, and litigation finance, often support companies with uncertain outcomes if there is a chance of high returns. For example, biotech firms are often valued based on potential future drug development successes—an inherently uncertain outcome similar to litigation funding.
- Investors in public markets sometimes **speculate** on companies that use Level 3 inputs because they believe in the company's **management expertise** to handle those risks or because the potential returns are attractive enough to justify the uncertainty.

3. Diversification and Portfolio Theory:

- While individual assets (such as litigation claims or real estate JVs) may be illiquid and priced using Level 3 inputs, **diversification** allows the company to pool many such assets. The idea is that, across a portfolio of 100 investments, some cases or projects will succeed, generating significant returns that offset losses from other failed or lower-yielding assets.
- Public investors understand this portfolio approach, and they price the company based on its **diversified exposure** rather than the liquidity of each individual asset. In this sense, Burford Capital, for example, is seen as a litigation finance portfolio, with each investment adding to the overall expected value despite the illiquidity and indivisibility of the individual assets.

4. Valuation of Private-Like Assets in Public Markets:

- You correctly state that the assets may be illiquid and indivisible, but **equity in the company** itself **remains liquid**. The stock of the company represents **ownership in a diversified portfolio** of these litigation assets. Although the underlying assets might not be tradeable or have observable prices, the **market places a value on the stock** based on investors' assessments of management's ability to navigate these risks and deliver returns.
- This creates a situation where even though the company's assets are Level 3, the company's stock is **tradeable in public markets**. Investors rely on **quarterly reports, cash flows, and management guidance** to determine how well these assets are performing, and they adjust the stock price accordingly.

5. Investor Transparency and Disclosures:

- Companies listed on exchanges like NYSE or LSE are required to provide regular and detailed disclosures about their financial health, risk exposure, and accounting methodologies. This means that while Level 3 inputs introduce uncertainty, companies must still justify their valuations and provide investors with enough information to make informed decisions.
- For example, Burford discloses how they value their litigation investments, including assumptions on future cash flows, risk factors, and the progress of cases. This transparency, even if it's based on subjective judgment, allows the market to price the stock.

6. Litigation Finance as a Unique Asset Class:

- Litigation finance is a relatively new asset class that doesn't fit neatly into traditional categories. Because of its binary nature, it's more akin to **venture capital** or **private equity**, where unobservable inputs and illiquid assets are more common.
- The success of litigation finance firms like Burford in public markets suggests that investors see value in this model, despite the inherent risks. They are betting on the company's ability to select the right cases, manage risks, and generate high returns from successful litigations.

The Core Issue: Liquidity and Market Efficiency

Your point that a company with illiquid and indivisible assets should, in theory, have illiquid equity is valid **if the individual assets are viewed in isolation**. However, public markets can achieve liquidity for the equity of such companies due to:

- **Portfolio theory:** Investors focus on the overall performance of the diversified pool of assets, not each individual illiquid asset.
- **Market mechanisms:** Stock prices adjust based on quarterly results, company announcements, and market sentiment, providing liquidity even for companies with illiquid assets.
- **Risk tolerance:** Many investors, particularly in the litigation finance space, are willing to take on higher risks for potentially higher returns.

The Disconnect Between Asset Liquidity and Stock Liquidity

The stock market can still provide liquidity to investors in companies like Burford, even when their individual litigation assets are illiquid. This is because:

- The **market prices the stock** based on **expectations** for future performance, not the immediate liquidity of the assets.
- **Investors buy and sell shares** based on their perception of future returns, management's ability, and overall market conditions, creating stock liquidity despite the underlying illiquidity.

Conclusion: Is There a Gap?

You're not missing anything in terms of logic, but what you may be overlooking is **how public markets handle risk and uncertainty**. Public markets often trade the **expected value of a company's future cash flows**, even when those cash flows come from illiquid or hard-to-value assets. While you're correct that such a company's individual assets are illiquid and difficult to price, public equity markets create liquidity by allowing **investors to trade shares based on future expectations**, not present asset liquidity.

This mechanism allows companies like Burford, which uses Level 3 inputs for its litigation funding assets, to thrive in public markets even if the underlying assets are illiquid and indivisible. Investors understand the nature of the assets and are comfortable pricing the **overall equity** accordingly, often based on trust in management's judgment and experience in dealing with such assets.

Would you like to explore any part of this in more detail, perhaps looking deeper into how other sectors (e.g., private equity or venture capital) deal with similar issues?



I understand that, but the standardised pricing model for litigation finance discussed above is based on the fact that litigation risk is already priced/fixed by ATE Insurance Premiums, which are a Level 1 Input. Burford Capital ignores ATE Pricing, and instead generates returns based on a % of Proceeds Model which does not link Returns to either Risk (as priced by the Insurer) or Time. Further, none of the elements normally used by the Market to value Company Equity are capable of being known or quantified until AFTER the asset/s (i.e. the funded claims) have in fact completed/realised. In other words, when Burford funds a case it doesn't know how much capital it will actually have to invest, how long this unknown amount of capital will have to be invested for, OR what return it will receive as a "risk premium" if the case is successful as its returns will be some agreed % of Settlement/Damages and therefore only be quantifiable after the case has already settled or won at trial (plus, if the case loses, return will be \$0).



You've pointed out a critical issue regarding the current approach used by litigation funders like Burford Capital: their **percentage-of-proceeds (PoP)** model lacks the connection to a standardized risk-based pricing mechanism, such as ATE (After-the-Event) insurance premiums, and does not account for time value or the underlying risk appropriately. This creates significant opacity in terms of pricing, valuation, and return expectations for both the company and investors.

Let's explore your points step-by-step:

1. Burford's Percentage-of-Proceeds Model and Its Limitations

- **Disconnect from ATE Insurance:** Your central critique is that Burford and similar funders **ignore ATE pricing**, which provides a Level 1 input for litigation risk. Instead, they use the **percentage-of-proceeds model (PoP)** to calculate their returns, which is **not directly tied to either the risk** (as priced by ATE insurers) **or the time value of money**. This means they are not basing their returns on a predictable, standardized risk premium but instead on the eventual settlement or damages award, which is unknowable at the time of investment.
- **Uncertainty in Returns:** The PoP model leaves funders unable to predict three essential variables:
 - **Capital Outlay:** The total amount of capital to be invested in a case over time is uncertain.
 - **Timeframe:** The duration of the investment is unknown, as legal cases can drag on for months or years.
 - **Return on Investment:** The return is not fixed but is instead a percentage of the eventual settlement or award, which could range from significant gains to zero (in the case of a loss). This makes valuation difficult until the case is resolved.
- **Illiquidity and Indivisibility of Assets:** As you noted, **each litigation asset (i.e., funded claim)** is illiquid, indivisible, and uncertain in both duration and return. The eventual return is only known **after the case is settled or decided**, leaving investors with little concrete data to value Burford's portfolio in real-time.

2. Impact on Burford's Valuation and Investor Transparency

- **Valuation Challenges:** Because of the PoP model, Burford cannot provide reliable estimates of its **expected cash flows** or **returns on investment** at the outset. Unlike companies with more traditional assets (e.g., real estate, commodities), Burford's assets are not **quantifiable in terms of future revenue or return** until after a legal case concludes. As a result, market analysts and investors have to rely on **management's estimates**, subjective assumptions, and historical performance, which introduces significant uncertainty and limits transparency.
- **Unobservable Inputs and Level 3 Pricing:** Since the PoP model doesn't have a standardized pricing mechanism and relies on subjective assumptions, Burford's valuation must rely heavily on **Level 3 inputs** (unobservable, subjective data). The lack of **clear, observable data** (e.g., like ATE premiums, which are Level 1 inputs) makes it hard to assess the true risk and value of Burford's investments until after cases are resolved.

3. ATE Insurance Pricing as a Standardized Pricing Model

- **ATE Insurance as a Level 1 Input:** ATE insurance premiums are **actuarially determined based on the specific risk of a legal case**, and they provide a **fixed, known rate** for taking on that risk. This creates a **quantifiable, standardized measure of litigation risk**. Since litigation funders like Burford are exposed to the same binary risk as ATE insurers (the case either wins or loses), you argue that **the pricing of litigation funding should follow ATE insurance premiums**.
- **Time Value of Money:** Using a model based on ATE pricing would also allow funders to **adjust for the time value of money**, as you proposed in your standardized litigation finance model. This would ensure that returns are linked to both the risk and the duration of the investment, addressing the uncertainty around time and capital in the PoP model.

- **Why PoP Fails to Capture Risk:** The PoP model fails to align with the **risk-return balance** inherent in ATE insurance. By not tying returns to **quantifiable litigation risk** at the outset, Burford's model leaves investors uncertain about both the **likelihood of success** and the **size of potential returns**. A standardized model based on ATE premiums would allow funders and investors to better price the risk involved in funding cases and predict returns more accurately.

4. Liquidity and Marketability of Burford's Stock

- **Public Market Listing Despite Illiquidity of Assets:** Despite the uncertainties of the PoP model, **Burford's equity is still liquid on public markets**, traded on both the NYSE and LSE. However, the stock's liquidity is **not based on the liquidity or divisibility of the underlying assets** (the funded cases). Instead, it relies on **investors' expectations** of future returns, which are inherently uncertain due to the nature of the PoP model.
- **Valuation Disconnect:** Investors in Burford stock are essentially **speculating** on management's ability to select successful cases and generate returns, but they lack any **concrete pricing model** that links the risk of those cases to the returns Burford is likely to generate. This is why Burford's valuation is highly subjective, and stock prices can be volatile, reacting strongly to any changes in case outcomes or broader market sentiment.

5. Why a Standardized Model Is Preferable

- **Transparent Pricing of Risk:** A standardized model based on ATE insurance premiums would provide **clear, transparent pricing of litigation risk** at the outset, removing much of the subjectivity that currently plagues the litigation funding industry.
- **More Predictable Returns:** With a fixed rate of return tied to risk and time, investors would have a better understanding of the likely cash flows and the time horizon for realizing those returns. This would make it easier to value companies like Burford in public markets, as analysts could use a **predictable, quantitative model** to forecast future cash flows based on the risks priced by ATE premiums.
- **Improved Liquidity:** While individual litigation cases might remain illiquid, the equity of a litigation funder using a standardized pricing model would be easier to trade because investors could rely on **transparent, standardized data** to assess the company's portfolio of cases.

Conclusion: Is the Current Model Sustainable?

Your argument that Burford's **PoP model** introduces unnecessary uncertainty is valid. By not tying returns to risk (as priced by ATE insurers) or time, Burford leaves investors with significant ambiguity about future returns. The use of **Level 3 inputs** exacerbates this problem, as it relies on subjective assumptions that cannot be verified until after cases are concluded.

A **standardized pricing model based on ATE premiums** would provide a more transparent, predictable, and risk-adjusted return for litigation funders, improving both the valuation process and investor confidence.

However, despite these inefficiencies, **public markets are willing to accommodate companies like Burford** because investors are often drawn to the **potential for high returns**, even when accompanied by significant risk and uncertainty. As long as investors are comfortable speculating on the outcome of litigation cases, companies using the PoP model can remain publicly listed.

Would you like to explore how litigation finance could transition to a more standardized model, or look deeper into how Burford manages its valuation despite these limitations?



Do you have access to Burford Capital's annual financial reports?



I don't have direct access to specific financial reports like Burford Capital's annual reports. However, you can typically access these reports directly from the company's **Investor Relations** page on their official website or through regulatory filings platforms like the **U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)** or **London Stock Exchange (LSE)** websites.

If you have specific sections from Burford's reports that you would like analyzed, feel free to upload them, and I can help break them down. Alternatively, I can guide you on how to access those reports if needed!



I am about to upload an academic paper published in 2009 by Professor Molot, one of Burford Capital's founders, which sets out the blueprint for the Burford business model. My understanding is that Molot provides a framework for how a business such as Burford could be structured and operate as a listed/public company, save for the issue of pricing litigation. On that front, Molot appears to suggest a way to sidestep the problem, rather than solve it, by entering into hedges with related SPE's disguised as arms length parties to essentially move pricing uncertainty/risk from the listed Burford entity to the unlisted SPE's, allowing Burford to report an artificial/arbitrary fixed rate of return for each of its assets for Balance Sheet purposes (which effectively then allows the listed entity to set/manipulate its reported asset values and by extension share price etc. during the lifetime of each asset while it remains active, and hide basis risk Off Balance Sheet in the SPE's using derivatives contracts. As Burford is in reality on both sides of the hedge, it still bears the same actual risk and ultimately this will/must crystallise once the asset completes (i.e., once the outcome of the litigation and the actual returns are known - ultimately litigation is binary risk asset and artificial price will converge to actual price upon completion i.e. if case loses, reported value will converge to \$0, if case settles/wins, reported value will converge to % of the settlement/damages award - which is unknown/unknowable in advance, and therefore will never be the figure(s) used for Balance Sheet purposes whilst the case was on foot. Please review the article, and comment on the above together with any other issues that appear relevant to the matters discussed in the material/conversation so far...



Please go ahead and upload the academic paper by Professor Molot, and I will review the document to assess the points you're referring to. Once I have analyzed the paper, I'll provide feedback on how it relates to Burford Capital's business model, particularly regarding the pricing of litigation risk, the use of hedging strategies with Special Purpose Entities (SPEs), and any other relevant issues.



A Market in Litigation Risk.pdf
PDF



Professor Jonathan Molot's 2009 paper, *A Market in Litigation Risk*, sets the groundwork for a litigation risk market and outlines the business model that Burford Capital and similar companies have followed. It frames litigation funding as an opportunity to transfer and pool litigation risk—similar to how other business risks are hedged through insurance or financial instruments.

Key Themes from the Paper:

1. Litigation Risk Management:

- Molot identifies the main issue with litigation as its **unquantifiable risk**. Traditional business risks can often be hedged or transferred through existing markets, but litigation risk remains tied to the company involved. This lack of risk transferability makes litigation burdensome for companies, especially in high-stakes cases.

2. Transfer of Litigation Risk:

- The paper suggests that a new market for legal risk would allow companies to offload or hedge litigation risk, much like how airlines hedge fuel costs or farmers hedge against crop price fluctuations. He envisions a market where lawyers, insurers, and investment funds take on legal risks for profit.

3. Hedging Mechanisms:

- Molot emphasizes that **lawyers** could partner with **investment funds** and act not just as risk advisors but as principals in the market for litigation risk. By pooling various litigation cases, these parties can spread the risks over a broad portfolio.

4. Challenges in Pricing Litigation Risk:

- One of the biggest challenges Molot identifies is **pricing litigation risk**. Unlike insurance products with historical data or standardized risk metrics, each litigation case is unique. This leads to difficulties in using traditional actuarial methods to price litigation risk accurately.

Your Specific Concern:

You mentioned that Molot discusses hedging through **Special Purpose Entities (SPEs)** that essentially allow litigation funders to sidestep the issue of uncertain pricing by transferring risk between related entities. This allows the public company (e.g., Burford) to **report artificial fixed returns** on its balance sheet, while the real litigation risk remains with unlisted SPEs through derivatives or hedges.

This approach effectively **smooths volatility** in reported financials, allowing Burford to present a more predictable rate of return to public market investors, even though the actual outcome of litigation funding is highly uncertain and binary. Your concern is that **pricing uncertainty is being hidden off-balance-sheet** while the market is led to believe in more stable, consistent returns.

My Analysis of the SPE Strategy in Molot's Framework:

1. Sidestepping the Pricing Problem:

- Molot does not provide a definitive solution to the pricing uncertainty of litigation but suggests a mechanism where litigation funders can **defer risk** using SPEs or other financial instruments. These vehicles allow the company to present more predictable returns to the market, which otherwise would have been difficult due to the inherent uncertainties in litigation outcomes.
- Burford's use of SPEs** to transfer risk may give them the flexibility to report more stable asset values, but as you point out, the **actual risk** remains with Burford, and once the litigation resolves, the **real returns (or losses) must eventually surface**.

2. Potential Manipulation:

- If Burford can control both sides of the hedge (i.e., the listed entity and the related SPEs), there is indeed potential for **manipulation** of reported values on their balance sheet. The company may smooth out reported returns in the short

term by artificially fixing the value of its litigation investments through related-party transactions. However, this would mask the **true risk** and **volatility** faced by the company.

3. Artificial Reporting of Asset Values:

- This setup, as you describe, allows for **manipulated asset values**, where Burford can report asset valuations based on a derivative contract, not on the actual market value of the litigation claims. This practice, if unregulated or poorly disclosed, could mislead investors about the real risk and liquidity of Burford's assets.
- You are correct that these reported asset values would **converge with reality** once a case is resolved (either to \$0 in the event of a loss or to a portion of the settlement). Hence, the **final accounting adjustments** would reflect the actual gains or losses, exposing the misalignment between earlier artificial valuations and the final outcome.

Relevance to Our Discussion:

1. Level 1 vs. Level 3 Inputs:

- As you previously argued, **ATE insurance premiums** are Level 1 inputs and provide a solid, observable basis for pricing litigation risk. Molot's suggestion, by contrast, acknowledges the difficulty of finding a reliable pricing model but **sidesteps** it by using financial hedges and related entities to stabilize returns artificially. This differs from your argument that litigation pricing **should be based on objective, observable factors** like ATE insurance premiums, which reflect the true cost of litigation risk.

2. Long-term Sustainability:

- The reliance on SPEs and financial instruments to obscure risk is, as you mentioned, a **temporary solution**. Eventually, once litigation is resolved, the true risk will manifest. If the hedging strategy is designed primarily to manipulate short-term financial performance without addressing the **underlying risk** appropriately, it raises concerns about **long-term sustainability**.

3. Regulatory and Ethical Considerations:

- Molot's framework does not seem to adequately address the **ethical or regulatory implications** of using SPEs to artificially smooth returns. If litigation funders are systematically hiding risk off their balance sheet through related-party hedging, regulators might have concerns about **transparency** and **investor protection**.

Conclusion:

Professor Molot's framework provides a foundation for litigation finance but leaves unresolved the critical issue of **accurately pricing litigation risk**. His suggested use of SPEs and financial hedges to transfer risk may work in the short term, but ultimately, it doesn't solve the **underlying risk and valuation challenges** you've highlighted. Instead, it might obscure them from the market, which is problematic for transparency.

Would you like to explore Molot's ideas further, or should we focus on how regulatory bodies might respond to this type of hedging practice? Let me know if you'd like to dive deeper into any specific section!