## Sun sets on oil era



- Contrary to market expectations, we believe that oil prices to remain lower for a longer period of time as against consensus estimates of USD60/bbl, USD82/bbl, USD90/bbl and USD96/bbl for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, respectively.
- We reduce our oil price assumptions to USD50/bbl for 2009, USD56/bbl for 2010, and long-term assumption to USD60/bbl for 2011, which is increased by USD1.5/ bbl every year thereafter.
- Taking a cue from estimations of international agencies, we also estimate that oil demand growth to remain negative in 2008 and 2009 by $350 \mathrm{Mbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ and $450 \mathrm{Mbbl} / \mathrm{d}$, respectively, while the oil supply capacity would continue to grow from ongoing projects.
- Due to the above demand-supply mismatch, the spare capacity (indicator of oil fundamentals) is expected to rise as high as 7MMbbls or $8 \%$ of demand by 2010, peaking in 2012.
- We also discount the theory that the marginal cost of production would provide floor to falling oil prices, since with falling commodity prices and increased availability of contractors, capital costs could decline by as much as $30 \%$.
- Taking a historical reference from the 1979-80 oil shock and the global recession that followed, we found that oil prices remained in the range of USD10-30/bbl for 20 years between 1983 and 2003.
- We estimate that earnings of Indian upstream companies would have a significant

Our oil price assumptions are 30\% lower than consensus estimates.

## Summary

A continuing weak economy, which would cause lack of demand, we believe, would be the key reason for oil prices to remain lower over a longer period of time. However, consensus estimates still do not reflect lower oil prices in the medium to longer term. After seeing a dramatic rise in oil prices during 2008 and continuous structural build-up during 2003-07, market participants are reluctant to contemplate a lower oil price scenario.

Contrary to consensus estimates, we believe that oil prices to remain lower for a longer period of time. We lower our oil price assumptions for 2009 to USD50/bbl, 2010 to USD56/bbl, and longterm price assumption to USD60/bbl. Our oil price assumptions vis-à-vis consensus, on an average, are lower by around 30\% for 2009-12.

| Antique and consensus estimates on oil prices (USD/bbl) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| WTI | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |
| Antique | 50 | 56 | 60 | 62 |
| Consensus | 60 | 82 | 90 | $\mathbf{9 6}$ |
| Diff between Antique and consensus | $\mathbf{( 1 7 \% )}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 2 \% )}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 3 \% )}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 6 \% )}$ |

Source: Bloomberg, Antique

## The key reasons for the continuous depressed oil prices are as follows:

- As per IMF estimates, the global economy is expected to expand only by 2.2\% in 2009, after clocking an average growth of $4.5 \%$ during 2003-07. In advanced economies, the output is forecast to contract on a full-year basis in 2009, the first such fall in the post-war period. We believe that current recessionary conditions would have a dampening impact not only on demand growth, but also on the affordability of oil at higher prices.
- With the economic slowdown, we expect global oil demand to contract by $450 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ in 2009 after shrinking by 350MMbbl/d in 2008. This would be the first consecutive contraction in oil demand growth after the 1981 recession.
- However, supply would continue to rise in the medium term from ongoing projects due to sunk cost economics. Also, a significant reduction in upstream capital costs by about $30 \%$ would also make projects feasible in a lower oil price environment. This would lead to continuity in global supply additions at least till 2013.
- Due to this supply-demand mismatch, the spare capacity, which on average stood at 2.0MMbbl/ d during 2005-07, is expected to grow even further through 2009-12. The spare capacity is likely to rise from $2.7 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ in 2007 to peak in 2012 at $8 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$. The excess spare capacity would also help in removing the permanent geopolitical risk premium, which had been built into the oil price since 2003.
- Non-fundamental factors such as the decline in the US dollar, the increased speculative index investing and the 'fear factor' about the adequacy of oil supplies are also in rapid retreat now.

| Recommendation summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Company | Recommendation | CMP | Target price | Downside | FY10e EPS | PE ( $\mathbf{x}$ ) | Valuation |  |
| Cairn India Ltd.* | SELL | 179 | 144 | $-20 \%$ | 2.7 | 68 | DCF |  |
| GAIL | SELL | 211 | 171 | $-19 \%$ | 17.7 | 12 | SOTP |  |
| ONGC | SELL | 719 | 594 | $-17 \%$ | 66.6 | 11 | SOTP |  |

[^0]CMP as of 6th Jan., 2009

Since 1970, world GDP growth fell after every oil shock.

After 1981 recession, oil prices remained lower for 20 years.

## Taking a cue from history

Historically, every recession since the early 1970s has followed a period of high oil prices. However, the excessive leverage and under-pricing of risk are also central to the current downturn. In the current down turn, oil prices played what has been described as a 'contributing role' by reducing consumer spending and confidence, and placing the burden on many businesses, both large and small.

In the early 1970s, the global GDP was growing at annual rates of 6-9\%. The so-called first oil shock, which took place in 1973, restricted the GDP growth in 1974-75 to less than $2 \%$. Similarly, the GDP grew at 6-7\% during 1976-79, the year of the Iranian revolution and the accompanying second oil shock. For 1980-82, the average growth was again below 2\%. From 1983 to 1988, it recovered to around 6\%.

After 1980, oil prices began a 6-year decline, which culminated with a 46\% price drop in 1986. This was due to reduced demand and over-production, which caused cracks in OPEC's unity. Oil prices remained on a low trajectory during 1983-2003. Prices saw a small spike again in 2000. In 2001, the GDP growth registered a similar drop.

The highest average annual oil price prior to 2004 was USD36/bbl in 1980. For 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007, the annual price of WTI crude averaged USD41/bbl, USD56/bbl, USD66/bbl and USD72/ bbl, respectively, as the GDP continued to grow at 6-7\% over this period.

## Oil prices remained low for 20 years after the 1981 recession.



[^1]Consensus still bullish on oil prices, assumptions has a down side risk.

## Consensus estimates still do not reflect lower oil prices

Consensus estimates on oil prices are still very bullish. These estimates indicate a USD82/bbl and USD90/bbl for 2010 and 2011, respectively, and even reflect a higher price assumption at USD96/bbl for 2012, which we believe amounts to ignoring the fundamentals. In fact, looking at the history of consensus estimates, we found that current oil price estimates are higher than what they were one year ago, despite economic fundamentals being considerably weaker than what they were at that time. While in September 2007, the oil price assumption averaged USD62/bbl for 2009-12, the current assumption averages 43\% higher at USD89/bbl. The current high oil price assumption also reflects high oil prices seen in 2008.

Oil price assumptions to come down significantly (USD/bbl)


Source: Bloomberg, Antique

In our opinion, further scope exists for these assumptions to come down, as oil prices continue to remain lower going forward. This is similar to what had happened after the 1979 oil shock, when oil price assumptions continued to fall with price assumptions drifting lower during 1982-97.

## Oil price-falling assumptions every year (USD/bbl)



[^2]Global economic growth for 2009 is estimated at 2.2\%.

World oil demand growth is expected to remain negative during 2008 and 2009.

## Interpreting factors that would contribute to lower oil prices during 2009-12

## Global economic growth - Single most important variable for oil demand growth

The IMF downgraded world economic growth estimates to $2.2 \%$ in 2009 from its earlier estimate of 3\%. After averaging 4.5\% between 2003 and 2007, the global GDP growth is now expected to average $2.2 \%$ in 2009. In its recent world economic outlook, the IMF also mentioned that the prospects for global growth have deteriorated over the past months due to the financial sector's continued de-leveraging, and producer and consumer confidence taking a hit. In advanced economies, the output is forecast to contract on a full-year basis in 2009, the first such fall in the post-war period. Growth rates in emerging and developing economies are estimated at $5 \%$, which is higher than in earlier business cycle troughs (for example, 1990, 1998, and 2001). However, the IMF estimates that the cyclical downturn in emerging economies is of a similar magnitude to that in advanced economies, when measured relative to higher trend growth rates in line with past cycles.


Source: EIA, CERA, Bloomberg, Antique

## Global oil demand expected to contract in 2009

We believe that a sharp deterioration in the global economic outlook for 2009 would lead to a second consecutive decline in world oil demand growth. At the beginning of 2008, most international agencies had anticipated that the global oil demand would grow by around $1.2 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ and $1.5 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ in 2008 and 2009, respectively, after averaging $1.6 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ in the preceding 5 years. Our current outlook for demand growth for 2008 and 2009 is negative at -350Mbbl/d and -450Mbbl/ d, respectively. Most reputed international oil agencies also expect oil demand to contract in 2008 and 2009, which would be the first consecutive fall in oil demand after the 1981 recession. This sharp reduction in demand has been a significant factor in the oil price decline.

Table of demand growth estimates by international oil agencies (Mbbl/d)

| Agencies | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| IEA | $(200)$ | 440 |
| EIA | $(53)$ | $(445)$ |
| CERA | $(300)$ | $(300)$ |
| OPEC | $(100)$ | $(150)$ |

Spare capacity to peak in 2012 at 8MMbbl/d, or 9\% of demand.

Despite lower prices, we do not expect the demand to increase because of the overwhelming impact of weaker economic activity. What happens next to oil prices depends greatly, as in the case of 2003-07, on the pace of the global economic growth. But this time around, the question is how deep and how long the recession would be, and how big would be the hit on consumer spending. But even as demand recovers with the economy, supply from projects underway would also continue to increase at a greater pace, which was a missing factor during 2003-07.

## Spare capacity would continue to rise till 2012

In the beginning of 2008, the average global spare capacity stood at around $2.7 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$. But as the demand has slid sharply, the spare capacity would rise to $5.4 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$, or $6 \%$ of the global demand in 2009 - levels not seen since 2002 or the beginning of the surge in oil prices. This increase in spare capacity, for the time being, has removed the geopolitical risk premium that contributed to rising prices until July 2008. The significance of the spare capacity cannot be understated, as it is a fear gauge of whether excess supply is available should a disruption to normal production materialise.

CERA also expects that productive capacity in 2010 will be more than $4 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ higher than in 2008. This figure of $4 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ is a net increase over and above the replacement of production declines at an average aggregate rate of $4.5 \%$ per year from existing fields. During this period, oil demand is projected to be broadly flat, with some growth in 2010 offsetting declines in 2008-09. Therefore, shut-in and spare capacity could increase to $7 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$, on an average, for 2010, and would continue to rise till 2012. The spare capacity would increase to $8 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$ in 2012 and decline only post-2013.

In the last 3 months, OPEC has also announced bigger production cuts of $4.4 \mathrm{MMbbl} / \mathrm{d}$. Possibly, fiscal responsibilities of governments globally may not allow a cut in production to boost prices. We expect the adherence to quotas to fall as prices decline further, which would keep supplying markets with sufficient volumes.


[^3]Supply from currently producing or projects under development, not at risk.

Upstream cost is expected to fall by c30\% over next two years.

## No real impact on supply

## Supplies in medium term not vulnerable to lower oil prices

The current fall and volatility in oil prices have a differential impact on various components of supply.

## Currently producing fields

We believe that the investment in producing-fields will continue as long as the price covers their cash costs. Some high-cost, low-producing 'stripper' wells and expensive projects for enhanced oil recovery are especially vulnerable. But volumes that are immediately at risk are less than 500 Mbbl/d.

## Fields under development to proceed

We believe that most fields underway will also proceed with their activities because of the impact of sunk cost economics. The momentum of fields already under development will continue to add to supply in the short-to-medium term.

## Projects not yet started

We believe that categories that are at maximum risk are development projects, which have not yet started, discoveries not yet approved for development and spending on exploration. Other nontraditional components of future supply such as new biofuel, coal-to-liquids and gas-to-liquids projects will also be affected. As these are the project categories that bear the brunt of any delays, their impact on total supply builds up over time would only be evident post-2013.

## Runaway upstream costs - Not the case now

From 2005 to the summer of 2008, there was a dramatic rise in the cost to find, develop, and produce oil and gas. The IHS/CERA Upstream Capital Costs Index has increased by 130\% since 2000.

Rising oil prices from 2003 onward gave oil companies the wherewithal to raise their capital budgets, and the market's focus on possible tightness in supply gave them encouragement to take on more projects.

In addition to tight markets for upstream services and equipment, and a shortage of skilled personnel and labour, the industry's cost base was inflated by some of the same factors that drove the broader economic boom. There were big hikes in raw material prices like steel, besides a rise in bulk shipping, driven partly by higher fuel prices and partly by capacity constraints.

Currently, strong downward pressure is seen on many of these cost components. New tenders are beginning to reflect reductions, while oil companies are revisiting existing contracts, which do not reflect the current market environment. With a sharp fall in key input costs, we estimate that capital costs for upstream projects would drop by $20-30 \%$ over the next 2 years. CERA also estimates that upstream costs could be down by $40 \%$ in the next 2 years.

| ars |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
| Marginal cost of production |
| at cusD62/bbl, after |
| assuming 20\% fall. |
|  |

[^4] costs also fell.

If we reduce current cost levels by 20\%, the highest cost estimate for Canada's oil sand comes down to USD62/bbl at $15 \%$ IRR. If we estimate that upstream costs would decline more than $20 \%$ over the next 2 years, this would even make Canada's oil sands feasible under our long-term price estimate of USD60/bbl. Hence, it allays concerns on under-investment due to lower oil prices as

```
Minimum WTI oil price to justify investment in new projects (USD/bbl)
(based on a \(\mathbf{1 5 \%}\) IRR after taking a 20\% cut in current cost levels in fiscal terms)
```



Existing contracts at higher prices would also be revisited.

Industry cost base to fall adjusting for prevailing oil price, similar to 19922002.

Oil majors still use USD5560/bbl as justification for investments.

## What would happen to existing contracts at higher prices?

In cases where the expected oil price is too low to justify the prevailing cost level, we expect that projects would be postponed or even cancelled. In a slackening equipment market, part of the price fall may be absorbed, as in the past, by suppliers in the form of lower rates. While if suppliers' alternative is to see people and equipment idled, they may prefer to cover just their cash costs and absorb the loss on their own recent investments while waiting for the cycle to turn, which seems unlikely.

These are not just theoretical possibilities. As per a CERA study, in 1981, the oil price dropped from its highs, following the second oil shock in 1979. Just as in 2008, the industry's cost base was left uncomfortably high in relation to the newly prevailing oil price. By 1996, these costs had been reduced to about a third of their 1981 levels.


Source: CERA

## Oil majors conservative on oil prices to evaluate projects

Our analysis of Western oil majors suggests that the oil price used by companies to evaluate their investment is still below USD60/bbl, despite substantially high oil prices seen in 2007 and 2008. The 2008 average for six oil majors is close to USD52/bbl, which in most cases had been raised in 2008 after seeing an average USD72/bbl of oil price in 2007. This, we believe, helps in supporting our view that lower oil prices below USD60/bbl may not impact investments in the oil sector by oil majors, though we believe that the recent crash in oil prices will bring more capital discipline.

| Table of oil price assumptions by global oil majors |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Oil price assumptions by global oil majors (USD/bbl) | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |
| ENI | 64 | 57 | 50 |
| Repsol | 55 | 60 | 60 |
| Total | 40 | 60 | 60 |
| BP | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| BG | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| StatoilHydro | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| Average | $\mathbf{5 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ |

[^5]Fiscal terms are also expected to ease.

The 'USD' factor not supporting now.

## Easing fiscal terms to help supply growth

During rising oil prices, we saw the phenomenon of resource-holding by governments for securing a larger share of economic rents through tax hikes and changes to terms on which resources could be accessed. In many major oil-producing nations (countries holding more than 200bn bbls of reserves), the state-takes now averages 85\%, having risen over recent years by more than $15 \%$. Some host governments have set tougher terms only for new activities, while others have also increased their take from existing contracts.

However, with lower oil prices and rising risk to investments, we expect that government policies would also change, consolidating the weaker demand trajectory. Critical imbalances among price, costs and taxes may call for emergency responses.

There has already been one such response: in November, Russia announced a 32\% cut in oil export duties. We believe that easing fiscal terms may also bring down the cost of investments, besides making projects more attractive in IRR terms. Going forward, this would be helpful in easing supply constraints.

## Other factors not supporting now

## The 'USD' factor

The tight balance between supply and demand during 2002-08 was not the only factor that drove higher oil prices; oil prices were also caught up in an increasingly unsustainable commodity boom. The final explosion in oil and other commodity prices began in late summer 2007, as a weakening dollar set off a 'flight to commodities', besides creating an increasing emphasis on oil and other commodities as an asset class and storehouse of value.

However, they are no more contributing factors now, as de-leveraging across the globe has reduced the availability of money for chasing commodities. Despite the recent sharp fall in USD once again, oil prices have not inched up.


[^6]Speculative interest in oil futures also fell due to global de-leveraging.

## Speculative interest following oil has also taken a back-seat

In early 2008, as the US economy showed growing signs of weakness and prospects deteriorated for its housing, credit and financial markets, 'non-commercial investors' moved even more vigorously into oil and other commodities as a new asset class. However, as economic conditions worsened and financial liquidation began, investors fled from oil futures under redemption pressure to fund other obligations. Open interest in Nymex oil futures, which was 1.5 MMbbls at peak in March 2008, fell to 1MMbbls by October 2008.

Falling open interest in oil futures at Nymex vs oil prices


Source: Bloomberg, Antique

## Net long speculative positions vs rise in oil prices



Net long speculative positions (000bbls) LHS
_WTI (USD/bbl) RHS
Source: Bloomberg, Antique

## Risks to our call

## Key macro risks to our oil price assumption are as below:

- Strong global economic growth may increase the oil demand growth for 2009 and 2010, which may lead to higher oil prices.
- Significant delay in oil projects estimated by us may affect our spare capacity estimates and bring tightness to oil markets.
- A more-than-expected slowdown in future exploration and development activities may affect our estimates of future oil supply.
- Overestimation of supply additions and how fast the new capacity will come on-stream may affect our bearish view on oil prices.
- Any adverse regulatory change with respect to direct or indirect taxation on oil may affect our future supply estimates.
- Unexpected non-commercial activity in oil futures by financial investors may lead to price distortion on the higher side.
- During 2008, as USD weakened, financial investors moved into oil futures driving its prices higher. Any such development in future may affect our oil price assumptions.
- Geopolitical tension in oil-producing countries may bring back the premium for geopolitical risk to drive oil prices higher.


## Cairn India Ltd. (CIL)

No more riding the 'crude' wave

SELL
CMP: INR179
Target Price: INR144
January 7, 2009
Strictly confidential

| Market Data |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Sector | $:$ | Oil \& Gas |
| Market Cap (INRbn) | $:$ | 345 |
| Market Cap (USDbn) | $:$ | 7.1 |
| OIS shares (m) | $:$ | 1,897 |
| Free Float (m) | $:$ | 430 |
| 52-wk HI/LO (INR) | $:$ | $343 / 88$ |
| Avg Daily Vol ('000) | $:$ | 5,628 |
| Face Value (INR) | $:$ | 10 |
| Bloomberg | $:$ | CAIR IN |
| Reuters | $:$ | CAIL.BO |


| Price Performance |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 m}$ | $\mathbf{3 m}$ | $\mathbf{6 m}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 m}$ |
| Absolute | 21 | 1 | $(28)$ | $(30)$ |
| Relative | 16 | 17 | $(1)$ | 20 |
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## We initiate coverage on CIL, with a SELL rating and a target price of INR144/share.

## Lower oil price to impact CIL value

CIL's value is highly levered to crude oil prices. We believe that oil prices are expected to remain lower for a longer period of time. Our oil price assumptions are 30\% lower than the average consensus price assumption for CY2009-12. We have assumed a long-term oil price of USD60/bbl for our earnings forecast for CY2011, and increased it by USD1.5/bbl every year thereafter. At our long-term oil price assumption of USD60/bbl, CIL DCF estimates suggests a fair value of INR144/share.

## Concerns over discount on quality of Rajasthan crude

Rajasthan crude, with an API gravity of $26-28^{\circ}$, as against Brent's API gravity of $38^{\circ}$, is of waxy and heavy nature with a product yield lower as compared with Brent. This implies that Rajasthan crude would be sold at a discount to the benchmark Brent. For Rajasthan crude, we estimate a 14\% discount to Brent. We believe that PSU refiners may also ask for a convenience discount along with the discount due to quality of crude.

## Producing properties in declining mode

CIL's currently producing fields, Ravva and Cambay, are in decline mode. Consortium partners have proposed drilling of additional wells, besides planning a capital expenditure (USD100m net to Cairn) for improving the production profile. However, despite these measures, we believe that production from these fields would decline from CY2010.

## Valuations

We initiate coverage on CIL with a 12-month target price of INR144/ share based on our DCF estimate.

| Key financials |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended December | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7 a}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| Net Revenue (INRm) | 10,123 | 13,139 | 18,864 | 75,992 |
| EBITDA (INRm) | 2,039 | 8,118 | 11,997 | 59,803 |
| EBITDA growth (\%) | na | $298 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $398 \%$ |
| PAT (INRm) | $(247)$ | 3,699 | 5,035 | 44,304 |
| PAT growth (\%) | na | na | $36 \%$ | $780 \%$ |
| EPS (INR/share) | $(0.1)$ | 2.0 | 2.7 | 23.2 |
| EPS growth (\%) | na | na | $36 \%$ | $777 \%$ |
| PE (x) | na | 93.2 | 68.6 | 7.8 |
| PB (x) | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| EV/EBITDA (x) | 164.1 | 44.6 | 31.0 | 5.6 |
| RoE (\%) | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $12 \%$ |

[^7]
## Valuing MBA fields (Block: RJ-ON-90/1)

- CIL share $70 \%$, ONGC share $30 \%$.
- Total oil production: 677MMbbls without EOR, first oil from 2HCY09.
- Total EOR oil production: 270MMbbls, starting from CY2014.
- Gross development capital expenditure: USD3.0bn.
- Cost of production: USD4.5/bbl, including the pipeline operating cost.
- EOR cost of production: USD10/bbl.
- Discount to Brent: $14 \%$.
- Cess: INR927/mt.
- Cost of Equity: 12\%; Debt: Equity ratio: 10:.90.
- Royalty: $12.5 \%$ on oil revenue borne by ONGC.
- Income tax: IT rate of 34\%; tax holiday for the first 7 years. We have assumed MAT of 10.3\%.

| The government's profit share |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Investment multiple | GOI share |
| $0.0-1.5$ | $20 \%$ |
| $1.5-2.0$ | $30 \%$ |
| $2.0-2.5$ | $40 \%$ |
| $>2.5$ | $50 \%$ |

Source: Company

## Production profile of Rajasthan block (Mbbl/d)



[^8]We expect a bigger discount of $14 \%$ to Cairn Rajasthan crude.

Table of reserves (MMboe)

|  | Gross <br> STOIIP <br> Cairn | 2P Gross <br> Reserves/Resources |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2P Net } \\ \text { Reserves/Resources } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | D\&M | Cairn | D\&M | Cairn | D\&M |
| Rajasthan MBA fields | 2,054 | 2,118 | 685 | 701 | 479 | 491 |
| Rajasthan MBA EOR |  |  | 308 | 308 | 216 | 216 |
| RJ small fields-Saraswati \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raageshwari oil | 300 | 144 | 12 | 39 | 9 | 27 |
| RJ other fields | 1,397 | 1,216 | 72 | 54 | 51 | 38 |
| Total | 3,751 | 3,478 | 1,077 | 1,102 | 755 | 772 |

2P Reserves and resources - Gross and Cairn net 2007 year end - Cairn India Le and DeGolyer \& MacNaughton
2P Reserves include estimates of expected production during the current PSC term (May 14, 2020 for Rajasthan)
2C Resources are those volumes expected to be produced outside the current PSC term (end of field life), or where development planning or approval is pending.
Source: Company
Against gross 2 P reserves of 993MMbbls accruing to MBA fields, including EOR, our production assumption pegs the gross recovery at 946 MMbbls , implying a recovery factor of $95 \%$ for 2 P reserves.

## Nil valuation to exploration upsides

Assets where exploration is under progress: These are high-risk assets, as exploration is under progress, and discoveries are either not made or they are under appraisal. The valuation of these assets depend on the probabilistic estimation of success, history of previous exploration successes in the block, experience and technical expertise of the operator, and the risk appetite of investors. In our valuations, we ascribe nil value to these assets.

## Uncertainties ahead

## Crude discount to remain a bigger issue

Rajasthan crude, with an API gravity of $26-28^{\circ}$, as against Brent's API gravity of $38^{\circ}$, is of waxy and heavy nature with a product yield lower as compared with Brent. As a result, we reckon that the pricing of the crude would be at a substantial discount to the Brent.

We estimate that Rajasthan crude to have a higher discount of 14\% to Brent, as India oil marketing companies are sceptical about the quality of the crude and their ability to process for maximising yields.

## Risk of windfall tax - Unlikely in lower oil price scenario

The government was considering the imposition of a special oil tax on the domestic crude oil production under the pre-NELP blocks. The proposed tax was supposed to be implemented after the price of domestically produced crude oil crossed the USD75/bbl-mark. Under the proposal, public sector oil producers such as ONGC and Oil India would have to fork out to the government $100 \%$ of additional realisations beyond the cut-off price, while private companies would be required to pay $40 \%$ of their windfall gains. With the recent sharp fall in oil prices, we do not expect this levy to come up, which is slightly positive for Cairn since Rajasthan block is a pre-NELP block.

## Levy of cess on Rajasthan block

CIL's liability to pay the cess on production from Rajasthan block has been under dispute with the Government of India due to ambiguities in the production sharing contract (PSC). If CIL is asked to bear the liability, it can range between nil and INR2,575/mt. In our base case valuations, we have assumed that CIL would be liable for a cess of INR927/mt. However, if CIL is mandated to pay the cess at the rate of INR2,575/mt, then it will reduce our DCF estimate by INR14/share.

Sensitivities of CIL valuation with respect to various assumptions

| DCF sensitivity to WACC and exchange rates |  |  |  | Exchange rates |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  |  | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 |
|  | $9.5 \%$ | 162 | 162 | 163 | 164 | 164 | 165 | 166 |
| U | $10.0 \%$ | 156 | 157 | 158 | 158 | 159 | 160 | 160 |
| U | $10.5 \%$ | 151 | 152 | 153 | 153 | 154 | 155 | 155 |
| 3 | $11.0 \%$ | 147 | 147 | 148 | 149 | 149 | 150 | 150 |
|  | $11.5 \%$ | 142 | 143 | 143 | 144 | 145 | 145 | 146 |
|  | $12.0 \%$ | 138 | 138 | 139 | 140 | 140 | 141 | 142 |

Source: Antique

| DCF sensitivity to oil prices and exchange rates |  |  |  |  | Oil prices |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 50 | 53 | 56 | 59 | 62 | 65 | 68 |
|  | 40 | 128 | 135 | 143 | 151 | 160 | 166 | 172 |
|  | 41 | 129 | 136 | 143 | 152 | 160 | 167 | 173 |
|  | 42 | 129 | 137 | 144 | 153 | 161 | 168 | 174 |
|  | 43 | 130 | 137 | 145 | 153 | 162 | 168 | 175 |
|  | 44 | 130 | 138 | 145 | 154 | 163 | 169 | 175 |
|  | 45 | 131 | 138 | 146 | 155 | 163 | 170 | 176 |

Source: Antique

## Valuations

We initiate coverage on CIL with a SELL rating, and a 12-month target price of INR144/share based on our DCF estimate.

| Valuation table |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Particulars | WACC | INRm |
| DCF | $11.5 \%$ | 290,316 |
| Net Debt |  | $(17,045)$ |
| Total Value | $\mathbf{2 7 3 , 2 7 1}$ |  |
| No. of shares $(m)$ | 1,899 |  |
| Value per share | $\mathbf{1 4 4}$ |  |

Source: Antique

## Key risks to our estimates

- Rise in oil prices higher than our estimates would increase DCF valuations as shown in the sensitivities above.
- Nil liability of cess on CIL would increase the value of our DCF-based target price by INR14/ share.
- Discount on Rajasthan crude lower than our estimates would increase our DCF value.
- Ramp up of production from Rajasthan block faster than our expectations would affect our DCF estimates.

| Profit and Loss Account |  |  |  |  |  | Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year ended 31st Dec 2007a |  | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e | Year ended 31st Dec | 2007a | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |
| Revenues | 10,123 | 13,139 | 18,864 | 75,992 | 96,250 | PBT | 1,259 | 6,765 | 6,822 | 50,726 | 70,819 |
| Expenses | $(8,083)$ | $(5,021)$ | $(6,866)$ | $(16,189)$ | $(18,887)$ | Depreciation | 2,077 | 2,751 | 3,754 | 8,152 | 8,978 |
| EBITDA | 2,039 | 8,118 | 11,997 | 59,803 | 77,363 | Interest | (701) | $(1,399)$ | 1,422 | 925 | $(2,435)$ |
| Depreciation \& amortisation ( 2,077 ) |  | $(2,751)$ | $(3,754)$ | $(8,152)$ | $(8,978)$ | Changes in working capital Others | (908) | $(4,119)$ | 1,779 | $(8,049)$ | $(3,292)$ |
| EBIT | (38) | 5,366 | 8,244 | 51,651 | 68,384 |  | 4,596 | 136 | 136 | 98 | 0 |
| Interest expense | (27) | $(1,951)$ | $(1,891)$ | $(2,645)$ | $(1,424)$ | Tax paid | (820) | (581) | $(1,412)$ | $(6,160)$ | $(7,937)$ |
| Other income | 1,324 | 3,350 | 469 | 1,719 | 3,859 | CF from operating activities | s 5,504 | 3,553 | 12,501 | 45,692 | 66,134 |
| Profit before tax | 1,259 | 6,765 | 6,822 | 50,726 | 70,819 | Capex | $(32,939)$ | $(56,659)$ | $(24,218)$ | $(1,008)$ | (144) |
| Tax | $(1,505)$ | $(1,116)$ | $(1,786)$ | $(6,422)$ | $(8,121)$ | InvestmentsOthers | $(7,024)$ | 3,512 | 3,161 | (35) | (39) |
| Profit after tax | (245) | 5,649 | 5,035 | 44,304 | 62,698 |  | $(25,609)$ | $(4,389)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adjusted profit after tax | (247) | 3,699 | 5,035 | 44,304 | 62,698 | Income from investments | 1,269 | 1,399 | 469 | 1,719 | 3,859 |
| Recurring EPS (INR) | (0.1) | 2.0 | 2.7 | 23.2 | 32.7 | CF | $(64,304)$ | $(56,138)$ | $(20,588)$ | 676 | 3,677 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Changes in share capital | 2,094 | 25,346 | 0 | (0) | 0 |
| Balance Sheet |  |  |  |  |  | Changes in Debt | $(1,692)$ | 24,914 | 9,953 | (42) | $(17,438)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Dividends \& Interest paid CF from financing activities | $(1,447)$ | 0 | $(1,891)$ | $(12,174)$ | $(12,920)$ |
| Year ended 31st Dec 2007a |  | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  | $(1,045)$ | 50,260 | 8,062 | (12,216) | $(30,358)$ |
| Share Capital | 17,784 | 18,944 | 18,990 | 19,058 | 19,160 |  | $(59,844)$ | $(2,324)$ | (25) | 34,153 | 39,452 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Add: Opening balanceClosing balance | 73,162 | 13,318 | 10,994 | 10,969 | 45,121 |
| Reserves \& SurplusNetworth | 276,574 | 306,409 | 311,399 | 346,105 | 397,205 |  | 13,318 | 10,994 | 10,969 | 45,121 | 84,574 |
|  | 294,358 | 325,353 | 330,388 | 365,163 | 416,366 | Closing balance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt | 3,124 | 28,039 | 37,992 | 37,950 | 20,512 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Employed | 297,482 | 353,392 | $368,380$ | $403,113$ | 436,877 | Key assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Fixed Assets | 254,285 | (779) |  | $\begin{array}{r} 258,675 \\ (1,128) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 258,675 \\ (1,306) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accumulated Depreciation | (606) |  | $\begin{array}{r} 258,675 \\ (953) \end{array}$ |  |  | Year ended 31st Dec 2007a |  | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |
| Net Assets <br> ExdDevelop and sie restarion coss | 253,679 | 257,896 | 257,722 | 257,546 | 257,369 | WTI (USD/bbl) | 72 | 97 | 50 | 5641 | 60 |
|  | 29,060 | 83,139 | 103,778 | $\begin{array}{r} 96,810 \\ 492 \end{array}$ | 88,152 | INR/USD | 44 |  | 42 |  | 40 |
| Investments | 7,129 | 3,617 | 456 |  | 530 |  | nil | nil | 25 | 41 | 175 |
| Current Assets Loans \& Advances |  |  |  |  |  | Onerfeels seemploculdion(Mbeed) | 19 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 4.5 |
| Inventory | $1,216$ | $1,578$ | 2,266 | 9,129 | 11,562 | MBA costof production (USD/bbl) | na6.9 | ${ }^{\text {na }}$ | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Debtors | 13,318 | 1,723 | 10,969 | $\begin{array}{r} 9,627 \\ 45,121 \end{array}$ | 12,17584,574 |  |  | 6.6 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 7.1 |
| Cash \& Bank |  | 10,994 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans \& advances and others 4,650 |  | 6,808 | 5,457 | 6,403 | 6,868 | Growth Indicators (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Liabilities \& Provisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Creditors | 4,692 | 3,570 |  | 4,906 | 11,349 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,004 \\ 5,077 \end{array}$ | Year ended 31st Dec 2007a |  | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |
| Other liabilities \& provisions | 3,680 | 3,577 | 4,077 | 4,577 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,077 \\ 97,097 \end{array}$ | Revenue |  |  | 44\% | 303\% | 27\% |
| Net Current Assets | 12,161 | 13,956 | 12,152 | 54,353 |  |  |  | 298\% |  | 398\% |  |
| Deferred tax assets/(liabilities) | $(4,917)$ | $(5,451)$ | $(5,826)$ | $(6,088)$ | $(6,272)$ | EBITDA | na |  | 48\% |  | 29\% |
| Misc expenses | 370 | 234 | 98 | 0 | 0 | PAT | na | na | $36 \%$$36 \%$ | 777\% | 42\% |
| Application of Funds | 297,482 | 353,392 | 368,380 | 403,113 | 436,877 | EPS | na | na |  |  | 41\% |
| Per share data |  |  |  |  |  | Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year ended 31st Dec | 2007a | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e | Year ended 31st Dec | 2007a | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |
| No. of shares (Mn) | 1,778 | 1,894 | 1,899 | 1,906 | 1,916 | PE ( $)^{\text {) }}$ | na | 93.2 | 68.6 | 7.8 | 5.6 |
| BVPS (INR) | 166 | 172 | 174 | 192 | 217 | P/BV ( x ) | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| CEPS (INR) | 1 | 3 | 5 | 28 | 37 | EV/EBITDA ( x ) | 164.1 | 44.6 | 31.0 | 5.6 | 3.6 |
| DPS (INR) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | EV/Sales ( x ) | 33.1 | 27.5 | 19.7 | 4.4 | 2.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Dividend Yield (\%) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 3.3\% |
| Margins (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | Financial ratios |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year ended 31st Dec | 2007a | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e | Year ended 31st Dec | 2007a | 2008e | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |
| EBITDA | 20\% | 62\% | 64\% | 79\% | 80\% | RoE | 0\% | 1\% | 2\% | 12\% | 15\% |
| EBIT | 0\% | 41\% | 44\% | 68\% | 71\% | RoCE | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% | 13\% | 16\% |
| PAT | -2\% | 43\% | 27\% | 58\% | 65\% | Debt/Equity ( x ) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | EBIT/Interest (x) | (1.4) | 2.8 | 4.4 | 19.5 | 48.0 |
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| Market Data |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Sector | $:$ | Oil \& Gas |
| Market Cap (INRbn) | $:$ | 272 |
| Market Cap (USDbn) | $:$ | 5.6 |
| OIS shares (m) | $:$ | 1,268 |
| Free Float (m) | $:$ | 449 |
| 52-wk HI/LO (INR) | $:$ | $357 / 165$ |
| Avg Daily Vol (‘000) | $:$ | 2,681 |
| Face Value (INR) | $:$ | 10 |
| Bloomberg | $:$ | GAIL IN |
| Reuters | $:$ | GAIL.BO |


| Price Performance |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 m}$ | $\mathbf{3 m}$ | $\mathbf{6 m}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 m}$ |
| Absolute | $(2)$ | $(23)$ | $(7)$ | $(42)$ |
| Relative | $(9)$ | $(5)$ | $(29)$ | 11 |



## Price Performance Vs NIFTY



We initiate coverage on GAIL, with a SELL rating and a target price of INR171/share.

## New tariff regulations - Negative for pipeline division

The Petroleum and Natural Gas Regulatory Board (PNGRB) has notified new regulations for pipeline tariffs. The PNGRB has fixed the regulated return at $12 \%$ post-tax ROCE, and the capital employed would be based on net block. This would be highly negative for GAIL, as the lower depreciated value of its pipelines would reduce the capital employed and tariffs thereon. We are assuming a $14 \%$ reduction in average tariffs for GAIL in FY10e. Despite our estimation of additional transmission volumes of 17MMcmd for GAIL in FY10e, the FY10e pipeline EBIT is expected to decline by $8 \%$ YoY.

## Petrochemical earnings dive

We expect petrochemical prices to remain depressed during FY1011e, as the demand outlook remains weak and gas-based Middle East supply comes in CY2009. We have assumed polyethylene prices at USD820/mt for FY10e, which would reduce FY10e PetChem's EBIT by 74\% YoY.

## LPG and liquid hydrocarbons - Realisations down

This division has a story similar to petrochemical division, where prices LPG and naphtha prices are expected to remain lower, following the decline in oil prices. Our under-recoveries model indicate that cooking fuels would continue to see under-recoveries during FY10e, and at USD52/bbl of oil prices, estimated losses could be INR203bn. We estimate that GAIL would share underrecoveries of INR4,173m, and post a $39 \%$ YoY decline in segmental EBIT.

## Valuations

We initiate coverage on GAIL with a 12-month target price of INR171/ share based on sum-of-the-parts valuation. We value the core business at INR142/share, applying an 8x multiple on FY10e EPS of INR17.7/share. We value listed investments at INR29/share, and arrive at our target price of INR171/share.

| Key financials |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended March | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 a}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 e}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 e}$ |
| Net Revenue (INRm) | 188,705 | 227,772 | 219,119 | 225,892 |
| EBITDA (INRm) | 43,140 | 47,782 | 39,627 | 46,151 |
| EBITDA growth (\%) | $13 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| PAT (INRm) | 27,907 | 30,187 | 22,496 | 25,570 |
| PAT growth (\%) | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| EPS (INR/share) | 22.0 | 23.8 | 17.7 | 20.2 |
| EPS growth (\%) | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| PE (x) | 9.7 | 9.0 | 12.1 | 10.6 |
| PB (x) | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| EV/EBITDA (x) | 6.1 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 7.2 |
| RoE (\%) | $21 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ |

Amit Rustagi
+91 2240313434
amitr@antiquelimited.com

12\% ROCE on net block to reduce tariffs for GAIL pipeline division.

PetChem earning's under pressure due to depressed prices.

## Summary of key points of new tariff regulations

The PNGRB notified the determination of Natural Gas Pipeline Tariff Regulations, 2008 to come in effect from FY10e onwards. The regulations provide a reasonable rate of return as $12 \%$ post-tax ROCE for a natural gas pipeline.

The key aspects of the regulations regarding determination of the network tariff for natural gas pipelines are as follows:

1. Tariff computation: The tariff to be charged for a period shall be calculated based on the discounted cash flow methodology on an IRR basis. Cash flows will be discounted using the project's reasonable rate of return. The tariff will remain constant over the economic life of the pipeline, but will be subject to review for each tariff period.
2. Reasonable rate of return: The reasonable rate of return has been fixed at $12 \%$ post-tax ROCE. The pre-tax rate of return shall be computed by grossing up $12 \%$ by the nominal applicable rate of income tax. This works out to $18.2 \%$ based on existing corporate tax rate of $33.99 \%$. The authorised entity is free to leverage the financing of the project in any suitable manner.
3. Return on capital employed (ROCE): The total capital employed shall be equal to gross fixed assets in the project less accumulated depreciation (as per rates allowed under Schedule VI of the Companies Act, 1956), plus the normative working capital (equal to 30 days of the operating cost, excluding depreciation and 18 days of natural gas pipeline tariff receivables).
4. Gross fixed assets: Gross fixed assets shall be the lower of the actual historical cost of acquisition (including the cost of any subsequent replacement or improvement or modification), or that normatively assessed by the board.
5. Operating costs: Actual operating costs or as assessed by the PNGRB, whichever is lower, will be allowed for recovery.
6. Volumes for computation of unit network tariff: The regulations lay down the capacity utilisation norms to be considered for computing the unit tariff over the economic life of the project.

Since it is difficult to ascertain full data on the historical cost and the current net gross block (gross block less accumulated depreciation) of each of GAIL's pipelines in new regulations, we are assuming a 14\% reduction in average tariffs for GAIL in FY10e to INR726/Mcm. Despite our estimation of additional transmission volumes of 17MMcmd for GAIL in FY10e, the FY10e pipeline EBIT is expected to decline by $8 \%$ YoY.

## Petrochemicals earnings down under the downcycle

GAIL petrochemical earnings would take a significant hit as polymer prices have crashed in 3QFY09. We expect polymer prices to remain depressed during FY10-11e, as the demand outlook remains weak and new gas-based Middle East supply is expected to come on-stream by CY2009. We have assumed polyethylene prices at USD820/mt for FY10e and estimate a $74 \%$ YoY decline in PetChem's EBIT.

Subsidies to OMCs would affect earnings for LPG and liquid hydrocarbon segment.


Source: Company, Bloomberg and Antique

## LPG and liquid hydrocarbon business - Subsidies to continue

Earnings from this segment are mainly dependent on LPG prices and subsidy to OMCs. We believe that in line with our lower oil price assumption, LPG prices would remain lower, affecting realisations and margins. Despite lower LPG prices, under-recoveries on cooking fuels would continue in FY10e. We estimate FY10e total cooking fuel under-recoveries at INR203bn based on our oil price estimate of USD52/bbl for FY10e. We estimate GAIL's share of subsidy to oil marketing companies at INR4,173m, and expect the company to post a $39 \%$ YoY decline in segmental EBIT.


Source: Company, Bloomberg and Antique

## GAIL segmental EBIT

| INRm | FY08 | FY09 | FY10 | FY11 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Natural gas transmission | 15,535 | 16,352 | 15,019 | 16,687 |
| LPG transmission | 2,318 | 2,127 | 2,398 | 2,622 |
| Natural Gas Trading | 2,044 | 4,163 | 4,228 | 4,232 |
| Petrochemicals | 12,542 | 9,038 | 2,393 | 3,994 |
| LPG and Liquid Hydrocarbons | 9,004 | 11,370 | 6,949 | 8,861 |
| Gailtel | 31 | $(21)$ | 16 | 16 |
| Profit/Loss Before Interest and Tax | 41,475 | 43,028 | 31,003 | 36,413 |

Source: Company, Antique

## Capex to add value post-FY11e

GAIL's capex of INR170bn would add significant value post-FY11e only. Two major projects VijaipurDadri Pipeline and Dahej-Vijaipur Pipeline Phase-II, which are expected to add significant volumes, have a target completion date of October 2010. Due to the slow progress on projects, we expect a delay of 6-8 months in their completion, which would defer any benefits from these pipelines to FY12e.

| GAIL's pipeline projects |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Major projects | Total cost of project (INRbn) | Expected date of completion from GAIL |
| Vijaipur-Dadri pipeline | 51 | Oct-10 |
| Bawana-Nangal pipeline | 18 | Oct-09 |
| Dahej-Vijaipur pipeline Phase-II | 44 | Oct-10 |
| Chainsa-Jhajjar pipeline | 10 | Oct-09 |
| Jhajjar-Hissar pipeline | 3 | Oct-10 |
| Kailarao and Chainsa compressor | 11 | Oct-11 |

Source: Company, Antique

| Schedule of investments |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Investment | Shares (m) | Price | INRm |
| ON G C | 51 | 594 | 30,507 |
| Indraprastha Gas | 32 | 83 | 2,621 |
| Petronet LNG | 94 | 32 | 3,000 |
| Guj. Inds. Power | 1 | 42 | 24 |
| Total |  |  | $\mathbf{3 6 , 1 5 2}$ |
| No. of shares (m) |  |  | $\mathbf{1 , 2 6 8}$ |
| Value of investments/share |  |  | $\mathbf{2 9}$ |

Note: ONGC-Antique's target price, Other investments at $20 \%$ discount to current market price
Source: Company,Antique

## Valuations

We initiate coverage on GAIL with a 12-month target price of INR171/share based on the sum-of-the-parts valuation. We value the core business at INR142/share, applying an $8 x$ multiple on FY10e EPS of INR17.7/share. We value investments in ONGC at our target price of INR594/ share, and other listed investments at a $20 \%$ discount to the current market value. The value of listed investments to GAIL is INR29/share.

## Table of sum-of-the-parts valuation

| Particulars | Earnings | Multiple | Value per share |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Core business | 17.7 | 8 | 142 |
| Value of investments/share |  |  | 29 |
| Value per share |  | $\mathbf{1 7 1}$ |  |

Source: Antique

## Key risks to our estimates

- Polymer prices higher than our estimates may affect our Petchem division earnings estimates.
- Lower subsidy sharing than our estimates may affect our earnings estimates for LPG and Liquid Hydrocarbons division.
- Lower reduction in transmission pipeline tariffs or higher transmission volumes may affect our earnings estimate for Natural Gas division.
- Deregulation of transportation fuels and relieving upstream companies from sharing under recoveries on cooking fuels, have potential to re rate the earnings and multiples for GAIL.

Financials (INR m)

| Profit and LoSs Account |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| Revenues | 166,062 | 188,705 | 227,772 | 219,119 | 225,892 |
| Expenses | $(133,840)$ | $(145,565)$ | $(179,990)$ | $(179,491)$ | $(179,741)$ |
| EBITDA | 32,222 | 43,140 | 47,782 | 39,627 | 46,151 |
| Depreciation \& amortisation (6,216) | $(6,627)$ | $(6,688)$ | $(8,625)$ | $(9,738)$ |  |
| EBIT | 26,006 | 36,513 | 41,093 | 31,003 | 36,413 |
| Interest expense | $(1,217)$ | $(1,493)$ | $(1,509)$ | $(2,593)$ | $(2,871)$ |
| Other income | 6,099 | 6,221 | 5,894 | 5,874 | 5,226 |
| Profit before tax | 30,889 | 41,241 | 45,479 | 34,283 | 38,768 |
| Tax | $(5,435)$ | $(13,412)$ | $(15,293)$ | $(11,787)$ | $(13,198)$ |
| Profit after tax | 25,453 | 27,829 | 30,187 | 22,496 | 25,570 |
| Adjusted profit after tax | 25,436 | 27,907 | 30,187 | 22,496 | 25,570 |
| Recurring EPS (INR) | 20.1 | 22.0 | 23.8 | 17.7 | 20.2 |


| Balance Sheet |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March $2007 a$ | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| Share Capital | 12,685 | 12,685 | 12,685 | 12,685 | 12,685 |
| Reserves \& Surplus | 105,545 | 122,841 | 142,338 | 156,282 | 171,163 |
| Networth | 118,230 | 135,526 | 155,023 | 168,967 | 183,847 |
| Debt | 36,639 | 37,867 | 38,222 | 78,143 | 88,205 |
| Capital Employed | 154,869 | 173,393 | 193,244 | 247,110 | 272,052 |
| Gross Fixed Assets | 156,971 | 193,642 | 215,619 | 243,456 | 246,066 |
| Accumulated Depreciation | $(76,504)$ | $(82,885)$ | $(89,573)$ | $(98,198)$ | $(107,936)$ |
| Net Assets | 80,467 | 110,758 | 126,046 | 145,259 | 138,130 |
| Capital work in progress | 46,837 | 22,859 | 25,882 | 78,045 | 125,435 |
| Investments | 9,664 | 10,225 | 10,225 | 10,225 | 10,225 |
| Current Assets Loans $\boldsymbol{\&}$ Advances |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inventory | 6,248 | 6,302 | 7,607 | 7,318 | 7,544 |
| Debtors | 8,275 | 11,552 | 13,944 | 13,414 | 13,829 |
| Cash \& Bank | 27,383 | 46,321 | 59,384 | 43,161 | 27,814 |
| Loans \& advances and others 38,379 | 43,938 | 43,938 | 43,938 | 43,938 |  |
| Current Liabilities \& Provisions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Creditors | 27,926 | 35,515 | 43,819 | 43,985 | 44,125 |
| Other liabilities \& provisions | 20,667 | 28,461 | 35,192 | 35,095 | 35,143 |
| Net Current Assets | 31,691 | 44,137 | 45,861 | 28,751 | 13,856 |
| Deferred tax assets/(liabilities) | $(13,791)$ | $(13,848)$ | $(14,032)$ | $(14,432)$ | $(14,857)$ |
| Minority interest | 0 | $(738)$ | $(738)$ | $(738)$ | $(738)$ |
| Application of Funds | 154,869 | 173,393 | 193,244 | 247,110 | 272,052 |


| Per share data |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| No. of shares (Mn) | 1,268 | 1,268 | 1,268 | 1,268 | 1,268 |
| BVPS (INR) | 93 | 107 | 122 | 133 | 145 |
| CEPS (INR) | 25 | 27 | 29 | 25 | 28 |
| DPS (INR) | 10 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 8 |


| Margins (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| EBITDA | $19 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| EBIT | $16 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| PAT | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

## Cash Flow

| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PBT | 30,889 | 41,241 | 45,479 | 34,283 | 38,768 |
| Depreciation | 6,214 | 6,656 | 6,688 | 8,625 | 9,738 |
| Interest | $(851)$ | 1,046 | $(5,048)$ | $(2,900)$ | $(1,100)$ |
| Changes in working capital | $(9,644)$ | $(52)$ | 11,339 | 888 | $(452)$ |
| Tax paid | $(9,178)$ | $(11,076)$ | $(15,108)$ | $(11,387)$ | $(12,773)$ |
| CF from operating activities | 17,430 | 37,815 | 43,350 | 29,508 | 34,180 |
| Capex | $(48,226)$ | $(16,062)$ | $(25,000)$ | $(80,000)$ | $(50,000)$ |
| Investments | 4,496 | $(437)$ | - | - | - |
| Income from investments | 3,817 | 3,576 | 6,557 | 5,493 | 3,971 |
| CF from investing activities | $(39,914)$ | $(12,922)$ | $(18,443)$ | $(74,507)$ | $(46,029)$ |
| Changes in share capital | - | - | - | - | - |
| Changes in Debt | 15,674 | 1,442 | 355 | 39,921 | 10,062 |
| Dividends \& Interest paid | $(11,206)$ | $(7,396)$ | $(12,198)$ | $(11,145)$ | $(13,561)$ |
| CF from financing activities | 4,468 | $(5,955)$ | $(11,843)$ | 28,776 | $(3,499)$ |
| Net cash flow | $(18,016)$ | 18,938 | 13,063 | $(16,222)$ | $(15,347)$ |
| Add: Opening balance | 45,399 | 27,383 | 46,321 | 59,384 | 43,161 |
| Closing balance | 27,383 | 46,321 | 59,384 | 43,161 | 27,814 |


| Key assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| WTI (USD/bbl) | 64 | 82 | 83 | 52 | 57 |
| INR/USD | 45 | 40 | 45 | 43 | 41 |
| Transmission volumes (mmcmd) | 79 | 82 | 83 | 100 | 111 |
| Transmission tariff (INR/mcm) 775 | 774 | 841 | 726 | 726 |  |
| Polymer prices (USD/mt) | 1,299 | 1,492 | 1,317 | 820 | 944 |
| LPG prices (USD/mt) | 501 | 659 | 699 | 385 | 463 |
| Subsidy sharing with OMCs (INR m)14,880 | 13,047 | 14,691 | 4,173 | 5,057 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Growth Indicators (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year ended 31st March2007a | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 a}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 e}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 e}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ |  |
| Revenue | $11 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| EBITDA | $-13 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| PAT | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| EPS | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $14 \%$ |


| Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| PE (x) | 10.7 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 12.1 | 10.6 |
| P/BV (x) | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| EV/EBITDA (x) | 8.7 | 6.1 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 7.2 |
| EV/Sales (x) | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Dividend Yield (\%) | $4.7 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Financial ratios |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year ended 31st March $2007 \mathbf{a}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 a}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 e}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 e}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 e}$ |  |
| RoE | $22 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| RoCE | $17 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Debt/Equity (x) | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| EBIT/Interest (x) | 21.4 | 24.5 | 27.2 | 12.0 | 12.7 |

[^10]
## ONGC

Earnings trapped in oil

SELL
CMP: INR719

Target Price: INR594


ANTIQUE

January 7, 2009

| Market Data |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Sector | $:$ | Oil \& Gas |
| Market Cap (INRbn) | $:$ | 1,551 |
| Market Cap (USDbn) | $:$ | 31.9 |
| OIS shares (m) | $:$ | 2,139 |
| Free Float (m) | $:$ | 337 |
| 52-wk HI/LO (INR) | $:$ | $1,343 / 538$ |
| Avg Daily Vol ('000) | $:$ | 2,708 |
| Face Value (INR) | $:$ | 10 |
| Bloomberg | $:$ | ONGC IN |
| Reuters | $:$ | ONGC.BO |


| Price Performance |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 m}$ | $\mathbf{3 m}$ | $\mathbf{6 m}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 m}$ |
| Absolute | 7 | $(26)$ | $(17)$ | $(46)$ |
| Relative | 2 | $(10)$ | 9 | 7 |



Price Performance Vs NIFTY


We initiate coverage on ONGC, with a SELL rating and a target price of INR594/share.

## Earnings sensitive to lower oil prices

ONGC earnings are not sensitive to rising oil prices due to the sharing of under-recoveries with oil marketing companies. While it is not the other way round, realisations and earnings are sensitive to declining oil prices. We believe that oil prices will remain lower for a longer period of time. Our oil price assumptions are $30 \%$ lower than the average consensus price assumption for CY20092012. For FY10e and FY11e, we have assumed oil price of USD52/ bbl and USD57/bbl, respectively. We believe that at our oil price assumption of USD52/bbl for FY10e, ONGC net realisations, after meeting under-recoveries, would fall by 16\% YoY to USD44/bbl.

## Subsidy burden to impact net realisations

Our under-recoveries model indicates that under-recoveries on cooking fuels would continue in FY10e, and estimated losses at USD52/bbl could be INR203bn. We estimate that ONGC would share under-recoveries of INR53bn in the form of upstream discounts, which would reduce its net realisations by $16 \%$ YoY to USD44/bbl.

## Other products realisations also down

LPG, naphtha, C2-C3 and kerosene contribute c15\% to ONGC's revenues. With the fall in oil prices, realisations for these products have come down significantly. Since we expect oil prices to remain lower for a longer period of time, we do not see any recovery in realisations for them. This would not only keep margins under pressure, but also depress ONGC's earnings.

## Valuations

We initiate coverage on ONGC, with a 12-month target price of INR594/share based on the sum-of-the-parts valuation. We value the core business including OVL at INR533/share, applying an $8 x$ multiple on FY10e EPS of INR67/share. We value ONGC's 30\% share in Cairn MBA field's at INR18/share. We value the listed investments at INR43/share to arrive at our target price of INR594.

## Key financials

| Year ended March | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Net Revenue (INRbn) | 604 | 633 | 528 | 546 |
| EBITDA (INRbn) | 303 | 315 | 242 | 253 |
| EBITDA growth (\%) | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $-23 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| PAT (INRbn) | 167 | 180 | 124 | 127 |
| PAT growth (\%) | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-31 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| EPS (INR/share) | 78 | 84 | 58 | 59 |
| Consolidated EPS | 89 | 96 | 67 | 69 |
| Consolidated EPS growth (\%) | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $-30 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| PE (x) | 8.1 | 7.6 | 10.9 | 10.5 |
| PB (x) | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| EV/EBITDA (x) | 4.8 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 6.0 |
| RoE (\%) | $24 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Source: Antique |  |  | $0 i l$ | $\&$ |

We estimate, subsidies to OMCs would continue in FY10e despite lower oil prices.

## No benefit of higher oil prices

During FY2006-08, despite higher and rising oil prices, ONGC's net realisations were almost flat. This signifies that ONGC may not be the beneficiary of oil prices, if they rise as the company has to share under-recoveries with oil marketing companies.


Source: company, Antique

## Subsidies to impact net realisations

Although the government had earlier fixed the FY09e subsidy burden for ONGC at INR385bn, we believe that current lower oil prices would force the former to revert to its old policy of upstream sharing of $33 \%$ of under-recoveries. According to recent media reports, the government may cap total upstream subsidies at INR300bn for FY09e, as the upstream capacity to share under-recoveries has been affected due to lower oil prices.

For FY10e, we expect that subsidy burden on the company would continue, as there would be under-recoveries on cooking fuels even at a lower oil price assumption of USD52/bbl. At USD52/ bbl of oil prices, we estimate FY10e under-recoveries at INR203bn. Taking a historical reference from FY04, when there was no under recoveries on petrol and diesel, upstream companies used to share under-recoveries with oil marketing companies in a proportion of $33 \%$ of total losses. We expect a similar situation in FY10e. We estimate that ONGC would share the under-recoveries of INR53bn in the form of upstream discounts, which would reduce its net realisations by $16 \% \mathrm{YoY}$ to USD44/bbl.

Discount to oil marketing companies (OMCs) takes away higher oil earnings


Source: Bloomberg, Antique

## No volume growth in the near term

ONGC's domestic production, mainly from Bombay High, is in natural decline. The company is investing in drilling more wells as well as redevelopment of fields. But they would only help in maintaining the oil production at current levels. For the next 2 years, we have not taken any production growth for ONGC. ONGC's 30\% share in oil production from Rajasthan MBA fields is valued on DCF basis.

## OVL - Also in the same phase

OVL is in a significant investment phase, where most assets are in the exploration stage. After the successful exploration, production from upstream projects takes close to 4-8 years, depending on the complexity of the field and the development plan. We value earnings from OVL in computing our consolidated E\&P earnings for ONGC.

| OVL (excl. Imperial) production estimates (MMT) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | FY07 | FY08 | FY09e | FY10e | FY11Ee |
| Production | 7.95 | 8.8 | 8.65 | 8.48 | 8.92 |

Source: Company

## Realisations from other products under pressure

ONGC's c15\% revenue comes from production of LPG, naphtha, C2-C3 and kerosene on gasbased feedstock. With the fall in oil prices, realisations for all these products have come down significantly. Since we expect oil prices to remain lower for a longer period of time, we do not see any recovery in realisations for them. This would not only keep margins under pressure, but also depress ONGC's earnings.


Source: Bloomberg, Antique

## 30\% stake in Rajasthan block - Low value to ONGC

ONGC is a 30\% partner in Cairn Rajasthan block, with a proportionate right in production and development costs. However, as per PSC, ONGC is supposed to bear the entire royalty burden. We expect a royalty of $12.5 \%$ on Rajasthan crude, which reduces the value to ONGC drastically. For other assumptions of our DCF, please refer to the section on Cairn India Ltd. Our DCF estimate indicates the value of Rajasthan block to ONGC at INR18/share.

| Schedule of investments |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Investment | Shares (m) | Price | INRm |
| GAIL | 61 | 171 | 10,475 |
| Indian Oil Corp. Ltd. | 106 | 345 | 36,705 |
| MRPL | 1,255 | 34 | 42,180 |
| Petronet LNG Ltd. | 94 | 32 | 3,000 |
| Total |  | 92,360 |  |
| No. of shares (m) | 2,139 |  |  |
| Value of investments/share |  | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |  |

Note: GAIL-Antique's target price, Other investments at 20\% discount to current market price.
Source: Bloomberg, Antique

## Valuations

We initiate coverage on ONGC, with a 12-month target price of INR594/share based on the sum-of-the-parts valuation. We value the FY10e core business earnings, including OVL at INR533/ share, applying an 8x multiple on FY10e EPS of INR67/share. We value the $30 \%$ stake in the Cairn Rajasthan block at INR18/share based on DCF estimates of the field. We value investments in GAIL at our target price of INR171/share, and other listed investments, including MRPL, at a $20 \%$ discount to the current market value. The value of listed investments to ONGC is INR43/ share.

## Table of sum of parts valuation

| Particulars | Earnings | Multiple | Value per share |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Core business incl OVL | 67 | 8 | 533 |
| $30 \%$ stake in Rajasthan block | DCF | 18 |  |
| Value of investments/share |  | 43 |  |
| Value per share |  | $\mathbf{5 9 4}$ |  |

Source: Antique

## Key risks to our estimates

- Oil prices higher than our estimates may affect our earnings estimates.
- Lower subsidy sharing than our estimates may affect our earnings estimates.
- Deregulation of transportation fuels and relieving upstream companies from sharing underrecoveries on cooking fuels have the potential to re-rate earnings and multiples for ONGC.
- Higher production growth may affect our earnings estimate.

Financials (INR bn)
ONGC

| Profit and LoSs Account |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| Revenues | 569 | 604 | 633 | 528 | 546 |
| Expenses | $(284)$ | $(301)$ | $(318)$ | $(286)$ | $(292)$ |
| EBITDA | 285 | 303 | 315 | 242 | 253 |
| Depreciation \& amortisation | $(95)$ | $(98)$ | $(99)$ | $(99)$ | $(100)$ |
| EBIT | 190 | 205 | 216 | 143 | 153 |
| Interest expense | $(0)$ | $(1)$ | $(1)$ | $(1)$ | $(1)$ |
| Other income | 42 | 48 | 58 | 46 | 40 |
| Profit before tax | 232 | 252 | 273 | 188 | 193 |
| Tax | $(80)$ | $(85)$ | $(93)$ | $(64)$ | $(65)$ |
| Profit after tax | 152 | 167 | 180 | 124 | 127 |
| Recurring EPS (INR) | 71 | 78 | 84 | 58 | 59 |
| Consolidated EPS (INR) | 79 | 89 | 96 | 67 | 69 |


| Balance Sheet |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| Share Capital | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| Reserves \& Surplus | 598 | 685 | 785 | 834 | 881 |
| Networth | 619 | 706 | 806 | 855 | 902 |
| Debt | 151 | 125 | 179 | 179 | 179 |
| Capital Employed | 770 | 831 | 985 | 1,034 | 1,081 |
| Gross Fixed Assets | 1,135 | 1,232 | 1,392 | 1,603 | 1,812 |
| Accumulated Depreciation | $(751)$ | $(825)$ | $(925)$ | $(1,024)$ | $(1,125)$ |
| Net Assets | 384 | 407 | 467 | 579 | 688 |
| Capital work in progress | 82 | 110 | 127 | 151 | 174 |
| Investments | 57 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| Current Assets Loans | Advances |  |  |  |  |
| Inventory | 34 | 39 | 41 | 34 | 35 |
| Debtors | 28 | 44 | 46 | 38 | 39 |
| Cash \& Bank | 193 | 224 | 342 | 258 | 205 |
| Loans \& advances and others | 542 | 347 | 327 | 307 | 287 |
| Current Liabilities \& Provisions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Creditors | 88 | 109 | 115 | 95 | 99 |
| Other liabilities \& provisions | 401 | 222 | 237 | 218 | 226 |
| Net Current Assets | 307 | 322 | 404 | 324 | 242 |
| Deferred tax assets/(liabilities) | $(65)$ | $(74)$ | $(79)$ | $(85)$ | $(89)$ |
| Misc expenses | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Application of Funds | 770 | 831 | 985 | 1,034 | 1,081 |


| Per share data |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| No. of shares (Mn) | 2,139 | 2,139 | 2,139 | 2,139 | 2,139 |
| BVPS (INR) | 290 | 330 | 377 | 400 | 422 |
| CEPS (INR) | 115 | 124 | 131 | 104 | 106 |
| DPS (INR) | 31 | 32 | 32 | 30 | 32 |


| Margins (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| EBITDA | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| EBIT | $33 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| PAT | $27 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $23 \%$ |

## Cash Flow

| Year ended 31st March 2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PBT | 240 | 252 | 273 | 188 | 193 |
| Depreciation | 64 | 83 | 99 | 100 | 101 |
| Interest | $(17)$ | $(33)$ | $(47)$ | $(32)$ | $(27)$ |
| Changes in working capital | 19 | $(1)$ | 36 | $(4)$ | 28 |
| Others | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(3)$ | $(3)$ | $(3)$ |
| Tax paid | $(73)$ | $(83)$ | $(88)$ | $(58)$ | $(61)$ |
| CF from operating activities | 229 | 215 | 271 | 191 | 230 |
| Capex | $(96)$ | $(136)$ | $(177)$ | $(234)$ | $(233)$ |
| Investments | $(1)$ | $(6)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Others | 29 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income from investments | 17 | 30 | 50 | 35 | 30 |
| CF from investing activities | $(50)$ | $(102)$ | $(128)$ | $(200)$ | $(203)$ |
| Changes in share capital | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Changes in Debt | 3 | $(3)$ | 54 | 0 | 0 |
| Dividends \& Interest paid | $(77)$ | $(78)$ | $(80)$ | $(75)$ | $(80)$ |
| CF from financing activities | $(74)$ | $(82)$ | $(26)$ | $(75)$ | $(80)$ |
| Net cash flow | 105 | 31 | 118 | $(84)$ | $(53)$ |
| Add: Opening balance | 88 | 193 | 224 | 342 | 258 |
| Closing balance | 193 | 224 | 342 | 258 | 205 |


| Key assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Year ended 31st March2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |  |
| WTI (USD/bbl) | 64 | 82 | 83 | 52 | 57 |  |
| INR/USD | 45 | 40 | 45 | 43 | 41 |  |
| Crude sales excl. Caim \& OVL (MMT) | 24 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 25 |  |
| OVL production incl Imperial (MMT) | 8 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 |  |
| Discount to OMCs (USD/bbl) | $(22)$ | $(33)$ | $(34)$ | $(7)$ | $(8)$ |  |
| Net realisations to ONGC (USD/bbl) | 45 | 53 | 48 | 44 | 48 |  |
| Gas sales (MMcm) | 20,306 | 20,432 | 20,534 | 20,637 | 20,740 |  |


| Growth Indicators (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| Revenue | $18 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| EBITDA | $4 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $-23 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| PAT | $8 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-31 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| EPS | $8 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-31 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Consolidated EPS | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $-30 \%$ | $3 \%$ |


| Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year ended 31st March2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| PE (x) | 9.2 | 8.1 | 7.6 | 10.9 | 10.5 |
| P/BV (x) | 2.5 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| EV/EBITDA (x) | 5.3 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 6.0 |
| EV/Sales (x) | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Dividend Yield (\%) | $4.3 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |

## Financial ratios

| Year ended 31st March2007a | 2008a | 2009e | 2010e | 2011e |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| RoE | $24 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| RoCE | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Debt/Equity (x) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| EBIT/Interest (x) | 882.9 | 348.2 | 255.3 | 169.2 | 181.1 |
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