



**ASSESSMENT REPORT
FOR THE
AB INBEV GOUP PLC**

REPORT PROXY	
Name of region	
Name of country	
Name of University/Institute	
Name of team	
Key regions	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Africa 2. Rest of Africa 3. Asia 4. Oceania 5. EU & larger Europe 6. North America 7. South America 8. Middle East 	

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND SUBMISSION FORMAT

We seek to highlight the centrality of teamwork, creativity, presentation skills, business acumen as well as the value of taking a holistic and strategic approach to management. The CharterQuest Competency Framework for *grooming financially qualified business leaders* has guided the report marking as below:

PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN	Finance & Technical	Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial	Ethics & People	Presentation (incl. Question & Answers)	Innovation & Integration	Decisiveness & Leadership	Total
Strategic analysis (<i>Prioritisation & focus</i>)	5%	10%					15%
Strategic choice (<i>Impact & options evaluation</i>)	10%	10%	10%	10%	5%		45%
Strategic implementation (<i>Recommendation & Actions</i>)			5%	10%	5%	20%	40%
	15%	20%	15%	20%	10%	20%	100%

To better interpret the above marking grid and submit a good quality and competitive report, each team was advised to watch *The CFO Case Study Competition* 'Master Class Videos' published on our [You Tube Channel](#). These are labeled Master Class Video 1 of 2 Scene 1 of 3, Scene 2 of 3 and Scene 3 of 3 as well as Master Class Video 2 of 2.

PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN	Finance & Technical	Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial	Ethics & People	Presentation (incl. Question & Answers)	Innovation & Integration	Decisiveness & Leadership	Total
STRATEGIC ANALYSIS (PRIORITISATION AND FOCUS)	5%	10%					15%
FOCUS							5
1. ONLY 4 issues as per the model answer reflected in the executive summary, with a formal SWOT analysis performed and referred to explicitly; AND a closing paragraph introduced to explain that other issues are dealt with as ethics, or not as critical (<i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i>)?	Max 5/5						
2. ONLY 4 issues as per the model answer reflected in the executive summary with a formal SWOT analysis performed, and referred to explicitly; BUT NO closing paragraph introduced to explain that other issues are dealt with as ethics, or not as critical (<i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i>)?	Max 4/5						
3. All 5 issues reflected in the executive summary as 5 separate issues (<i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i>)?	Max 3/5						
4. Others (<i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i>)?	Max 2/5						
PRIORITISATION							5
5. ALL 4-5 issues in the correct order with suitable justification including impact, urgency, SWOT/relative position ?		Max 10/10					
6. ALL 4-5 issues in the correct order with <u>incorrect</u> justification (marker to exercise judgment but take into account extent to which report took into account impact, urgency, SWOT and relative position in the rankings)?		Max 8/10					
7. 2 marks off for every ranking away from its correct position up to a maximum of 4 marks for the top 2 issues?		Max 7/10					
8. 1 mark off for every step displacement from bottom 2 issues?		Max 7/10					
9. Any others?		Max 5/10					
TOTAL	5/5	10/10					15

PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN	Finance & Technical	Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial	Ethics & People	Presentation (incl. Q/A)	Innovation & Integration	Decisiveness & Leadership	Total
STRATEGIC CHOICE (IMPACT AND OPTIONS EVALUATION)	10%	10%	10%	10%	5%		45%
10. For each issue -whether commercial or ethical, report has done a thorough impact assessment -pointing to calculations or technical models/analysis attached as appendix or otherwise?	Max 2 per issue max 10						10
11. For each issue -whether commercial or ethical, report has done a thorough impact assessment -pointing to the group's strategic and financial objectives/priorities as provided in the scenario on Deal Funding and Group Financial Performance?		1 per issue max 5					5
12. For each issue -weather commercial or ethical, good and credible examples in the business world was cited and adequately applied to the issue at hand; to enhance understanding or add value to the solutions proposed (real world example should be 'googled' to validate)?		1 mark per issue max 5					5
13. For each ethical issue that is well-justified, was reference to the ethical construct violated, and was good recommendation provided?			2.5 per issue max 5				5
14. For the 'Africa Direct Entry Via Nigeria', 'Integration, Synergies and Execution Risk' issues, clear identification of the people dimension of the problem -including employees and other stakeholders, and the behavioral implications well highlighted -and justifiably so?			1 mark per issue max 3				3
15. Recognition of other people and stakeholder behavioral implications well justified outside of the above 2 issues.			1 mark per issue max 2				2
16. Cover page, table of contents, introduction, terms of reference, prioritisation/executive summary, detailed report, recommendations, conclusion, appendixes and others? (<i>less 0.5 for each item that does not meet standard for that section</i>)? (<i>Please also remove maximum of 3 marks for calculations done in the body of the report instead of separately in an appendix</i>).				1 mark for each max 10			10
17. Observation/taking account of linkages/integration between the different issues in the analysis of each issue?					1 mark each max 5.		5
TOTAL	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	5/5		45

PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN	Finance & Technical	Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial	Ethics & People	Presentation (incl. Q/A)	Innovation & Integration	Decisiveness & Leadership	Total
STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION (<i>Recommendation & Actions</i>)			5%	10%	5%	20%	40%
18. For each commercial issue, viable options were identified and assessed, and care taken to specifically link the assessments to the explicitly stated core or strategic decisions the Board must now make (<i>See next section of this questionnaire to ensure the core issues as implied in the case study were addressed</i>)?						2 per issue max 10	10
19. For each commercial issue, a clear and decisive recommendation is offered with clear, convincing and logical justification?						2 per issue max 10	10
20. Each recommendation is presented in a manner that clearly articulates the who/when/action plans and also finds expression in the executive summary i.e. the essence of the recommendation was also summarised as part of the prioritisation/executive summary section?				2 for each issue max 10			10
21. Care taken to show how the SWOT has informed the recommendations over and above the analysis undertaken under strategic choices, including thinking 'out-of-the-box', in search for adjacent solutions?					1 mark for each up to max of 5		5
22. Specific attention is drawn to where and how recommendations are influenced/impacted by people and key stakeholders, by way of specific action to address these; further; people/stakeholder issues that may arise during implementation of each recommendation is balanced to address short-term and long-term considerations.			1 mark each max of 5				5
TOTAL	15%	20%	15%	20%	10%	20%	100%

B. CORE ISSUE-BY-ISSUE QUESTIONNAIRE

Africa Direct Entry Via Nigeria

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO, PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
A	GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)			
0.	The report explicitly recognises this issue as an Opportunity in AB INBEV's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well-attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to AB INBEV's strategic priorities?			
3.	The report clearly incorporate relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identify any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Were there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Were there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AB INBEV, well-justified with clear action plans that addressed both short-term and long-term considerations, including any 'people' dimensions?			
	SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. Core Board Decision/s) and explicitly formulated the issue as a STRATEGIC CHOICE BETWEEN ORGANIC VERSUS IN ORGANIC GROWTH?			
10.	The report analysed the results of the detailed NPV calculations (including valuation of the embedded real option to expand into West Africa, using Black Scholes Model)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the report recognized the sunk costs already incurred and took these out of the NPV calculations, recognized the ethical implications in some of these sunk costs (payments) and incorporated the reverse break-up fee into the analysis? 			
11.	The report recognizes and addresses the link between this issue and the 'Integration, Synergies and Execution Risk' Issue?			
12.	The report considered the strategic risks of doing business in Nigeria/Africa, including the people or cultural aspects e.g. alcohol consumption by a largely moslem country such as Nigeria?			
13.	The report attempted to contrast this method of entry into Africa versus the acquisition path AB INBEV had initiated?			
14.	The report did a holistic assessment of the Nigeria FDI Opportunity using a suitable framework such as Johnson and Scholes' Suitability, Acceptability and Feasibility, demonstrating sufficient ' professional skepticism ' in relation to the reliability of the market share data provided and any other matters?			
15.	The ultimate recommendation – which must address itself to the Core Board Decision choices in 9 above - is informed by the results of the calculation but taking into account the broader risk issues - including financing , and dealing with the STRATEGIC THREATS in this market especially if a 'proceed' decision/recommendation is reached? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute? Was there clear evidence of short-term and long-term actions incorporated into the recommendation and/or action plans?			

B2B And Downstream Supply Chain Strategy In Southern Africa

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
A	GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)			
0.	The report explicitly recognises this issue as an Opportunity and/or a Weakness in AB INBEV's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well-attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to AB INBEV's strategic priorities?			
3.	The report clearly incorporates relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identifies any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Where there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Where there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AB INBEV, well-justified with clear action plans that addressed both short-term and long-term considerations, including any 'people' dimensions?			
	SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. Core Board Decision/s) and explicitly formulated the issue as a strategic choice between the 4 strategic responses: 1) stop selling to the least profitable supermarkets; 2) persuading them to reduce the cost of the cost-generating activities; 3) venture into retailing direct to consumers; and/or 4) introduce new technologies to reduce the cost of the cost-generating activities?			
10.	The report analysed the results of the detailed calculations, identifying and ranking the supermarkets customers in order of profitability?			
11.	The report spotted the interconnection between this issue and the issue on 'Integration, Synergies and Execution Risk' factor?			
12.	Did the report discuss the pros and cons of each of the 4 strategies, taking into account the broader supply chain considerations and the problems or challenges faced with forecasting?			
13.	Was a suitable recommendation reached -which must address itself to the Core Board Decisions Choices in 9 above -justified by the numbers, balanced against the other interconnected issues, especially -'Integration, Synergies and Execution Risk' factors? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute? Was there clear evidence of short-term and long-term actions incorporated into the recommendation and/or action plans?			

Integration, Synergies And Execution Risk				
		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
A	GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)			
0.	The report explicitly recognises this issue as a Threat, Opportunity and/or Weakness in AB INBEV's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well-attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to AB INBEV's strategic priorities?			
3.	The report clearly incorporate relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identify any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Were there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Were there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AB INBEV, well-justified with clear action plans that addressed both short-term and long-term considerations, including any 'people' dimensions?			
	SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. Core Board Decision(s)), and explicitly formulated the issue as a strategic decision around two core issue: 1) Is the Deal fairly valued? And 2) Can we successfully integrate SAB Miller into our group?			
10.	The report, ideally in the Appendix, did meaningful calculations for the projected schedule variance, cost variance and related earned value conventions, taking into account all the data provided?			
11.	The report, ideally in the same Appendix as above or separately, recognized the need to value the synergies (costs and revenues) in the deal and attempt to determine whether the price paid is a fair price?			
12.	Did the report explicitly discuss the status of each synergy and/or execution risk factor in terms of its potential impact on the M/A Project integration cost and schedule variation?			
13.	The report recognizes and addresses the link between this issue and the 'Deal Funding and Group Financial Performance' Issue?			
14.	Was a suitable recommendation reached -which must address itself to the Core Board Decision Choices in 9 above -justified by the numbers, balanced against the other interconnected issues? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute?			

Deal Funding Strategy And Group Financial Performance				
		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
A	GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)			
0.	The report formerly recognises this issue as an Opportunity and/or Weakness in AB INBEV's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well-attended calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to AB INBEV's strategic priorities.			
3.	The report clearly incorporate relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identify any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Were there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Were there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AB INBEV, well-justified with clear action plans that addressed both short-term and long-term considerations, including any 'people' dimensions?			
	SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. Core Board Decision(s)) and explicitly formulated the issue as a strategic choice of whether to fund the deal with debt and/or equity and what the resulting impact on the group's financial performance will be?			
10.	The report, ideally in the Appendix, did meaningful calculations by testing debt and equity finance against each of the 3 financial objectives of AB INBEV?			
11.	The report recognizes and addresses the link between this issue and the 'Integration, Synergies and Execution Risk' Issue?			
12.	Was a suitable recommendation reached -which must address itself to the Core Board Decision Choices in 9 above – justified by the numbers, balanced against any other interconnected issues? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute?			

C. ETHICAL SECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Africa Direct Entry Via Nigeria

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
A				
1.	Did report recognize the US\$20 million payment already made as a potential conflict of interest issue –in sponsoring research for which AB INBEV may potentially seek to influence the findings?			
2.	Did report recognize the US\$5 million payment already made for sponsorship of industry lobby body to potentially forestall legitimate regulation as potentially in conflict with integrity, or otherwise ?			
3.	Did report recognize US\$60 million payment already made towards marketing billboards next to schools as a lack of due care issue or otherwise unethical?			
4.	Did report recognize US\$5million payment already made towards disguised smart consumption goals as a self-interest issue or otherwise ?			
5.	Appropriate and well justified recommendations was offered for the above?			

Environmental Hazard In China

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
1.	The report identified professional behaviour , in relation to not taking accountability for the actions of the contracted construction workers and also points to lack of due care for the environment? The report recognized the dishonesty in informing the public that action was taken, when it is indeed not the case?			
2.	Appropriate and well justified recommendations was offered for the above?			