

Ten Critical Challenges in Negotiating Successful Law Firm Mergers

By Blane R. Prescott, of MesaFive LLC

There are several well-publicized studies by leading accounting and consulting firms that have found 70% or more of corporate mergers failed to achieve their goals or even generate a return to shareholders. It isn't surprising, then, to learn that law firm mergers have a similarly low success rate. But why? How do law firm mergers go astray, and what can leaders learn from highly successful mergers?

Many lawyers assume mergers fail primarily due to implementation problems, after the merger has taken place. While implementation issues are challenging and pervasive, the real problems are fundamental flaws with the deal itself, which get hidden by a traditional corporate merger negotiation/due diligence process. The following is a summary of the most common, but not commonly understood, problems in analyzing and structuring mergers of law firms.

**“...the average law firm routinely overestimates
the benefits a merger will produce.”**

1. **Business Case:** The single biggest failure is the lack of a realistic business case - the summary of meaningful, achievable benefits to be realized through the merger. Overwhelmingly, the average law firm routinely overestimates the benefits a merger will produce. Why? Mergers sound sexy, seem bold, and are tangible proof of action by leaders in a profession often characterized by a lack of visible progress. But rather than analyze a combination through an objective, rigorous assessment of the benefits and drawbacks, too many firms get drawn into the excitement of merger negotiations and then rationalize a deal with a light analysis.

One common failure is that firms assume the merger itself will create value. But, as has been proven over and over, the mere structural combination of two firms achieves almost nothing by itself. The real test and questions leaders should be asking themselves, are:

- What will we do different after the merger, that we don't do now, to be more successful? Just having more resources rarely means that law firms use them effectively.
- Which partners will lead those efforts and be accountable for specific actions and specific results? Just as importantly, have those partners led similar efforts

before, and demonstrated their success (beyond just developing a large personal client base)?

- To make this merger successful, are we expecting significant culture shifts and new behaviors that we haven't been able to implement before?

Many firms spend only a few hours analyzing the business case, without doing any real testing of the same, and thereafter just repeat slogans ("after the merger we will be a market leader in X" or "we will have the largest practice in the Y market") rather than plan meaningful client or industry penetration strategies.

If one looks at the history of the profession, the lack of real planning isn't surprising: Law firms are often lightly managed, highly autonomous, have benefitted from a long-term sellers' market, and were successful more due to inertia and market conditions rather than developing/implementing new strategies. But mergers, especially in the rapidly evolving market, tend to create immediate competitive and integration challenges for even the best leaders. Those challenges test leadership's ability (or inability) to create real partner teamwork and accountability. Slogans are easy; successful merger integration is hard, messy, and requires aggressive actions and real accountability.

2. **Lost in Process:** Another common problem in negotiating mergers is that firms conduct multiple meetings, exchange war stories and bounce from topic to topic, but make little substantive integration progress. If you are a law firm leader who has had this experience, it just means you are human. In some ways, law firm mergers are more complex and challenging than corporate transactions, primarily because the performing assets are all people. The numbers, deal terms and hard asset side of a merger are easy, the people issues are far more complicated.

Law firm mergers require a different approach than a typical corporate merger. When done right – because firm leadership has followed a disciplined, methodical approach – some of the largest, most successful law firm mergers have been negotiated and structured in as little as three to four months. It is interesting to note that the longer merger negotiations take, there is an increased likelihood that the merger won't achieve its goals. If you don't have the benefit of prior experience in creating a *successful* merger, keep in mind four critical concepts:

- One, identify and resolve the big issues first, so you don't waste months negotiating a merger that has no chance of completion.
- Two, organize the discussions into three sequential, but overlapping, components: Business Case, Deal Structure (term sheet), and Integration. Of

those three, the Business Case and the Integration efforts will determine the success of the merger, far more so than the Deal Structure/term sheet.

- Three, keep in mind the one fact that separates mediocre deals from the most highly successful: Focus on the specific activities you will do together, and wherever needed, acknowledge how those are different and/or more difficult than your past. Verify with clients that they see value/benefit in your combination. If your integration teams keep talking hypothetically about what you *could* do, but don't get specific in terms of *who/when/how*, you are well down the path of creating yet another mediocre, underperforming merger. The worst combinations are almost always characterized by a lack of cultural and market position progression, and a lack of actual teamwork between predecessor firms.
 - Last, don't be afraid to walk away. Too many firm leaders find themselves negotiating deal terms for six months, on a marginal combination, but keep pushing forward because fear they will look foolish if they have invested so much time and don't produce a merger. If you handle the process right, bad deals should die after one to three meetings and die for all the right reasons.
3. **Don't Put Off the Hard Issues:** One of the most pervasive red flags in law firm mergers occurs when leaders run into a disagreement over a core philosophy or structural issue, and decide to run separate, parallel systems initially and deal with the harder issue of integration sometime *after* the merger. Examples of this often include partner compensation, leadership, debt/capital, long term strategy, partner performance standards, future investment priorities, etc. If you can't solve your major issues before the merger, then this is the best indicator you shouldn't be merging in the first place, or at the least, you should go back to the negotiating table and talk about what you are really trying to accomplish.

For too many firms, the negotiation of big issues becomes a juvenile argument of "if we use your structure on some issues then to be fair, we get to keep some of *our* structures/policies/ procedures," even if those structures/policies/procedures make no sense and have a proven history of destroying teamwork. Bad firm mergers are characterized by structures chosen primarily because they were "the way we have always done things." Successful mergers provide firms with a rare and unique opportunity to rapidly change and evolve, not just pick from the limited habits of their predecessors. Most successful leaders recognize and capitalize on this opportunity.

4. **Conflicts, Conflicts, Conflicts:** Most leaders understand that conflicts will be a time consuming, difficult issue to resolve, yet still most firms fail to start the conflicts check early enough, or to deal with conflicts effectively. The simple rule of thumb is, once the business case has been vetted, and you *think* you can come to agreement on the core

philosophical issues, start working on conflicts. And no, just checking the top 100 or 200 or 300 clients isn't good enough. The history of law firm "almost-mergers" has a shocking number of great combinations that were killed at the last minute over a tiny, but unsolvable, client conflict. Or worse, actual mergers accompanied by the last-minute departure of great rainmakers who were forced out due to a conflict.

"The merger of two middle market, midsize firms only creates a large middle market firm, not a dominant market leader."

5. **No Magic Beans:** Mergers *can be* one of the best strategic moves law firms can pursue. But they rarely cure pervasive ills that are present in predecessors, simply by virtue of the combination. For example:
- The merger of two middle market, midsize firms only creates a *large* middle market firm, not a "dominant market leader." Too many firms confuse cause with correlation when it comes to firm size or market position.
 - Firms with a poor track record of cross office cooperation/cross selling almost always become a larger dysfunctional firm, rather than a highly integrated, well-functioning team. If your historic cross-selling efforts were largely instigated by your clients, rather than by your lawyers, the odds are you aren't going to capitalize on the opportunities created by a merger unless you face up to fundamental shifts in your culture.

Firms can merge and solve their problems, but that is only accomplished when talented leaders honestly confront the difficult aspects of their culture/behavior that need to change, because the merger or size by itself won't do it for them.

6. **Not Too Big, Not Too Small, Just Right:** This issue isn't about the size of the combined firm, but rather, the size of the respective committees negotiating the merger. There is a high correlation between poorly thought out mergers and negotiations carried out by a team of two or three leaders from each side. Likewise, there is a high correlation between never-ending merger discussions and merger committees that each have 20 or more members. A core negotiating team of 5-8 people from each firm, assisted by several critical, ancillary sub-committees involving other partners, working on issues like Capital, Associates, Compensation, Tax, etc., has the strongest track record of success.
7. **The 20% Rule Has Been Muddied:** Many leaders are familiar with the rule of thumb that says, in order for a law firm merger to work, the profit per partner of the

predecessor firms should be within 20% of one another. The underlying concept is still relevant, but the evolution in titles/roles has muddied the waters.

- What is a partner?
- Do you count non-equity partners?
- What about your partners who are “special” cases (every firm has them)?

Rather than relying on a single number for this analysis, performing a slotting exercise in which individual partner performance and compensation statistics are slotted against similarly performing partners in the other firm is far more helpful. Admittedly, the exercise is relatively simple – what you then do with the results is more challenging. But this analysis can give you a clear indication of the philosophical and performance integration challenges you will encounter.

8. **Openly Admit Weaknesses:** Admitting weaknesses is one of the hardest issues for law firm leaders to address, since it goes against human nature and most peoples’ instincts about selling one’s self: Spend dedicated time talking about all of your respective weaknesses, faults, and problems, and do so honestly and openly with the other side early in the process. Hiding or downplaying problems are some of the most threatening problems in law firm mergers. Firms are better off revealing those issues before the merger (even if it puts the deal at risk), rather than allowing them to be discovered post-merger.

Discovering critical problems post-merger becomes far more complicated than just fixing the problems themselves – the discovery creates distrust, prompts suspicions about the competence of leaders who led the due diligence efforts, and invariably creates fertile ground for partners to believe any and all rumors about the weaknesses of “the other side.” If you have never conducted an open, honest discussion of your weaknesses, get some help and invest the time to do so constructively. It may sound intimidating, but oddly enough, this one effort produces the strongest foundations for a successful long-term merger.

9. **You Are as Well Known for Your Worst Lawyer as Your Best Lawyer:** Perhaps one of the most troubling lapses in the due diligence efforts of law firms is the failure to look at the reputation and quality of their potential merger partner. Lawyers tend to have strong critical opinions about other firms/partners in the normal course of business. But too often, once merger discussions commence, everyone is suddenly a star. This often happens because no one wants to embarrass the other side by asking to look at their work product, asking about their weak lawyers, talking to a cross section of clients, or seeing how they routinely staff and manage a project. But firms are far better off asking sensitive questions up front than in finding out post-merger that their new firm does sub-standard work or has predominantly small or short-term clients because they don’t

service them well. Leaders shouldn't underestimate the persistent, long term damage that can be done to their firm's reputation due to a lack of quality or service, even by just a few lawyers.

“Term sheets are important, but they virtually never predict or create the success of a law firm merger”

10. **Lawyers Think Term Sheets/Successful Leaders Think Integration and Strategy:** The adage, “when you are a hammer all the world looks like a nail,” applies to law firm mergers: The average partner tends to think of the negotiation of a term sheet as the core of merger negotiations. While term sheets are important, they virtually never predict or create the success of a law firm merger. That is one of the reasons many corporate lawyers, who are truly extraordinary at generating clients and doing corporate deals, fail when it comes to analyzing and executing law firm mergers. In fact, one of the most common characteristics of weak mergers is that the bulk of the negotiations primarily focus on the term sheet, while real integration and business planning are largely ignored or left as post-merger considerations.

Law firm mergers are far less like corporate deals (there are no meaningful assets being bought or sold), and far more like marriages. Yes, you can out-negotiate your future spouse. But just like a spouse, merger partners can and will walk away if the relationship doesn't work out and may do so even when it doesn't make immediate economic sense. The most successful law firm mergers are overwhelmingly characterized by a clear understanding and excitement about what they can build and achieve together. When firms argue over deal terms for months on end, or partners have to be incentivized to vote for a deal, it is often a sign that there are deep philosophical or structural differences that won't be overcome.

The intent of this article is not to discourage law firm leaders from pursuing a merger. Instead, it is to encourage leaders to understand how to do successful mergers, and not end up among the majority that fail to meet their goals (or worse, fail completely). Successful law firm mergers frequently produce extraordinary benefits almost immediately – literally within one to three months. Most of the best mergers have occurred because great leaders weren't afraid to ask hard questions, to run a rigorous assessment process, and to face up to the difficult decisions that need to be made first about *whether* to merge, and then if appropriate, *how* to merge.

Blane Prescott is a consultant and principle with MesaFive, LLC, a specialized management consulting firm serving law firms and in-house counsel in North America, Asia and Europe. For more information please contact the author at B.Prescott@MesaFive.com, or view our website at www.MesaFive.com.