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## Corporate

- Beer giants Carlsberg and Heineken informed the London Stock Exchange that they were in discussions for a consortium bid to buy out UK-headquartered Scottish \& New castle (S\&N) which owns a 37.5\% stake in United Breweries (UB). (ET)
- In a sharp reaction to the Orissa government's " inaction" to provide " support and security" for the implementation of its Rs51,000-crore stell project at Paradip, South Korean steel major Posco withdrew most of its staff from the site office and relocated them to its Bhubaneshwar corporate office. (BS)
- Airbus is considering buying 10 Aorbus A380s, the world's largest civilian aircraft. (BS)
- Patni Computer Systems has signed a five-year deal worth US\$200 mn with UKbased Carphone W arehouse, a leading independent mobile phone retailer. (BS)


## Economic and political

- The Sensex closed Wednesday, October 17 down just 1.76\% at 18,715.82, ending a day of twists and turns during which the benchmark Sensex plunged $10 \%$ within minutes of opening. The plunge forced a one-hour trading halt for the third time in the history of the markets, which recovered dramatically following clarifications from the finance minister and market regulator and buying interest from domestic institutions.
- TRAI (Telecom Regulatory Authority of India) has recommended a foreign equity cap of 74\% for companies that want to operate Headend in the Sky (HITS).
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| Utilities |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RLEN.BO, Rs1762 |  |
| Rating | NR |
| Sector coverage view | Attractive |
| Target Price (Rs) | - |
| S2W High -Low (Rs) | $1959-448$ |
| Market Cap (Rs bn) | 401.3 |


| Financials |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| M arch y/e | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 E}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 E}$ |
| Sales (Rs bn) | 57.1 | 64.5 | 69.4 |
| Net Profit (Rs bn) | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.3 |
| EPS (Rs) | 34.8 | 35.2 | 36.4 |
| EPS gth | $(4.0)$ | 1.0 | 3.4 |
| P/E (x) | 50.6 | 50.1 | 48.5 |
| EV/EBITDA (x) | 56.3 | 49.2 | 47.1 |
| Div yield (\%) | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 |

$\left.\begin{array}{lrrr}\text { Shareholding, June } 2007 \\ \text { \% of }\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Over/(under) } \\ \\ \\ \text { Pattern }\end{array}\right)$

## Reliance Energy: 2QFY08 income from power business in-line w ith expectations, EPC order book contracts

Aman Batra : aman.batra@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1231
M urtuza Arsiwalla : murtuza.arsiw alla@kotak.com, 91-22-66341-125

- Operating performance of power business on track
- Lower revenues but higher margins from EPC business

Reliance Energy (REL) reported revenues of Rs15.4 bn (w e estimated Rs15.6 bn) and EBITDA of Rs1.8 bn (we estimated Rs0.7 bn). While revenues from the power business increased on account of higher fuel charges and power purchase costs (and therefore higher tariffs), revenues from the EPC business declined by 43\% yoy. The change in accounting policy (with effect from April 1, 2007) to reflect the fair value of foreign exchange derivative instruments resulted in a credit of Rs 496 mn , in turn raising reported profits. REL reported a PAT of Rs2.46 bn, including forex gains, as against our estimate of Rs2 bn. We believe that a strong and liquid balance sheet, predictable cash flows of existing business puts the company in an excellent position to exploit emerging opportunities in the core power business.

Operating performance of pow er business on track. Income from the sale of electrical energy increased by about $40 \%$ to Rs12.8 bn. The increase in sales was on account of the higher sale of electrical energy (up $8.4 \%$ yoy to 2,371 MU in 2QFY 08). Tariff realization also improved reflecting the higher cost of fuel and purchased power as well as a better tariff structure effected under the multi-year tariff formula. REL purchased 1,296 M U of power during the quarter from external sources at an average cost of Rs5.01/unit. Dahanu Thermal Power Station (DTPS) operated at a PLF of 93.7\% during 2QFY08 against a PLF of $94.1 \%$ during 2QFY07. The Samalkot Power Plant operated at a PLF of $75.7 \%$, against $46.5 \%$ achieved last year. According to the company, the improved performance is on account of mixed fuel operation and increased availability of gas.

Low er revenues but higher margins from EPC business. Income from EPC contracts declined by $43.8 \%$ yoy to Rs2.8 bn. Margin expansion ( 700 bps ) in the EPC business resulted in EBIT growth 44\% on lower revenues. We note that the order book of the company stood at Rs47.1 bn at the end of 2QFY08 as compared to Rs50 bn at the end of 1QFY06 and Rs55 bn at the end of FY2007. Revenue recognition of the EPC business tends to be erratic depending on actual execution schedule and achievement of milestones for projects under implementation. Key projects with the company include-2X300 MW thermal power station at Yamuna Nagar; 2X600 M W thermal power station at Hisar, rural electrification project in UP and $65-\mathrm{km}$ long Allain Duhangan-Panarasa transmission project. We believe the EPC business of REL will likely benefit from the large capacity addition planned (about 24,200 MW) by its subsidiary Reliance Power as well as increased orders from IPPs/state gencos.

Reliance Energy - Quarterly results, March yearends (Rs mn)

|  | yoy |  |  | Ourest. | yoy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2Q FY2008 | 2Q FY2007 | \% chg |  | \% chg |
| Net sales from Electrical Energy | 12,594 | 9,049 | 39.2 | 10,340 | 14.3 |
| Income from EPC and Contracts | 2,823 | 5,027 | (43.8) | 5,282 | 5.1 |
| Net sales | 15,417 | 14,076 | 9.5 | 15,622 | 11.0 |
| Cost of electrical energy purchased | $(6,492)$ | $(3,344)$ |  |  |  |
| Cost of fuel | $(1,991)$ | $(2,149)$ |  |  |  |
| Tax on electricity | (337) | (315) |  |  |  |
| Cost of matl. \& other direct exp.(EPC \& Contracts) | $(2,222)$ | $(4,397)$ |  |  |  |
| Personnel costs | $(1,044)$ | (749) |  |  |  |
| Other expenses and provisions | $(1,519)$ | $(1,347)$ |  |  |  |
| Total expense | $(13,604)$ | $(12,301)$ |  |  |  |
| EBITDA | 1,813 | 1,775 | 2.1 | 715 | (59.8) |
| Depreciation | (556) | (635) |  | (600) |  |
| EBIT | 1,257 | 1,140 |  | 115 |  |
| Other income | 2,582 | 1,761 |  | 3,000 |  |
| Net interest | (854) | (671) |  | (670) |  |
| PBT | 2,984 | 2,230 | 33.8 | 2,445 | 9.6 |
| Tax | (352) | (353) |  | (439) |  |
| Deferred tax | (170) | (14) |  | - |  |
| Net profit | 2,462 | 1,864 | 32.1 | 2,005 | 7.6 |
| Extraordinary income | 38 | - |  | - |  |
| EBITDA margin (\%) | 11.8 | 12.6 |  | 4.6 |  |
| Effective tax rate (\%) | 17.5 | 16.4 |  | 18.0 |  |
| Growth (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sales | 9.5 | 35.0 |  | 11.0 |  |
| EBITDA | 2.1 | (12.7) |  | (59.8) |  |
| PBT | 33.8 | 24.2 |  | 9.6 |  |
| PAT | 32.1 | 16.8 |  | 7.6 |  |
| Cost to sales ratio(\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost of Electrical Energy purchased (as \% of net sales from Elec. Energy) | 51.5 | 37.0 |  |  |  |
| Cost of Fuel (as \% of net sales from Elec. Energy) | 15.8 | 23.7 |  |  |  |
| Tax on electricity | 2.2 | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| Cost of matl. \& other direct exp.(EPC \& Contracts) | 78.7 | 87.5 |  |  |  |
| Personnel costs | 6.8 | 5.3 |  |  |  |
| Other expenses | 9.9 | 9.6 |  |  |  |
| Segment Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electrical Energy | 12,760 | 9,160 |  |  |  |
| EPC \& Contracts | 2,871 | 5,030 |  |  |  |
| Others | - | 1 |  |  |  |
| Total | 15,631 | 14,191 |  |  |  |
| Less: Inter segment revenues | - | - |  |  |  |
| Net revenues | 15,631 | 14,191 |  |  |  |
| Growth (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electrical Energy | 39.3 | 11.7 |  |  |  |
| EPC \& Contracts | (42.9) | 108.9 |  |  |  |
| Others | (100.0) | (74.4) |  |  |  |
| Total | 10.1 | 33.7 |  |  |  |
| Profit/ loss before tax \& int |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electrical Energy | 1,517 | 1,041 |  |  |  |
| EPC \& Contracts | 335 | 233 |  |  |  |
| Others | (0) | (0) |  |  |  |
| Total | 1,852 | 1,273 |  |  |  |
| EBIT Margin (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electrical Energy | 11.9 | 11.4 |  |  |  |
| EPC \& Contracts | 11.7 | 4.6 |  |  |  |
| Others |  | (20.0) |  |  |  |
| Total | 11.8 | 9.0 |  |  |  |

Source: Company data, Kotak Institutional Equities

## Profit model, balance sheet, cash model 2005-2009E, March fiscal year-ends (Rs mn)

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 E}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 E}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Profit model (Rs mn) | 41,398 | 40,335 | 57,100 | 64,452 | 69,388 |
| Net sales | $\mathbf{6 , 6 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 4 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 9 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 3 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 5 8 4}$ |
| EBITDA | 3,787 | 5,744 | 8,653 | 7,667 | 7,417 |
| Other income | $(1,348)$ | $(1,919)$ | $(2,503)$ | $(2,890)$ | $(2,500)$ |
| Interest | $(3,464)$ | $(3,486)$ | $(2,401)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,653)$ |
| Depreciation | 35 | $(806)$ | 512 | 0 | 0 |
| Extraordinary items | 5,696 | 7,010 | 9,235 | 9,700 | 9,848 |
| Pretax profits | $(495)$ | $(506)$ | $(1,221)$ | $(1,688)$ | $(1,566)$ |
| Tax | $\mathbf{5 , 2 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 5 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 2 8 1}$ |
| Net profits | $\mathbf{2 6 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 4}$ |
| Earnings per share (Rs) |  |  |  |  |  |


| Balance sheet (Rs mn) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total equity | 63,399 | 78,733 | 93,392 | 99,126 | 105,052 |
| Deferred taxation liability | 2,606 | 2,041 | 2,313 | 2,086 | 1,761 |
| Total borrowings | 37,387 | 42,669 | 58,583 | 52,468 | 43,117 |
| Currrent liabilities | 18,878 | 22,140 | 29,772 | 34,095 | 36,616 |
| Service Line deposits form customers | 221 | 235 | 246 | 246 | 246 |
| Total liabilities and equity | $\mathbf{1 2 2 , 4 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 5 , 8 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 4 , 3 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 8 , 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 6 , 7 9 3}$ |
| Cash | 60,454 | 56,529 | 21,759 | 20,166 | 17,511 |
| Current assets | 25,951 | 48,624 | 106,385 | 108,722 | 110,872 |
| Total fixed assets | 29,123 | 28,737 | 31,044 | 33,791 | 32,954 |
| Investments | 6,962 | 11,927 | 25,119 | 25,343 | 25,456 |
| Total assets | $\mathbf{1 2 2 , 4 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 5 , 8 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 4 , 3 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 8 , 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 6 , 7 9 3}$ |


| Free cash flow (Rs mn) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Operating cash flow, excl. working capital | 8,792 | 11,889 | 10,922 | 10,720 | 10,926 |
| W orking capital | $(1,281)$ | $(21,693)$ | $(51,372)$ | $(542)$ | $(63)$ |
| Capital expenditure | $(1,677)$ | $(3,100)$ | 13,245 | $(5,210)$ | $(1,816)$ |
| Investments | 21,788 | $(4,965)$ | $(13,191)$ | $(224)$ | $(113)$ |
| Free cash flow | $\mathbf{2 7 , 6 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 7 , 8 7 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 4 0 , 3 9 6 )}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 7 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 9 3 4}$ |

Source: Company data, Kotak Institutional Equities estimates.

| Energy |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| GAIL.BO, Rs417 |  |
| Rating | LL |
| Sector coverage view | Neutral |
| Target Price (Rs) | 380 |
| 52W High -Low (Rs) | $444-243$ |
| Market Cap (Rs bn) | 353.0 |


| Financials |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| March yle | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 2008E | 2009E |
| Sales (Rs bn) | 160.5 | 228.5 | 241.3 |
| Net Profit (Rs bn) | 21.4 | 24.1 | 24.9 |
| EPS (Rs) | 25.3 | 28.6 | 29.4 |
| EPS gth | $(9.5)$ | 12.9 | 3.1 |
| P/E (x) | 16.5 | 14.6 | 14.2 |
| EV/EBTDA (x) | 9.6 | 8.7 | 7.8 |
| Div yield (\%) | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.6 |

## Shareholding, June 2007

|  | \% of <br> Pattern |  | Portfolio (under) <br> weight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Promoters | 57.3 | - | - |
| Flls | 22.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| M Fs | 1.4 | 0.3 | $(0.5)$ |
| UTI | - | - | $(0.8)$ |
| LIC | 6.4 | 1.3 | 0.5 |

## GAIL (India): Weaker-than-expected 2QFY08 results due to significant E\&P expenditure w rite-off

Sanjeev Prasad : sanjeev.prasad@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1229

Gundeep Singh : gundeep.singh@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1286

- Weaker-than-expected results due to E\&P expenditure write-off
- Lower-than-expected subsidy loss; full-year subsidy burden will likely be higher
- Key to stock is volume grow th versus nature of regulations, government policy on subsidy
- Revised earnings and 12-month SOTP-based target price to Rs380 (Rs350 previously)

GAIL (India) reported 2QFY08 net income at Rs5.7 bn versus our expected Rs6.4 bn and Rs4.5 bn in 2QFY07. GAIL's 2QFY 08 EBITDA was Rs8.8 bn versus our expected Rs9.2 bn and Rs5.9 bn in 2QFY07. Subsidy loss was lower at Rs2.6 bn versus our expected Rs3.5 bn - a large write-off on E\&P (dry well expense) of Rs2.6 bn partly explains the difference. The strong yoy performance reflects significantly higher subsidy loss in 1HFY07. We have revised our FY2008E, FY2009E and FY2010E EPS estimates to Rs28.6, Rs29.4 and Rs29, respectively, from Rs31.0, Rs32.3 and Rs34.1, respectively, to reflect (1) higher subsidy losses (-ve impact), (2) higher petrochemical and LPG prices (+ve) and (3) stronger rupee (-ve). We have revised our 12-month SOTP-based target price to Rs380 from Rs350 previously to reflect higher prices of investments (particularly 51 mn shares of ONGC) and modestly higher multiples for the petrochemical and LPG segments (see Exhibit 1). Key downside risks stem from higher-than-expected subsidy losses, weaker-than-expected commodity prices and imminent regulations.

2QFY08 results-E\&P expenditure write-off dampens results but subsidy loss on provisional basis and looks to be on the lower side. Exhibit 2 gives details of GAIL's 2QFY08 and 1HFY08 results. (1) GAIL wrote off dry well expenditure of Rs2.57 bn in 1 HFY08 versus Rs50 mn in the corresponding period. GAIL's accounting policy of "Successful Efforts M ethod" will likely make its results volatile if it does not make successful discoveries and such write-offs may be a recurring feature; it wrote off Rs2.8 bn of survey and dry well expenses in FY2007 compared to Rs0.96 bn in FY2006; (2) GAIL provided for subsidy loss of Rs2.6 bn versus Rs2.72 bn in 1QFY08. We find the subsidy loss figure on the lower side as we compute higher industry under-recoveries in 2QFY08 versus 1QFY08. GAIL's 1HFY08 subsidy loss is Rs5.32 bn versus Rs6. 71 bn in 1HFY07; (3) Petrochemicals segment's EBIT declined 6.8\% qoq (Rs235 mn) to Rs3.2 bn led by lower sales volumes (-8.6\%) and lower sales (-17.7\%) ; the decline in EBIT should have been higher based on the steep decline (Rs1.38 bn) in sales.

Key to stock price performance-volumes versus regulations, government policies

1. Likely strong volume growth in gas transportation volumes beyond FY2010E.

We expect GAIL's gas transportation volumes to increase significantly beyond FY2010E propelled by a steep increase in domestic gas volumes. GAIL is in the process of augmenting its extant pipeline network. How ever, we believe GAIL's proposed pipeline netw ork will take time to develop. We give details of its proposed expansion plans in Exhibit 3 and our expected schedules for the pipelines. GAIL has proposed to build $5,052 \mathrm{kms}$ of pipelines (eight new ones) at a cost of Rs180 bn. How ever, we believe it may construct five pipelines by CY2010-2011 and the balance three will not start before CY2011-2012 and will depend on several currently unfathomable factors-
(1) construction of LNG terminals, (2) availability of competitively-priced LNG and
(3) development plans of Reliance and other operators for their offshore Orissa/West Bengal fields.
2. Nature of regulations- may result in declining tariffs, profits from extant pipelines. The methodology adopted for determination of transmission tariff by the newly-constituted Petroleum and Natural Gas Regulatory Board will influence GAlL's future profits from its mainstay gas transmission business. The key variables include (1) reasonable rate of retum, (2) total capital employed (or return-eaming asset) on which the reasonable rate of return will apply, (3) operating costs and (4) volumes. We see the first two as being more important.
The draft regulations for natural gas pipelines prepared by the ministry of petroleum and natural gas defines capital employed as gross fixed assets less depreciation plus normative working capital; this is in line with the cost of services (COS) methodology followed globally. This would mean that GAIL's tariff for a pipeline (and earnings from the pipeline) would decline over a period of time due to a declining return-earning asset base. However, if the regulator allows a constant asset base for the economic life of the pipeline for as is the case in the power sector, then GAIL's tariff and earnings from a pipeline will largely remain constant over time and change modestly with changes in pass-through operating costs.
Exhibit 4 gives our computation of GAIL's ROCE for its various segments based on FY2007 and 1HFY08 data. The pipeline segment shows a ROCE of 19\% for 1HFY08 and $25.7 \%$ for FY 2007 . The decline in 1HFY08 reflects addition of new assets but limited revenues and profits on those assets. We clarify that the computed ROCE is on the current capital employed (end-2QFY08), which may or may not be the base for computation of regulated tariffs. The regulator may decide to use a different capital employed (total investment in pipeline and associated infrastructure since inception of a pipeline [GCI] or replacement value).
3. Subsidy burden remains an issue especially at current very high crude prices.

We believe that high crude prices will continue to create uncertainty about GAIL's subsidy burden and earnings without a proper compensation and subsidy-sharing system. We believe significant upside risks exist given that the upstream companies can absorb higher subsidy losses compared to the downstream companies at higher crude oil prices. In particular, we believe that the GAIL would incur a higher subsidy burden in 2HFY08 versus 1HFY08 given that the government's estimate of FY2008 gross underrecoveries (Rs549 bn) will likely be exceeded by a significant amount due to significantly higher crude prices in 2HFY 08 versus 1HFY08. Nonetheless, we model GAIL's subsidy burden at Rs13.5 bn for FY2008 versus Rs14.9 bn in FY2007. We assume that upstream companies will bear 33.33\% of industry gross under-recovery in FY2008 versus $41.5 \%$ in FY2007. The government may yet revise the share of upstream companies upw ard to offset the impact of higher crude prices on downstream oil companies.

Earnings revisions. We have made several revisions to our earnings model-(1) higher subsidy losses, (2) stronger rupee and (3) higher crude and LPG prices. Exhibit 5 gives our key assumptions and Exhibit 6 gives key financials.

FY2008. We have reduced FY2008E EPS to Rs28.6 from Rs31.0. The downward revision primarily reflects (1) higher subsidy loss of Rs13.5 bn compared to Rs11.5 bn assumed previously and (2) stronger rupee at Rs40/US\$ versus Rs41/US\$ previously, which is a modest negative for the petrochemical and LPG segments. This is partly compensated by higher LPG prices due to revised crude prices (US\$72/bbl versus US\$70/bbl previously, Dated Brent basis); GAIL benefits from high crude prices due to fixed raw material costs.

FY 2009. We have revised FY2009E EPS to Rs29.4 from Rs32.3. The downward revision reflects higher subsidy loss to Rs12 bn compared to Rs10 bn assumed previously to reflect higher crude prices and thus, higher industry gross under-recoveries. We had assumed that the government would raise prices of auto fuels in FY2009E, which would result in low er industry gross under-recoveries. We believe this looks unlikely in the current political environment and it would be best to assume flat auto fuels' prices. The higher subsidy loss is partly compensated by higher LPG (+2.6\%) prices, which in turn reflects our higher crude price view (US\$70/bbl versus US\$68/bbl).

FY2010. We have revised FY2010E EPS to Rs29 from Rs34.1 to reflect (1) higher subsidy loss (Rs12 bn compared to Rs8.5 bn previously) and (2) stronger rupee at Rs38/US\$ versus Rs41/US\$ previously. How ever, we have assumed higher product (LPG, polyethylene) prices to factor in higher crude prices (US\$70/bbl versus US\$68/bbl).

## We value GAIL stock at Rs380 per share

Sum-of-the-parts valuation of GAIL, FY 2009 basis (Rs bn)

|  | Valuation base (Rs bn) |  | Multiples (X) |  | EV (Rs bn) |  | EV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Replacement |  |  |  | Replacement cost basis | EBITDAbasis |  |
|  | cost | EBITDA | EV/RC | EV/EBITDA |  |  | (Rs/share) |
| Natural gas/LPG transportation |  | 19 |  | 6.0 |  | 114 | 135 |
| LPG production |  | 22 |  | 4.0 |  | 88 | 104 |
| Petrochemicals |  | 6 |  | 4.0 |  | 25 | 29 |
| Oil and gas upstream | 17 |  | 1.00 |  | 17 |  | 21 |
| Subsidy sharing scheme |  | (12) |  | 1.0 |  | (12) | (14) |
| Investments | 84 |  | 0.80 |  | 67 |  | 79 |
| ONGC shares | 58 |  | 0.80 |  | 46 |  | 55 |
| Others | 26 |  | 0.80 |  | 20 |  | 24 |
| Total |  | 35 |  |  |  | 214 | 353 |
| Net debt/(cash) |  |  |  |  | (22) | (22) | (26) |
| Implied value of share (Rs/share) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 379 |

Note:
(1) Low multiples for LPG and petrochemicals segments reflects super-normal profitability of the businesses due to arbitrage between crude oil and gas prices.

Source: Kotak Institutional Equities estimates.

## GAIL interim results, March fiscal year-ends (Rs mn)



Note:
(a) 1QFY08 and 4QFY07 sales and raw materials exclude internal consumption; corresponding figures of other quarters include internal consumption.

Source: Kotak Institutional Equities estimates, company reports.

Capital expenditure plan, March fiscal year-ends, 2006-2010E (Rs mn)

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Project cost } \\ \hline \text { (Rs mn) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { Length }}{\text { (Kms) }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Natural gas pipelines |  |  | Comments |
| Dadri-Bawana-Nangal pipeline | 25,000 | 610 |  |
| Chainsa-Gurgaon-Jhajar-Hissar | 10,000 | 310 |  |
| Jagdishpur-Haldia | 20,000 | 876 | Unlikely before CY2011; contingent on Reliance group's Kakinada-Haldia pipeline |
| Dabhol-Bangalore | 25,000 | 730 | Contingent on development of Dabhol LNG terminal and availability of surplus LNG |
| Kochi-Kanjirrkod-Bangalore/M angalore | 25,000 | 840 | Unlikely before CY2011; contingent on start of Petronet LNG's Kochi terminal |
| Dahej-Vijapur expansion | 25,000 | 610 |  |
| Vijaipur-Dadri | 25,000 | 505 |  |
| Vijaipur-Auraiya-Jagdishpur | 25,000 | 571 |  |
| Total | 180,000 | 5,052 |  |

Source: Kotak Institutional Equities estimates.

GAIL's earnings may be at risk if impending regulations are less favorable versus street expectations Return on capital employed for various segments of GAIL

|  | Transmission | Petrochemicals | LPG and liquid HCs |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| FY2007 |  |  |  |
| EBIT (Rs mn) | 17,060 | 9,545 | 1,022 |
| EBIT * (1-t) | 12,215 | 6,834 | 731 |
| Capital employed (Rs mn) | 47,521 | 19,128 | 8,970 |
| ROCE (\%) | $\mathbf{2 5 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 2}$ |
| 1HFY08 |  |  |  |
| Annualized EBIT (Rs mn) | 17,408 | 13,251 | 8,438 |
| EBIT* (1-t) | 11,780 | 8,967 | 5,710 |
| Capital employed (Rs mn) | 62,137 | 18,312 | $\mathbf{1 0 , 8 0 4}$ |
| ROCE (\%) | $\mathbf{1 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 8}$ |

Source: Company, Kotak Institutional Equities.

Key assumptions behind GAIL model, March fiscal year-ends, 2004-2010E

|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008E | 2009E | 2010E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural gas transportation, gross (mcm/day) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HBJ pipeline | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Other pipelines | 31 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Regassified LNG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dahej-Vijaipur pipeline (transmitted and sold) |  | 2 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Dahej-Vijaipur pipeline (transmitted) |  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Dahej-Uran pipeline |  |  |  |  | 6 | 12 | 12 |
| Panvel-Dabhol pipeline |  |  |  |  | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Elimination of double-counted volumes (a) |  |  | (1) | (3) | (7) | (9) | (11) |
| Total gas transmission | 63 | 72 | 79 | 77 | 90 | 96 | 96 |
| LPG (000 tons) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sold | 1,089 | 1,089 | 1,039 | 1,037 | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,100 |
| Transported | 1,841 | 2,138 | 2,228 | 2,490 | 2,750 | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| Petrochemicals (000 tons) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Polyethylene |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Domestic sales | 225 | 279 | 271 | 337 | 400 | 420 | 420 |
| Exports | 40 | 40 | 40 | 10 | 10 | - | - |
| Total petrochemicals | 265 | 319 | 311 | 347 | 410 | 420 | 420 |
| Prices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural gas (Rs/cubic meter) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural gas ceiling price | 2.85 | 2.85 | 3.52 | 4.21 | 5.24 | 5.83 | 6.42 |
| Regassified LNG including transportation | 6.61 | 6.50 | 6.47 | 6.93 | 6.40 | 5.18 | 6.53 |
| Transmission plus marketing charges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HBJ pipeline, Dahej-Vijaipur pipeline (from FY2007) | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.97 |
| Dahej-Vijaipur, Dahej-Uran, Panvel-Dabhol pipeline | 0.69 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.99 | 1.03 | 1.04 | 1.04 |
| Other pipelines | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.46 |
| LPG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LPG (US\$/ton) | 319 | 399 | 510 | 531 | 625 | 609 | 609 |
| Transmission charges (Rs/ton) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jamnagar-Loni | 1,436 | 1,522 | 1,522 | 1,522 | 1,522 | 1,522 | 1,522 |
| Vizag-Secunderabad | 1,450 | 1,450 | 1,450 | 1,450 | 1,450 | 1,450 | 1,450 |
| Other assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Polyethylene, HDPE (US\$/ton) | 680 | 990 | 1,055 | 1,315 | 1,380 | 1,305 | 1,255 |
| Import tariff, Polyethylene | 28\% | 17\% | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| Import tariff, LPG | 10\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Exchange rate (Rs/US\$) | 46.0 | 45.0 | 44.3 | 45.3 | 40.0 | 39.0 | 38.0 |
| Subsidy losses | 4,280 | 11,380 | 10,640 | 14,880 | 13,500 | 12,000 | 12,000 |

Note:
(a) Gas transported through the HVJ or DV pipeline and then to smaller pipelines.

Source: Company, Kotak Institutional Equities estimates.

India Daily Summary - October 18, 2007

GAIL (India) Ltd: Profit model, balance sheet, cash model of GAIL 2004-2010E, March fiscal year-ends (Rs mn)

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 E}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 E}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Profit model (Rs mn) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net sales | 116,395 | 135,914 | 163,513 | 160,472 | 228,498 | 241,293 | 264,090 |
| EBITDA | $\mathbf{3 0 , 6 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 , 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 , 7 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 , 8 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 , 8 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 , 2 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 , 9 4 5}$ |
| Other income | 2,440 | 3,491 | 4,555 | 5,450 | 4,796 | 4,956 | 6,916 |
| Interest | $(1,380)$ | $(1,341)$ | $(1,174)$ | $(1,071)$ | $(726)$ | $(656)$ | $(656)$ |
| Depreciation | $(6,640)$ | $(9,467)$ | $(5,595)$ | $(5,754)$ | $(6,084)$ | $(6,516)$ | $(6,556)$ |
| Pretax profits | 25,088 | 28,723 | 33,518 | 28,521 | 33,825 | 35,062 | 34,649 |
| Tax | $(8,373)$ | $(8,898)$ | $(9,221)$ | $(7,941)$ | $(7,397)$ | $(9,252)$ | $(9,669)$ |
| Deferred taxation | $(1,078)$ | $(277)$ | $(445)$ | $(190)$ | $(2,279)$ | $(921)$ | $(446)$ |
| Net profits | $\mathbf{1 8 , 6 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 , 5 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 , 1 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 , 8 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 1 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 8 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 5 3 4}$ |
| Earnings per share (Rs) | $\mathbf{2 2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 0}$ |


| Balance sheet (Rs mn) | $\mathbf{7 4 , 4 5 2}$ | 86,261 | 99,733 | 113,929 | 128,183 | $\mathbf{1 4 2 , 1 8 9}$ | 154,851 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total equity | 12,276 | 12,552 | 12,997 | 13,187 | 15,466 | 16,387 | 16,833 |
| Deferred taxation liability | 21,335 | 19,974 | 19,166 | 13,379 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 |
| Total borrowings | 30,302 | 34,742 | 37,522 | 45,512 | 43,726 | 45,630 | 49,401 |
| Current liabilities | $\mathbf{1 3 8 , 3 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 3 , 5 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 , 4 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 6 , 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 , 3 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5 , \mathbf { 2 0 6 }}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 2 , 0 8 5}$ |
| Total liabilities and equity | 15,680 | 34,468 | 44,959 | 26,604 | 10,722 | 33,302 | 55,208 |
| Cash | 25,391 | 29,671 | 28,309 | 50,851 | 62,867 | 61,823 | 61,541 |
| Other current assets | 89,574 | 81,550 | 81,716 | 93,913 | 110,149 | 105,443 | 100,697 |
| Total fixed assets | 7,720 | 7,840 | 14,434 | 14,638 | 14,638 | $\mathbf{1 4 , 6 3 8}$ | 14,638 |
| Investments | $\mathbf{1 3 8 , 3 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 3 , 5 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 , 4 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 6 , 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 , 3 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5 , 2 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 2 , 0 8 5}$ |
| Total assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Free cash flow (Rs mn) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Operating cash flow, excl. working capital | 23,954 | 26,912 | 25,165 | 23,920 | 27,715 | 27,369 | 24,620 |
| Working capital changes | 580 | 49 | 5,950 | $(10,151)$ | $(13,802)$ | 2,948 | 4,053 |
| Capital expenditure | $(26,924)$ | $(1,472)$ | $(5,811)$ | $(20,449)$ | $(22,320)$ | $(1,810)$ | $(1,810)$ |
| Investments | $(841)$ | $(120)$ | $(6,462)$ | $(205)$ | - | - | - |
| Other income | 1,826 | 2,416 | 3,995 | 3,884 | 4,796 | 4,956 | 6,916 |
| Free cash flow | $\mathbf{( 1 , 4 0 5 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 , 7 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 , 8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 , 0 0 2 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 , 6 1 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 , 4 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 , 7 7 9}$ |


| Ratios (\%) | 24.6 | 20.2 | 17.0 | 10.5 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 6.4 |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Debt/equity | 6.5 | $(14.7)$ | $(22.9)$ | $(10.4)$ | 0.2 | $(14.1)$ | $(25.7)$ |
| Net debt/equity | 23.2 | 21.1 | 21.8 | 19.9 | 17.8 | 16.5 | 14.9 |
| ROAE (\%) | $\mathbf{1 6 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 2}$ |
| ROACE (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Kotak Institutional Equities estimates.

| Transportation |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| GATE.BO, Rs138 |  |
| Rating | OP |
| Sector coverage view | Neutral |
| Target Price (Rs) | 180 |
| 52W High -Low (Rs) | $172-110$ |
| Market Cap (Rs bn) | 15.9 |


| Financials |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| M arch y/e | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 E}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 E}$ |
| Sales (Rs bn) | 1.6 | 2.3 | 3.4 |
| Net Profit (Rs bn) | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| EPS (Rs) | 6.8 | 6.8 | 9.0 |
| EPS gth | 8.9 | $(0.4)$ | 34.2 |
| P/E (x) | 20.3 | 20.4 | 15.3 |
| EV/EBITDA (x) | 16.5 | 14.8 | 10.9 |
| Div yield (\%) | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.6 |

## Shareholding, June 2007

|  | $\%$ of <br> Pattern |  | Over/(under) <br> Peight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Promoters | 39.1 | - | - |
| FIls | 34.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| M Fs | 4.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| UTI | - | - | - |
| LIC | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Gatew ay Distriparks: Volumes growth as well as margins decline probably contributed by consolidation of Punjab Conware; maintain target price and rating

Lokesh Garg : lokesh.garg@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1496
Sandip Bansal : sandip.bansal@kotak.com, +91-22-6749-3327

- Operating performance in line with expectations
- Volumes rise while margins decline due to consolidation of Punjab Conware
- Two ow ned rakes deployed in the domestic sector; plans to ramp-up significantly
- Snowman turns in a better performance, slow turnaround visible
- Maintain SOTP based target price of Rs180 and Outperform rating

On a consolidated basis GDPL has reported revenues of Rs640 mn (up 68\% yoy) and operating profit of Rs255 mn (up 17\% yoy). Excluding the contribution of Snowman and Gateway Rail, revenues in 1QFY 08 are Rs483 mn (up 25\% yoy) and operating EBIT is Rs206 mn (up 5\% yoy). The total number of TEUs handled by GDPL increased significantly in 2QFY 08 to 90,277 , up $49 \%$ yoy and $11 \%$ qoq. However, the EBIT margin of the CFS business has declined substantially by 590 bps, both on a yoy and qoq basis, to 42.6\%. The steep decline is possibly due to commencement of operations of Punjab Conware and increased competition at JNPT as well as other CFSs. GDPL had two of its own rakes in operations in the domestic route during the quarter and expects to receive deliveries of a further 10 rakes by the end of FY2008. Snowman is showing signs of a turnaround as its revenues and performance improve sequentially quarter on quarter. We maintain our SOTP-based target price of Rs180 and Outperform rating, as we await details of the operating performance of various assets.

## Operating performance in line with expectations

On a consolidated basis, GDPL has reported revenues of Rs640 mn (up 68\% yoy) versus our expectation of Rs524 mn and operating profit of Rs255 mn (up 17\% yoy) versus our expectation of Rs246 mn. However, comparison on a yoy basis is not appropriate as 2QFY 08 numbers include Snow man and Gatew ay Rail operations, while those of 1QFY07 do not. Excluding the contribution of Snowman and Gateway Rail, revenues in 1QFY08 are Rs483 mn (up 25\% yoy) and operating EBIT is Rs206 mn (up 5\% yoy). PAT in 2QFY08 (on a consolidated basis) was Rs189 mn (down 10\% yoy), versus our expectation of Rs205 mn . GDPL is making substantial investments in (1) rail freight business, (2) cold chain business and (3) Punjab Conware CFS, leading to lower other income on reduced cash position and higher depreciation charge. Other income has declined by Rs16 mn to Rs43 mn from Rs59 mn while depreciation has increased by Rs41 mn to Rs69 mn from Rs27 mn on a yoy basis. (Exhibits 1, 2 and 3)

## Volumes grow th as well as margins decline probably contributed by consolidation of Punjab Conw are

The total number of TEUs handled by GDPL increased significantly in 2QFY 08 to 90,277, up 49\% yoy and 11\% qoq. In 1HFY08, GDPL has handled 171,446 TEUs, up 45\% yoy. How ever, the EBIT margin of the CFS business has declined substantially by 590 bps, both on a yoy and qoq basis, to $42.6 \%$ in 2QFY08. The operating profit margin of the standalone entity, declined to $51.8 \%$ - a fall of 760 bps yoy and 920 bps qoq. The margin decline in the standalone entity is possibly attributable to consolidation of operations of Punjab Conware and increased competition. Punjab conware may not have achieved full scale during the quarter and payment of operation and maintenance fees to Punjab government has affected margins in the CFS segment. In the CFS business revenues have increased by 43\% in 1HFY08 (in comparison to 1HFY07), while EBIT margins have declined by 340 basis points.

Tw o ow ned rakes deployed in the domestic sector; plans to ramp-up significantly
GDPL had two of its own rakes in operations in the domestic route during the quarter. The train operations generated revenues of Rs91 mn and a negative EBIT of Rs10 mn. Possibly at an EBITDA level there were no losses from the rail operations in this quarter. GDPL expects to receive deliveries of a further 10 rakes by the end of FY2008 and hence a significant ramp-up of the rail operations is expected over the next few quarters.

## Snow man turns in a better performance, slow turnaround visible

Snow man generated revenues of Rs71 mn in 2QFY 08, up 10\% yoy. The EBIT margins have also improved by 250 basis points (on a qoq basis) to a negative of $5.2 \%$. Snow man is showing signs of a turnaround as its revenues and performance improve sequentially quarter on quarter (Exhibit 4). We believe that growth in organized retailing of fruits and vegetables would offer immense opportunity for a player in the organized sector offering pan-India cold chain logistics services. However, management has not shared any clear path for growth and turnaround of the business.

## M aintain SOTP based target price of Rs180 and Outperform rating

We maintain our SOTP based target price of Rs180 and our Outperform rating. We will revisit our numbers after receiving details of the operating performance of various assets.

Exhibit 1. Consolidated financials of Gateway Distriparks, March fiscal year-ends FY2007-2008 (Rs mn)

|  | FY2007 | FY2008E | 2Q08 | 2Q07 | \% YoY | 1Q08 | \% Q oQ | 1HFY08 | 1HFY07 | \% YoY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income from Operations | 1,610 | 2,278 | 640 | 382 | 67.8 | 483 | 32.5 | 1,124 | 727 | 54.5 |
| Total Expenditure | (799) | $(1,339)$ | (385) | (163) | 136.8 | (263) | 46.4 | (648) | (313) | 107.0 |
| Staff Cost | (89) | - | (43) | (16) | 164.0 | (23) | 86.9 | (65) | (31) | 108.4 |
| Transportation | (300) | - | (165) | (68) | 142.3 | (94) | 75.9 | (259) | (117) | 121.2 |
| Labour Charges | (64) | - | (35) | (10) | 240.0 | (21) | 69.5 | (56) | (23) | 149.1 |
| Sub Contract Charges | (71) | - | (21) | (19) | 12.4 | (19) | 9.0 | (40) | (36) | 10.4 |
| Auction Expenses | (14) | - | (3) | (1) | 138.8 | (2) | 110.9 | (5) | (4) | 24.8 |
| Fees on Operations \& M anagement of Punjab Conware CFS | - | - | (26) | - |  | - |  | (26) | - |  |
| Other Expenditure | (262) | - | (91) | (48) | 90.7 | (105) | (12.8) | (196) | (102) | 92.5 |
| Operating profit | 811 | 940 | 255 | 219 | 16.6 | 220 | 15.9 | 476 | 414 | 14.9 |
| Other Income | 250 | 208 | 43 | 59 | (27.0) | 48 | (9.5) | 91 | 125 | (26.9) |
| EBIDTA | 1,060 | 1,148 | 299 | 279 | 7.3 | 268 | 11.4 | 567 | 539 | 5.2 |
| Interest | (12) | (11) | (5) | (3) | 68.4 | (3) | 56.1 | (8) | (8) | 13.2 |
| Depreciation | (139) | (234) | (69) | (27) | 153.9 | (46) | 49.0 | (115) | (57) | 99.6 |
| Profit before Tax | 909 | 903 | 225 | 248 | (9.4) | 219 | 2.8 | 444 | 474 | (6.3) |
| Provision for taxation | (139) | (122) | (37) | (37) | (2.0) | (32) | 13.7 | (69) | (65) | 5.7 |
| Net Profit after Tax | 771 | 782 | 188 | 211 | (10.7) | 187 | 0.9 | 375 | 409 | (8.3) |
| M inority Interest | 8 | 2 | 1 | (0) | (626.0) | (1) | (163.8) | (0) | (0) | 11.2 |
| Net Profit | 778 | 783 | 189 | 211 | (10.5) | 186 | 1.6 | 375 | 408 | (8.3) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPM | 50.3 | 41.2 | 39.9 | 57.4 |  | 45.6 |  | 42.3 | 56.9 | (25.6) |
| EBIDTA margin | 65.9 | 50.4 | 46.7 | 73.0 |  | 55.5 |  | 50.5 | 74.1 | (31.9) |
| Effective tax rate | 15.3 | 13.5 | 16.3 | 15.1 |  | 14.7 |  | 15.5 | 13.8 | 12.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Throughput (TEUs) | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GDPL Consolidated | 240,491 | 308,494 | 90,277 | 60,497 | 49.2 | 81,169 | 11.2 | 171,446 | 117,937 | 45.4 |
|  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Company data, Kotak Institutional Equities estimates.

Exhibit 2. Stand-alone financials of Gatew ay Distriparks, March fiscal year-ends FY2007-2008 (Rs mn)

|  | 2Q08 | 2Q07 | \% YoY | 1Q08 | \% QoQ | 1HFY08 | 1HFY07 | \% YoY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income from Operations | 419 | 342 | 22.4 | 313 | 34.0 | 732 | 658 | 11.3 |
| Total Expenditure | (202) | (139) | 45.3 | (122) | 65.7 | (324) | (272) | 19.1 |
| Staff Cost | (15) | (13) | 17.6 | (11) | 40.3 | (26) | (25) | 3.7 |
| Transportation | (50) | (55) | (9.3) | (45) | 10.2 | (95) | (98) | (2.5) |
| Labour Charges | (28) | (11) | 152.2 | (10) | 165.0 | (38) | (22) | 73.3 |
| Sub Contract Charges | (19) | (17) | 9.4 | (17) | 11.5 | (36) | (36) | 1.3 |
| Auction Expenses | (2) | (1) | 35.5 | (2) | 19.0 | (3) | (4) | (8.1) |
| Fees on Operations \& M anagement of Punjab Conware CFS | (26) | - |  | - |  | (26) | - |  |
| Other Expenditure | (62) | (41) | 50.4 | (36) | 69.0 | (98) | (87) | 12.3 |
| Operating profit | 217 | 204 | 6.7 | 191 | 13.8 | 408 | 386 | 5.7 |
| Other Income | 33 | 62 | (46.6) | 37 | (10.1) | 70 | 130 | (45.9) |
| EBIDTA | 250 | 266 | (5.8) | 228 | 9.9 | 478 | 516 | (7.3) |
| Interest | (0) | (2) | (98.2) | (0) | (66.7) | (0) | (5) | (97.2) |
| Depreciation | (34) | (20) | 68.5 | (24) | 40.8 | (58) | (44) | 31.8 |
| Profit before Tax | 217 | 244 | (11.1) | 204 | 6.3 | 420 | 466 | (9.9) |
| Provision for taxation | (33) | (35) | (7.0) | (28) | 18.0 | (61) | (62) | (2.6) |
| Net Profit after Tax | 184 | 208 | (11.8) | 176 | 4.5 | 359 | 404 | (11.0) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPM | 51.8 | 59.4 |  | 61.1 |  | 14.5 | 13.4 |  |
| EBIDTA margin | 59.8 | 77.6 |  | 72.9 |  | 65.4 | 78.4 |  |
| Effective tax rate | 15.2 | 14.5 |  | 13.7 |  | 14.5 | 13.4 |  |

Source: Company data.

Exhibit 3. Improvement in volumes, fall in margins in core CFS business
Segmental performance of Gateway Distriparks (Rs mn)

|  | FY2007 | 2Q08 | 2 Q 07 | \% YoY | 1 Q 08 | \% Q 0 Q | 1HFY08 | 1 HFY 07 | \% Yoy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenues | 1,859 | 684 | 441 | 55.0 | 531 | 28.7 | 1,215 | 852 | 42.6 |
| Container Freight Station | 1,559 | 483 | 385 | 25.6 | 386 | 25.2 | 869 | 736 | 18.2 |
| Container Rail Logistics | - | 91 | - |  | 42 | 116.2 | 133 | - |  |
| Cold Chain Logistics | 86 | 71 | - |  | 65 | 10.1 | 136 | - |  |
| Unallocated including income from interest and investments | 215 | 38 | 56 | (32.8) | 38 | (0.8) | 76 | 116 | (34.7) |
| EBIT | 923 | 230 | 251 | (8.5) | 222 | 3.6 | 452 | 481 | (6.0) |
| Container Freight Station | 758 | 206 | 195 | 5.3 | 187 | 9.8 | 393 | 365 | 7.6 |
| Container Rail Logistics | - | (10) | - |  | 2 | (662.7) | (8) | - |  |
| Cold Chain Logistics | (17) | (4) | - |  | (5) | (25.4) | (9) | - |  |
| Unallocated including income from interest and investments | 182 | 38 | 56 | (32.8) | 38 | (0.8) | 76 | 116 | (34.7) |
| EBIT margin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Container Freight Station | - | 42.6 | 48.4 |  | 48.5 |  | 45.2 | 48.6 |  |
| Container Rail Logistics |  | (10.5) |  |  | 4.0 |  | (5.9) |  |  |
| Cold Chain Logistics |  | (5.2) |  |  | (7.7) |  | (6.4) | (19.3) |  |
| Capital Employed | 6,896 | 7,270 | 6,485 |  | 7,201 |  | 7,270 | 6,485 |  |
| Container Freight Station | 2,699 | 2,514 | 2,465 |  | 2,837 |  | 2,514 | 2,465 |  |
| Container Rail Logistics | 1,610 | 3,016 | 956 |  | 1,985 |  | 3,016 | 956 |  |
| Cold Chain Logistics | 400 | 410 | - |  | 402 |  | 410 | - |  |
| Unallocated including income from interest and investments | 2,187 | 1,330 | 3,064 |  | 1,978 |  | 1,330 | 3,064 |  |

Source: Company data.

| Exhibit 4. Improvement in performance of Snow man |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segmental performance of Cold Chain Logistics business of Gateway Distriparks (Rs mn) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2Q08 | 1 Q 08 | \% QoQ | 4Q07 | 3Q07 | FY07 |
| Revenues | 71.4 | 64.9 | 10.1 | 57.4 | 24.8 | 85.5 |
| EBIT | (3.7) | (5.0) | (25.4) | (11.9) | (4.6) | (16.5) |
| EBIT margin | (5.2) | (7.7) |  | (20.7) | (18.7) | (19.3) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Employed | 410 | 402 |  | 400 | 436 | 400 |

[^0]| Technology |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| POLL.BO, Rs115 |  |
| Rating | U |
| Sector coverage view | Attractive |
| Target Price (Rs) | 110 |
| 52 W High -Low (Rs) | $237-102$ |
| Market Cap (Rs bn) | 11.3 |


| Financials |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| March y/e | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 2008E | 2009E |
| Sales (Rs bn) | 10.3 | 11.4 | 13.3 |
| Net Profit (Rs bn) | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| EPS (Rs) | 10.3 | 9.1 | 11.6 |
| EPS gth | 359.1 | $(12.0)$ | 28.0 |
| P/E (x) | 11.2 | 12.7 | 9.9 |
| EV/EBTDA (x) | 6.2 | 6.9 | 5 |
| Div yield (\%) | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |

## Shareholding, June 2007

|  | \% of |  | Over/(under) |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pattern | Portfolio | weight |

## Polaris Softw are Lab: Results below expectations. Better revenue grow th trajectory critical to performance

Kawaljeet Saluja : kaw aljeet.saluja@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1243
Rohit Chordia : rohit.chordia@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1397

- Results below expectations
- Product business remains steady, sustainability the key
- Improved client mining required to push growth in FY2008
- Maintain Underperform with a Mar'09 DCF-based target price of Rs110/share

Polaris' reported net income of Rs182 mn for the Sep '07 quarter was 16\% below our expectations. The company disappointed on both revenue and margin performance. Revenues grew $6.3 \%$ to Rs2.74 bn (our expectation was Rs2.78 bn). Revenue growth in US\$ terms was $7.6 \%$ qoq. M ore importantly, yoy revenue growth (US\$ terms) stood at $22.6 \%$ (significantly below industry growth rate), despite a strong $57.4 \%$ yoy growth in the Intellect business. OPM improved 250 bps qoq (below our expectation of 380 bps), but was down 690 bps on a yoy basis. The performance, once again highlights that execution, though improving, is still a work in progress. The business model risks remain with a high dependence on a few clients, uncertainty around success of Intellect product suite and continuity of execution challenges (w ith a weak employee profile). We believe that improvement in revenue growth profile holds the key to stock performance. We have revised our FY2008 and FY2009 EPS estimates downwards by 13\% and 10\% to Rs9.1 and Rs11.6 respectively, primarily on the back of (1) revision in our Re/US\$ assumption for FY2008 and FY2009 to 39.8 and 39 from 40.5 and 40 earlier (2) lower than earlier OPM assumptions. M aintain Underperform.

2QFY08 performance below expectations. Polaris reported $6.3 \%$ qoq revenue growth (7.6\% qoq growth in US\$ terms). Revenue growth was once again driven by a robust $10 \%$ qoq growth in the products business. OPM at $11 \%$ (up 250 bps qoq, down 690 bps yoy) was below our expectations of $12.3 \%$. Net income at Rs182 mn (down $32.8 \%$ yoy) was 16\% below our expectations. Company's BPO subsidiary Optimus had a strong quarter and grew 22\% qoq in Re terms (off a small base).

OPM performance disappointing. Polaris' 2QFY08 OPM improved 250 bps qoq to $11 \%$ versus our expectation of a 380 bps improvement. M ore important, OPM decline yoy was 6.9\% from 17.9\% in 2QFY07. SG\&A expenses as a percentage of revenues have increased 130 bps yoy to $21.5 \%$ as the company continues to invest in its sales and marketing activities. While the company highlights levers like pricing improvements and utilization rates for improving margins, we believe that an improved revenue growth profile holds the key to Polaris' OPM performance. We factor in a 310 bps decline in OPM in FY2008, driven primarily by rupee appreciation.

Product business remains steady, sustainability the key. Polaris' products business grew at a higher than company average rate of $10 \%$ (US\$ terms). M ore important, the company signed up four new customers for its 'Intellect' suite. In addition, the company now has 25 live implementations of its different Intellect platforms. Polaris once again emphasized on its strategy to utilize its product 'Intellect' as an entry point into new customer relationships. Sustainable growth in products business is the key in our view to overall revenue growth in the coming quarters.

Better client mining and more efficient operations remain the key to a good FY2008. We believe that Polaris needs to improve its client mining to drive acceleration in its revenue growth. Polaris' impressive client base provides it ample scope to improve on its $22 \%$ yoy US\$ terms revenue growth of FY2007. The management reiterated its target of 25\% revenue growth in FY2008, which we believe is achievable with better sales execution (we factor in $26.4 \%$ US\$ revenue growth in FY2008). Also, while the company has been taking steps to iron out inefficiencies, we believe that the company needs to increase its focus on driving revenue productivity and SG\&A efficiencies to protect margins in the wake of the appreciating rupee scenario.

Business model risks remain higher than other players. While we like the product-led revenue growth strategy adopted by Polaris, we would like to highlight the potential risks of the approach in the event of a spending slowdown. Polaris' small size and weaker positioning with the clients (relative to some of its larger peers) makes it more vulnerable than peers to the risk of (1) a cut in new spending in the BFSI vertical and (2) vendor rationalization by some of the large clients.

Revising estimates. We have revised our FY2008 and FY2009 EPS estimates downwards by $13 \%$ and $10 \%$ to Rs9.1 and Rs11.6 respectively. We now factor in a Re/ US\$ rate of 39.8 and 39 for FY2008 and FY2009 respectively versus 40.5 and 40 earlier. We maintain our Underperform rating with a revised Mar '09 DCF-based target price of Rs110/share.


## Polaris Softw are Interim Results

| Rs mn | 2QFY07 | 1QFY08 | 2QFY08 | QoQ <br> \% chg. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YoY } \\ & \text { \% chg. } \end{aligned}$ | Kotak <br> Estimates | \% Deviation | Comments on QoQ performance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenues | 2,556 | 2,575 | 2,736 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 2,780 | (1.6) | Revenues grew $6.3 \%$ qoq versus our expectation of $8 \%$. US\$ terms revenue growth was $7.6 \%$ (driven by Intellect which grew 10\% qoq) |
| Cost of revenues | $(1,581)$ | $(1,775)$ | $(1,847)$ | 4.1 | 16.8 | $(1,835)$ | 0.6 |  |
| Gross profit | 975 | 800 | 889 | 11.1 | (8.8) | 945 | (6.0) |  |
| Sales \& marketing expenses | (265) | (310) | (315) | 1.5 | 18.8 | (320) | (1.5) |  |
| General administration expenses | (252) | (270) | (272) | 0.7 | 7.9 | (284) | (4.1) |  |
| SG\&A expenses | (517) | (580) | (587) | 1.1 | 13.5 | (603) | (2.7) |  |
| Operating Profits | 457 | 219 | 302 | 37.6 | (34.1) | 342 | (11.8) | Operating margins improved 250bps qoq against our expectation of 380 bps improvement. M argin improvement was driven by (a) absorption of wage hikes and (b) SG\&A efficiencies. Operating margin decline yoy stood at 690bps. |
| Non-operating Income | (7) | 82 | 39 | (52.6) | nmf | 45 | (12.6) |  |
| EBIDTA | 450 | 301 | 341 | 13.0 | (24.3) | 387 | (11.9) |  |
| Financial expenses | (2) | (2) | (2) | 7.6 | 9.7 | (2) |  |  |
| EBDT | 448 | 300 | 339 | 13.0 | (24.5) | 384 | (11.9) |  |
| Depreciation | (118) | (116) | (119) | 2.7 | 0.5 | (120) | (1.2) | Includes amortization of capitalized product development expenses |
| Pretax profits | 330 | 184 | 220 | 19.5 | (33.4) | 264 | (16.8) |  |
| Tax | (59) | (40) | (37) | (5.5) | (36.5) | (48) | (21.2) |  |
| Net profit | 271 | 144 | 182 | 26.4 | (32.8) | 217 | (15.9) | Net income 16\% below expectations on account of lower than expected revenues as well as profitability |
| Extraordinaries | - | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| PAT-Reported | 271 | 144 | 182 | 26.4 | (32.8) | 217 | (15.9) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Period EPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EPS - recurring (RS) | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 26.4 | (32.8) | 2.2 |  |  |
| EPS - reported (Rs) | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 26.4 | (32.8) | 2.2 |  |  |
| Margins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross margin (\%) | 38.1 | 31.1 | 32.5 |  |  | 34.0 |  |  |
| SG\&A expenses (\%) | 20.2 | 22.5 | 21.5 |  |  | 21.7 |  |  |
| Operating profit margin (\%) | 17.9 | 8.5 | 11.0 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  |
| Net profit margin (\%) | 10.6 | 5.6 | 6.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue Mix (Rs mn) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services | 2,130 | 2,036 | 2,151 | 5.6 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Products | 426 | 538 | 585 | 8.6 | 37.4 |  |  | Intellect revenues (up 10\% qoq in US\$ terms) continue to grow at higher than corporate average. Sustained momentum in Intellect revenues the key to company performance |
| Revenues from Citigroup (\%) | 48.8 | 39.6 | 38.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenues from Citigroup (Rs mn) | 1,246.7 | 1,019.5 | 1,058.9 | 3.9 | (15.1) |  |  | Slide in Citigroup revenues continues. Down $15 \%$ yoy. |


| Consumer Products |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sector coverage view |  | Neutral |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Price, Rs |  |  |
| Company | Rating | 17-Oct | Target |
| Hindustan Leve | LL | 209 | 230 |
| ITC | OP | 184 | 225 |
| Nestle India | LL | 1,271 | 1,150 |
| Colgate-Palmo | LL | 400 | 340 |
| SmithKilne Cor | LL | 597 | 625 |
| Asian Paints | L | 947 | 890 |
| Lakshmi | OP | 200 | 338 |
| Tata Tea | LL | 821 | 992 |
| Godrej Consun | OP | 122 | 185 |

## ITC launches shampoo and soaps-HUL's bastions under attack?

Aman Batra : aman.batra@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1231
M anoj M enon : manoj.menon@kotak.com, +91-22-6634-1110

- Slew of launches in personal care products
- ITC is well-placed to make a dent into HUL's dominant shares in shampoos and soaps
- Higher A\&P spends w ould be imperative in the short term, price war likely if ITC gains significant market share

In line with its stated mission of becoming the leading FM CG Company in India, ITC has entered the personal care category with the recent launch of soaps and shampoos. We estimate about $27 \%$ of HUL's sales and about $35 \%$ of HUL's EBIT to be under threat from ITC's entry. The impact for Godrej Consumer (GCPL) could be much higher as its dependence on soaps is about 65\% of sales (of which about 60\% is Godrej No.1) and $35 \%$ of EBIT. Higher A\&P spends in shampoo and soaps would be imperative in the short term, which could be followed by a price war in the medium term if ITC's market share gains in the next few quarters are significant. Over the last year, measured price hikes by HUL and GCPL have helped mitigate higher palm prices (up over 70\% ). ITC's entry could possibly cap this and the requirement for higher ad spends could adversely impact the margin profile of this category. We reiterate our Outperform rating on ITC with a target price of Rs225/share and In Line rating on HUL with a target price of Rs230/share. We will aw ait market response to ITC's new launches before revising our estimates on these companies.

Slew of launches in personal care products. Expanding its range of personal care products and following the launch of Fiama Di Wills Shampoos in the premium segment, ITC has launched Superia shampoo at the lower end. The company has launched soaps under the Superia brand as well. M arket sources indicate that the launch is in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa markets. The Fiama Di Wills range has been extended to shower gel as well.

- Fiama Di Wills' premium shampoo with four variants-Everyday M ild, Aqua Balance, Volume Boost and Silky Strong - priced at Rs 99 for 200 ml and Rs54 for 100 ml
- Fiama Di Wills' shower gel with three variants-M ild Dew, Clear Springs and Exotic Dream
- Superia shampoo at the lower end of the market with two variants-Shiny Black and Vibrant Green, priced at Rs 25 for 125 ml and Rs 10 for 55 ml
- Superia soaps at the lower end ('Popular' segment ) of the category with four variants-Fragrant Flower, Soft Sandal, Natural Glow and Healthy Glow

Foaming up. We believe ITC is well-placed to make a dent into HUL's dominant shares, gain from CavinKare as well as garner a higher incremental share in this under-penetrated and fast growing shampoo category. HUL with about 47\% market share is the leader and Proctor \& Gamble with about $25 \%$ share is the nearest competitor. The estimated market size is Rs18 bn. We estimate HUL's Shampoo business at about Rs9 bn.

The pricing and the positioning of the ITC launches in shampoo indicate immediate threat to all HUL brands except Clinic All Clear, which is on the anti-dandruff platform. HUL has five brands in the shampoo category-Clinic Plus ( $50 \%$ of shampoo business), Sunsilk (20\% ), Clinic All Clear (20\%), Lux (5\% ) and the recently launched Dove premium. We note that Superia is priced in line with the low-end brands like Chik, Nyle (CavinKare) and Lux. HUL is present in the low-end of the market through small pack sizes of Clinic Plus and Sunsilk. Our trade sources indicate that Lux shampoo is a non-focus brand currently sold in a few northern states.

We believe that higher A\&P spends would be imperative in the short term, followed by a price war in the medium term if ITC's market share gains disturb HUL's equanimity in the segment. HUL's possible response to counter ITC could be:

## 1. An aggressive push of Clinic Plus and Sunsilk with increased brand investments

## 2. Reviving Lux shampoo, taking it national

## 3. A possible price cut in select SKUs of Clinic Plus and Sunsilk

Lots of lather. We expect ITC's task in penetrating further into the soap category to be much more challenging than in shampoos. Consumer loyalty in soaps is significantly lower compared to personal care products. The exceptions are highly differentiated products like Dove, Pears etc. Soaps is a highly penetrated ( $>90 \%$ ), mature category and value market growth rates are in high single digits. However, the volume growth is flat or marginally negative (both HUL \& Godrej had taken price hikes of about10\% / grammage reductions during 1HCY07).

HUL is the leader in soaps with a dominant market share of about 54\% and GCPL with $10 \%$ share is the nearest competitor. HUL dominates the Rs50-bn category with 10 brands covering the entire range (premium, mid-priced and popular). ITC's Superia is launched in the popular segment where it will compete with HUL's Lifebuoy (estimated Rs 9 bn sales), Breeze (estimated Rs 2 bn sales) and Godrej No. 1 (about Rs 3 bn).

Over the past year, measured price hikes by HUL and Godrej have helped mitigate the higher palm prices (up over 70\% ). ITC's entry could possibly cap this and the requirement for higher ad spends could adversely impact the margin profile of this category.

Exhibit 1: ITC has entered the shampoo category at very competitive price points Shampoo (bottles) - brands and price points

| Brand | Company | Packsize <br> $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{~ m l}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Clinic All Clear | HUL | 70 |
| Dove | HUL | 60 |
| Fiama Di Wills | ITC | 54 |
| Sunsilk | HUL | 45 |
| Clinic Plus | HUL | 39 |
| Rejoice | P\&G | 32 |
| Superia (a) | ITC | 20 |
| Chik | Cavinkare | 18 |

(a) Rs 25 for 125 ml

| Brand | Company | Packsize <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0} \mathbf{~ m l}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Clinic All Clear | HUL | $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ |
| Dove | HUL | 115 |
| Garnier | L'Oreal | 110 |
| Pantene | P\&G | 102 |
| Fiama Di Wills | ITC | 99 |
| Sunsilk | HUL | 82 |

Source: Company, Kotak Institutional Equities.

Exhibit 2: Attempt to ride on the distribution strength and a competitive product offering
Shampoo (Sachets) - Brands and price points

| Price Point <br> Rs | Packsize <br> MI | Brand | Company |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0.5 | 3.5 | Sunsilk | HUL |
|  | 3.5 | Clinic Plus | HUL |
|  | 4 | Superia | ITC |
|  | 4 | Chik | Cavinkare |
|  | 4 | Lux | HUL |
|  | 8 | Sunsilk | HUL |
|  | 8 | Clinic Plus | HUL |
| 2.0 | 9 | Clinic Plus | HUL |
|  | 7 | Clinic All Clear | HUL |
|  | 7 | Head \& Shoulders | P\&G |

Source : Company, Kotak Institutional Equities.

## Exhibit 3: Competitive positioning in soaps

Soaps ( Low-end / Popular segment ) - Brands and price points

| Brand | Company | MRP for 75 gm <br> Rs | TFM (c) <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Breeze (a) | HUL | 6.25 | 66 |
| Godrej No.1 | Godrej Consumer | 6.75 | 76 |
| Superia | ITC | 6.50 | 70 |

(a) Banded pack of 4 soaps of 75 gm for Rs 25
(b) Banded pack of 4 soaps of 75 gm for Rs 27
(c) Total Fatty M atter (TFM) content indicates the oil content in soap.

Typical consumer perception is higher TFM = higher quality
Source : Company, Kotak Institutional Equities.

Exhibit 4: Existing brands of soaps (segmentw ise) in the market

| Segment | Brand | Company |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| Premium | Dove | HUL |
|  | Pears | HUL |
|  | Mysore Sandal | Karnataka Soaps |
| Mid-priced | Lux International | HUL |
|  | Lux | HUL |
|  | Hamam | HUL |
|  | Rexona | HUL |
|  | Cinthol | Godrej Consumer |
|  | Lifebuoy Plus | HUL |
|  | Santoor | Wipro |
|  | Breeze | HUL |
|  | Lifebuoy | HUL |
|  | Nima | Nirma |
|  | Nirma | Nirma |
|  | Godrej No.1 | Godrej Consumer |

Source : Company, Kotak Institutional Equities.

Exhibit 5: Immense grow th opportunities for ITC considering the high market shares of HUL and gap with the nearest competitor
Category snapshot for personal products

|  | Market share \% |  | Market growth \% |  | Category penetration \% |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | HUL | Nearest competitor | 2006 | YTD 2007 | All India | Urban |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personal wash | 54.0 | 10.0 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 92.0 | 92.0 |
| Shampoo | 47.5 | 24.8 | 13.1 | 13.3 | 92.0 |  |
| Skincare | 55.1 | 7.5 | 15.0 | 16.3 | 38.0 | 52.1 |

Source : HUL presentation.

Exhibit 6: Business under threat from ITC's products
Segment contribution of categories

| Company | Category | Contribution to |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sales (\%) | PBIT (\%) |
| HUL | Soap | 20 | 22 |
| HUL | Shampoo | 7 | 12 |
| Godrej | Soap | 64 | 35 |

Source: Kotak Institutional Equities estimates.

Exhibit 7: Superia-targeting the popular segment


Source: Company.
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