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Some Initial Thoughts

"One hundred thousand lemmings cannot be wrong"

Graffiti
Misconceptions about Valuation

■ Myth 1: A valuation is an objective search for “true” value
  • Truth 1.1: All valuations are biased. The only questions are how much and in which direction.
  • Truth 1.2: The direction and magnitude of the bias in your valuation is directly proportional to who pays you and how much you are paid.

■ Myth 2.: A good valuation provides a precise estimate of value
  • Truth 2.1: There are no precise valuations
  • Truth 2.2: The payoff to valuation is greatest when valuation is least precise.

■ Myth 3: . The more quantitative a model, the better the valuation
  • Truth 3.1: One’s understanding of a valuation model is inversely proportional to the number of inputs required for the model.
  • Truth 3.2: Simpler valuation models do much better than complex ones.
Approaches to Valuation

- **Discounted cashflow valuation**, relates the value of an asset to the present value of expected future cashflows on that asset.

- **Relative valuation**, estimates the value of an asset by looking at the pricing of 'comparable' assets relative to a common variable like earnings, cashflows, book value or sales.

- **Contingent claim valuation**, uses option pricing models to measure the value of assets that share option characteristics.
**Discounted Cash Flow Valuation**

- **What is it:** In discounted cash flow valuation, the value of an asset is the present value of the expected cash flows on the asset.

- **Philosophical Basis:** Every asset has an intrinsic value that can be estimated, based upon its characteristics in terms of cash flows, growth and risk.

- **Information Needed:** To use discounted cash flow valuation, you need
  - to estimate the **life of the asset**
  - to estimate the **cash flows** during the life of the asset
  - to estimate the **discount rate** to apply to these cash flows to get present value

- **Market Inefficiency:** Markets are assumed to make **mistakes** in pricing assets **across time**, and are assumed to correct themselves over time, as new information comes out about assets.
Discounted Cashflow Valuation: Basis for Approach

Value of asset = \( \frac{CF_1}{(1+r)^1} + \frac{CF_2}{(1+r)^2} + \frac{CF_3}{(1+r)^3} + \frac{CF_4}{(1+r)^4} \ldots + \frac{CF_n}{(1+r)^n} \)

where \( CF_t \) is the expected cash flow in period \( t \), \( r \) is the discount rate appropriate given the riskiness of the cash flow and \( n \) is the life of the asset.

**Proposition 1:** For an asset to have value, the expected cash flows have to be positive some time over the life of the asset.

**Proposition 2:** Assets that generate cash flows early in their life will be worth more than assets that generate cash flows later; the latter may however have greater growth and higher cash flows to compensate.
## DCF Choices: Equity Valuation versus Firm Valuation

**Firm Valuation**: Value the entire business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets in Place</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Investments</td>
<td>Fixed Claim on cash flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate cashflows today</td>
<td>Little or No role in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes long lived (fixed) and short-lived</td>
<td><em>Fixed Maturity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working capital assets</td>
<td><em>Tax Deductible</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Value that will be created by</td>
<td>Residual Claim on cash flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future investments</td>
<td>Significant Role in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Perpetual Lives</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity valuation**: Value just the equity claim in the business
### Equity Valuation

**Figure 5.5: Equity Valuation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets in Place</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Assets</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cash flows considered are cashflows from assets, after debt payments and after making reinvestments needed for future growth.
- Discount rate reflects only the cost of raising equity financing.
- Present value is value of just the equity claims on the firm.
Firm Valuation

Cash flows considered are cashflows from assets, prior to any debt payments but after firm has reinvested to create growth assets.

Discount rate reflects the cost of raising both debt and equity financing, in proportion to their use.

Present value is value of the entire firm, and reflects the value of all claims on the firm.
DISCOUNTED CASHFLOW VALUATION

**Cashflow to Firm**

- EBIT \( (1-t) \)
- \( -(\text{Cap Ex} - \text{Depr}) \)
- Change in WC
- \( = \text{FCFF} \)

**Expected Growth**

- Reinvestment Rate
- \( * \) Return on Capital

- Firm is in stable growth: Grows at constant rate forever

- Terminal Value = \( \text{FCFF} \frac{n+1}{(r-g_n)} \)

- Discontinued

- **Discount at**

- \( \text{WACC} = \frac{\text{Cost of Equity}}{\text{Debt} + \text{Equity}} \) + \( \text{Cost of Debt} \) (\( \text{Debt}/(\text{Debt}+\text{Equity}) \))

- **Cost of Equity**

- **Cost of Debt**

- \( \text{Riskfree Rate} \)

- No default risk
- No reinvestment risk
- In same currency and in same terms (real or nominal as cash flows)

- **Beta**

- Measures market risk

- **Risk Premium**

- Premium for average risk investment

- **Type of Business**

- Operating Leverage

- Financial Leverage

- Base Equity Premium

- Country Risk Premium

**Value of Operating Assets**

- Cash & Non-op Assets
- Value of Firm
- Value of Debt
- Value of Equity
Titan Cements: Status Quo

Current Cashflow to Firm

- EBIT(1-t) : 173
- Net CapX : 49
- Chg WC : 52
- FCFF : 72
Reinvestment Rate = 101/173 = 58.5%

Return on Capital = 19.25%

Expected Growth in EBIT (1-t)

- Stable Growth: g = 3.41%; Beta = 1.00;
- Country Premium = 0%
- Cost of capital = 6.57%
- ROE = 6.57%; Tax rate = 33%
- Reinvestment Rate = 51.93%

Terminal Value = 100.9/0.0657 - 0.0341 = 3195

Year 1 2 3 4 5
EBIT €244.53 €257.96 €272.13 €287.08 €302.85
EBIT(1-t) €182.25 €192.26 €202.82 €213.96 €225.7
- Reinvestment €52.01 €45.87 €57.88 €61.06 €64.42
FCFF €130.24 €137.39 €144.94 €152.90 €161.30

Discount at Cost of Capital (WACC) = 7.56%(1.024) + 3.11%(0.176) = 6.78%

Cost of Equity = 7.56%

Cost of Debt = (3.41% + 0.5% + 0.26%)(1 - 0.2547) = 3.11%

Weights:
E = 82.4% D = 17.6%

Riskfree Rate: Euro riskfree rate = 3.41%

Beta = 0.93

Risk Premium = 4.46%

Unlevered Beta for Sectors: 0.80
Firm’s D/E Ratio: 21.35%
Mature risk premium = 4%
Country Equity Prem = 0.46%

Value/Share = €32.84

On April 27, 2005 Titan Cement stock was trading at €25 a share.
Discounted Cash Flow Valuation: High Growth with Negative Earnings

Current Revenue

Current Operating Margin

Sales Turnover Ratio

Revenue Growth

Competitive Advantages

Expected Operating Margin

Reinvestment

Stable Growth

Stable Revenue Growth

Stable Operating Margin

Stable Reinvestment

Terminal Value = FCFF \[ \frac{n+1}{(r-g)n} \]

Value of Operating Assets
- Cash & Non-op Assets
  - Value of Firm
  - Value of Debt
  - Equity Options
  - Value of Equity in Stock

Cost of Equity

Discount at WACC = Cost of Equity (Equity/(Debt + Equity)) + Cost of Debt (Debt/(Debt + Equity))

Cost of Debt
(Riskfree Rate + Default Spread) (1-t)

Weights
Based on Market Value

Riskfree Rate:
- No default risk
- No reinvestment risk
- In same currency and in same terms (real or nominal as cash flows)

Beta
- Measures market risk

Risk Premium
- Premium for average risk investment

Type of Business

Operating Leverage

Financial Leverage

Base Equity Premium

Country Risk Premium
I. Estimating Discount Rates
Cost of Equity

Preferably, a bottom-up beta, based upon other firms in the business, and firm's own financial leverage

\[
\text{Cost of Equity} = \text{Riskfree Rate} + \text{Beta} \times (\text{Risk Premium})
\]

Has to be in the same currency as cash flows, and defined in same terms (real or nominal) as the cash flows

**Historical Premium**
1. Mature Equity Market Premium: Average premium earned by stocks over T.Bonds in U.S.
2. Country risk premium = Country Default Spread* (\( \sigma_{\text{Equity}} - \sigma_{\text{Country bond}} \))

**Implied Premium**
Based on how equity market is priced today and a simple valuation model
You are valuing a Greek company in Euros for a US institutional investor and are attempting to estimate a risk free rate to use in the analysis. The risk free rate that you should use is

- The interest rate on a US $ denominated treasury bond (4.25%)
- The interest rate on a Euro-denominated Greek government bond (3.67%)
- The interest rate on a Euro-denominated bond issued by the German government (3.41%)
Everyone uses historical premiums, but..

- The historical premium is the premium that stocks have historically earned over riskless securities.
- Practitioners never seem to agree on the premium; it is sensitive to
  - How far back you go in history…
  - Whether you use T.bill rates or T.Bond rates
  - Whether you use geometric or arithmetic averages.
- For instance, looking at the US:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Period</th>
<th>Arithmetic average</th>
<th>Geometric Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stocks - T.Bills</td>
<td>Stocks - T.Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-2007</td>
<td>7.78%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-2007</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2007</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing Country Risk Using Currency Ratings: Western Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Default Spread over German Euro (in bp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessing Country Risk using Ratings: Beyond the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Default Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Baa3</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Baa1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Baa2</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Ba1</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Baa1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Ba1</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Country Ratings to Estimate Equity Spreads

- Country ratings measure default risk. While default risk premiums and equity risk premiums are highly correlated, one would expect equity spreads to be higher than debt spreads.
  - One way to adjust the country spread upwards is to use information from the US market. In the US, the equity risk premium has been roughly twice the default spread on junk bonds.
  - Another is to multiply the bond spread by the relative volatility of stock and bond prices in that market. For example,
    - Standard Deviation in Greek ASE(Equity) = 16%
    - Standard Deviation in Greek Euro Bond = 9%
    - Adjusted Equity Spread = 0.26% (16/9) = 0.46%
**From Country Risk Premiums to Corporate Risk premiums**

- **Approach 1:** Assume that every company in the country is equally exposed to country risk. In this case,
  \[
  E(\text{Return}) = \text{Riskfree Rate} + \text{Country ERP} + \beta \text{ (US premium)}
  \]

- **Approach 2:** Assume that a company’s exposure to country risk is similar to its exposure to other market risk.
  \[
  E(\text{Return}) = \text{Riskfree Rate} + \beta \text{ (US premium + Country ERP)}
  \]

- **Approach 3:** Treat country risk as a separate risk factor and allow firms to have different exposures to country risk (perhaps based upon the proportion of their revenues come from non-domestic sales)
  \[
  E(\text{Return}) = \text{Riskfree Rate} + \beta \text{ (US premium)} + \lambda \text{ (Country ERP)}
  \]

  **Country ERP:** Additional country equity risk premium
Estimating Company Exposure to Country Risk

- Different companies should be exposed to different degrees to country risk. For instance, a Greek firm that generates the bulk of its revenues in the rest of Western Europe should be less exposed to country risk than one that generates all its business within Greece.

- The factor “\( \lambda \)” measures the relative exposure of a firm to country risk. One simplistic solution would be to do the following:
  \[ \lambda = \frac{\% \text{ of revenues domestically}_{\text{firm}}}{\% \text{ of revenues domestically}_{\text{avg firm}}} \]
  For instance, if a firm gets 35% of its revenues domestically while the average firm in that market gets 70% of its revenues domestically
  \[ \lambda = \frac{35\%}{70\%} = 0.5 \]

- There are two implications
  - A company’s risk exposure is determined by where it does business and not by where it is located
  - Firms might be able to actively manage their country risk exposures
Estimating E(Return) for Titan Cements

- Assume that the beta for Titan Cements is 0.95, and that the riskfree rate used is 3.41%. Also assume that the historical premium for the US (4.79%) is a reasonable estimate of a mature market risk premium.
- Approach 1: Assume that every company in the country is equally exposed to country risk. In this case,
  \[ E(\text{Return}) = 3.41\% + 0.46\% + 0.93 \times (4.79\%) = 8.33\% \]
- Approach 2: Assume that a company’s exposure to country risk is similar to its exposure to other market risk.
  \[ E(\text{Return}) = 3.41\% + 0.93 \times (4.79\% + 0.46\%) = 8.30\% \]
- Approach 3: Treat country risk as a separate risk factor and allow firms to have different exposures to country risk (perhaps based upon the proportion of their revenues come from non-domestic sales)
  \[ E(\text{Return}) = 3.41\% + 0.93 \times (4.79\%) + 0.56 \times (0.46\%) + 0.14 \times (3\%) = 8.35\% \]

Titan is less exposed to Greek country risk than the typical Greek firm since it gets about 40% of its revenues in Greece; the average for Greek firms is 70%. In 2004, though, Titan got about 14% of it’s revenues from the Balkan states.
An alternate view of ERP: Watch what I pay, not what I say..

- You can back out an equity risk premium from stock prices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dividend</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Buybacks/Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  Average yield between 2001-2007 = 4.02%

Between 2001 and 2007 dividends and stock buybacks averaged 4.02% of the index each year.

Analysts expect earnings to grow 5% a year for the next 5 years. We will assume that dividends & buybacks will keep pace.
Last year’s cashflow (59.03) growing at 5% a year

| 61.98 | 65.08 | 68.33 | 71.75 | 75.34 |

January 1, 2008
S&P 500 is at 1468.36
4.02% of 1468.36 = 59.03

After year 5, we will assume that earnings on the index will grow at 4.02%, the same rate as the entire economy (= riskfree rate).
Solving for the implied premium...

- If we know what investors paid for equities at the beginning of 2007 and we can estimate the expected cash flows from equities, we can solve for the rate of return that they expect to make (IRR):

\[
1468.36 = \frac{61.98}{(1 + r)} + \frac{65.08}{(1 + r)^2} + \frac{68.33}{(1 + r)^3} + \frac{71.75}{(1 + r)^4} + \frac{75.34}{(1 + r)^5} + \frac{75.35(1.0402)}{(r - .0402)(1 + r)^5}
\]

- Expected Return on Stocks = 8.39%
- Implied Equity Risk Premium = Expected Return on Stocks - T.Bond Rate
  = 8.39% - 4.02% = 4.37%
Implied Premium versus Risk Free Rate

\[ \text{Expected Return on Stocks} = \text{T.Bond Rate} + \text{Equity Risk Premium} \]
Equity Risk Premiums and Bond Default Spreads
Why implied premiums matter?

- In many investment banks, it is common practice (especially in corporate finance departments) to use historical risk premiums (and arithmetic averages at that) as risk premiums to compute cost of equity. If all analysts in the department used the arithmetic average premium for 1928-2007 of 6.42% to value stocks in January 2008, given the implied premium of 4.37%, what are they likely to find?
  - The values they obtain will be too low (most stocks will look overvalued)
  - The values they obtain will be too high (most stocks will look under valued)
  - There should be no systematic bias as long as they use the same premium (6.42%) to value all stocks.
Which equity risk premium should you use for the US?

- **Historical Risk Premium**: When you use the historical risk premium, you are assuming that premiums will revert back to a historical norm and that the time period that you are using is the right norm.

- **Current Implied Equity Risk premium**: You are assuming that the market is correct in the aggregate but makes mistakes on individual stocks. If you are required to be market neutral, this is the premium you should use. (What types of valuations require market neutrality?)

- **Average Implied Equity Risk premium**: The average implied equity risk premium between 1960-2007 in the United States is about 4%. You are assuming that the market is correct on average but not necessarily at a point in time.
Implied Premium for Greek Market: April 27, 2005

- **Level of the Index** = 2786
- **Dividends on the Index** = 3.28% of 2467
- **Other parameters**
  - Riskfree Rate = 3.41% (Euros)
  - Expected Growth (in Euros)
    - Next 5 years = 8% (Used expected growth rate in Earnings)
    - After year 5 = 3.41%

- **Solving for the expected return**:
  - Expected return on Equity = 7.56%
  - Implied Equity premium = 7.56% - 3.41% = 4.15%

- **Effect on valuation**
  - Titan’s value with historical premium (4%) + country (.46%) : 32.84 Euros/share
  - Titan’s value with implied premium: 32.67 Euros per share
Estimating Beta

- The standard procedure for estimating betas is to regress stock returns ($R_j$) against market returns ($R_m$) -
  \[ R_j = a + b R_m \]
  - where $a$ is the intercept and $b$ is the slope of the regression.
- The slope of the regression corresponds to the beta of the stock, and measures the riskiness of the stock.
- This beta has three problems:
  - It has high standard error
  - It reflects the firm’s business mix over the period of the regression, not the current mix
  - It reflects the firm’s average financial leverage over the period rather than the current leverage.
Beta Estimation: Amazon
Beta Estimation for Titan Cement: The Index Effect

HISTORICAL BETA

TITAN CEMENT CO. S.A.

FTSE/ASE 20 INDEX

*Identifies latest observation

ADJ BETA = (0.67) * RAW BETA + (0.33) * 1.0
Determinants of Betas

Beta of Equity

Beta of Firm

Nature of product or service offered by company:
Other things remaining equal, the more discretionary the product or service, the higher the beta.

Implications
1. Cyclical companies should have higher betas than non-cyclical companies.
2. Luxury goods firms should have higher betas than basic goods.
3. High priced goods/service firms should have higher betas than low priced goods/services firms.
4. Growth firms should have higher betas.

Operating Leverage (Fixed Costs as percent of total costs):
Other things remaining equal the greater the proportion of the costs that are fixed, the higher the beta of the company.

Implications
1. Firms with high infrastructure needs and rigid cost structures should have higher betas than firms with flexible cost structures.
2. Smaller firms should have higher betas than larger firms.
3. Young firms should have higher betas.

Financial Leverage:
Other things remaining equal, the greater the proportion of capital that a firm raises from debt, the higher its equity beta will be.

Implications
Highly levered firms should have higher betas than firms with less debt.
Bottom-up Betas

Step 1: Find the business or businesses that your firm operates in.

Step 2: Find publicly traded firms in each of these businesses and obtain their regression betas. Compute the simple average across these regression betas to arrive at an average beta for these publicly traded firms. Unlever this average beta using the average debt to equity ratio across the publicly traded firms in the sample. Unlevered beta for business = Average beta across publicly traded firms/ (1 + (1-t) (Average D/E ratio across firms))

Possible Refinements

If you can, adjust this beta for differences between your firm and the comparable firms on operating leverage and product characteristics.

While revenues or operating income are often used as weights, it is better to try to estimate the value of each business.

If you expect the business mix of your firm to change over time, you can change the weights on a year-to-year basis.

If you expect your debt to equity ratio to change over time, the levered beta will change over time.

Step 3: Estimate how much value your firm derives from each of the different businesses it is in.

Step 4: Compute a weighted average of the unlevered betas of the different businesses (from step 2) using the weights from step 3. Bottom-up Unlevered beta for your firm = Weighted average of the unlevered betas of the individual business

Step 5: Compute a levered beta (equity beta) for your firm, using the market debt to equity ratio for your firm.
Levered bottom-up beta = Unlevered beta (1+ (1-t) (Debt/Equity))
## Bottom up Beta Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Comparable Companies</th>
<th>Unlevered Beta</th>
<th>Levered Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titan Cement</td>
<td>Global Cement companies</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80 (1 + (1 - 25.47 \times 0.2135)) = 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon (First 5 years)</td>
<td>Internet Retailers</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.58 (1 - (1 - 0) \times 0.0121) = 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon (After year 5)</td>
<td>Specialty Retailers</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Kandy</td>
<td>Food Processing companies with market cap &lt; $250 million</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78 (1 + (1 - 0.4) \times (30/70)) = 0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Small Firm and Other Premiums

- It is common practice to add premiums on to the cost of equity for firm-specific characteristics. For instance, many analysts add a small stock premium of 3-3.5% (historical premium for small stocks over the market) to the cost of equity for smaller companies.

- Adding arbitrary premiums to the cost of equity is always a dangerous exercise. If small stocks are riskier than larger stocks, we need to specify the reasons and try to quantify them rather than trust historical averages. (You could argue that smaller companies are more likely to serve niche (discretionary) markets or have higher operating leverage and adjust the beta to reflect this tendency).
Is Beta an Adequate Measure of Risk for a Private Firm?

The owners of most private firms are not diversified. Beta measures the risk added on to a diversified portfolio. Therefore, using beta to arrive at a cost of equity for a private firm will

a) Under estimate the cost of equity for the private firm
b) Over estimate the cost of equity for the private firm
c) Could under or over estimate the cost of equity for the private firm
Adjust the beta to reflect total risk rather than market risk. This adjustment is a relatively simple one, since the R squared of the regression measures the proportion of the risk that is market risk.

Total Beta = Market Beta / Correlation of the sector with the market

To estimate the beta for Kristin Kandy, we begin with the bottom-up unlevered beta of food processing companies:

- Unlevered beta for publicly traded food processing companies = 0.78
- Average correlation of food processing companies with market = 0.333
- Unlevered total beta for Kristin Kandy = 0.78/0.333 = 2.34
- Debt to equity ratio for Kristin Kandy = 0.3/0.7 (assumed industry average)
- Total Beta = 2.34 ( 1- (1-.40)(30/70)) = 2.94
- Total Cost of Equity = 4.50% + 2.94 (4%) = 16.26%
When would you use this total risk measure?

- Under which of the following scenarios are you most likely to use the total risk measure:
  - when valuing a private firm for an initial public offering
  - when valuing a private firm for sale to a publicly traded firm
  - when valuing a private firm for sale to another private investor
- Assume that you own a private business. What does this tell you about the best potential buyer for your business?
From Cost of Equity to Cost of Capital

\[
\text{Cost of Capital} = \text{Cost of Equity} \left( \frac{\text{Equity}}{\text{Debt} + \text{Equity}} \right) + \text{Cost of Borrowing} \left( 1 - t \right) \left( \frac{\text{Debt}}{\text{Debt} + \text{Equity}} \right)
\]

- Cost of equity based upon bottom-up beta
- Cost of borrowing should be based upon
  1. synthetic or actual bond rating
  2. default spread
- Cost of Borrowing = Riskfree rate + Default spread
- Marginal tax rate, reflecting tax benefits of debt
- Weights should be market value weights
Estimating Synthetic Ratings

- The rating for a firm can be estimated using the financial characteristics of the firm. In its simplest form, the rating can be estimated from the interest coverage ratio

  Interest Coverage Ratio = EBIT / Interest Expenses

- For Titan’s interest coverage ratio, we used the interest expenses and EBIT from 2004.

  Interest Coverage Ratio = 232/ 19.4 = 11.95

- For Kristin Kandy, we used the interest expenses and EBIT from the most recent financial year:

  Interest Coverage Ratio = 500,000/ 85,000 = 5.88

- Amazon.com has negative operating income; this yields a negative interest coverage ratio, which should suggest a D rating. We computed an average interest coverage ratio of 2.82 over the next 5 years.
### Interest Coverage Ratios, Ratings and Default Spreads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Interest Coverage Ratio is</th>
<th>Estimated Bond Rating</th>
<th>Default Spread(1/00)</th>
<th>Default Spread(1/04)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8.50 (&lt;12.50)</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.50 - 8.50 (9.5-12.5)</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.50 - 6.50 (7.5-9.5)</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25 - 5.50 (6-7.5)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 4.25 (4.5-6)</td>
<td>A–</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 3.00 (3.5-4.5)</td>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 - 2.50 (3.5 -4)</td>
<td>BB+</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 2.25 ((3-3.5)</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75 - 2.00 (2.5-3)</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 - 1.75 (2-2.5)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 - 1.50 (1.5-2)</td>
<td>B –</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80 - 1.25 (1.25-1.5)</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65 - 0.80 (0.8-1.25)</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20 - 0.65 (0.5-0.8)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.20 (&lt;0.5)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Titan and Kristing Kandy, I used the interest coverage ratio table for smaller/riskier firms (the numbers in brackets) which yields a lower rating for the same interest coverage ratio.
Estimating the cost of debt for a firm

- The synthetic rating for Titan Cement is AA. Using the 2004 default spread of 0.50%, we estimate a cost of debt of 4.17% (using a riskfree rate of 3.41% and adding in the country default spread of 0.26%):
  \[
  \text{Cost of debt} = \text{Riskfree rate} + \text{Greek default spread} + \text{Company default spread} \\
  = 3.41\% + 0.26\% + 0.50\% = 4.17\%
  \]

- The synthetic rating for Kristin Kandy is A-. Using the 2004 default spread of 1.00% and a riskfree rate of 4.50%, we estimate a cost of debt of 5.50%.
  \[
  \text{Cost of debt} = \text{Riskfree rate} + \text{Default spread} = 4.50\% + 1.00\% = 5.50\%
  \]

- The synthetic rating for Amazon.com in 2000 was BBB. The default spread for BBB rated bond was 1.50% in 2000 and the treasury bond rate was 6.5%.
  \[
  \text{Cost of debt} = \text{Riskfree Rate} + \text{Default spread} = 6.50\% + 1.50\% = 8.00\%
  \]
Weights for the Cost of Capital Computation

The weights used to compute the cost of capital should be the market value weights for debt and equity.

There is an element of circularity that is introduced into every valuation by doing this, since the values that we attach to the firm and equity at the end of the analysis are different from the values we gave them at the beginning.

For private companies, neither the market value of equity nor the market value of debt is observable. Rather than use book value weights, you should try

- Industry average debt ratios for publicly traded firms in the business
- Target debt ratio (if management has such a target)
- Estimated value of equity and debt from valuation (through an iterative process)
Estimating Cost of Capital: Amazon.com

- **Equity**
  - Cost of Equity = $6.50% + 1.60 (4.00%) = 12.90%
  - Market Value of Equity = $84/share * 340.79 mil shs = $28,626 mil (98.8%)

- **Debt**
  - Cost of debt = 6.50% + 1.50% (default spread) = 8.00%
  - Market Value of Debt = $349 mil (1.2%)

- **Cost of Capital**
  
  Cost of Capital = $12.9 \% \times .988 + 8.00\% \times (1 - 0) \times .012) = 12.84\%$
Estimating Cost of Capital: Titan Cements

- **Equity**
  - Cost of Equity = 3.41% + 0.93 (4%+ 0.46%) = 7.56%
  - Market Value of Equity = 1940 million Euros (82.4%)

- **Debt**
  - Cost of Debt = 3.41% + 0.26% + 0.50% = 4.17%
  - Market Value of Debt = 414 million Euros (17.6%)

- **Cost of Capital**
  Cost of Capital = 7.56% (.824) + 4.17% (1- .2547) (0.176)) = 6.78%

The book value of equity at Titan Cement is 542 million Euros.
The book value of debt at Titan Cement is 405 million; Interest expense is 19 mil; Average maturity of debt = 4 years
Estimated market value of debt = 19 million (PV of annuity, 4 years, 4.17%) + $405 million/1.0417^4 = 414 million Euros
Estimating Cost of Capital: Kristin Kandy

- **Equity**
  - Cost of Equity = 4.50% + 2.94 (4%) = 16.26%
  - Equity as percent of capital = 70%

- **Debt**
  - Pre-tax Cost of debt = 4.50% + 1.00% = 5.50%
  - Marginal tax rate = 40%
  - Debt as percent of capital = 30% (Industry average)

- **Cost of Capital**
  Cost of Capital = 16.26% (.70) + 5.50% (1-.40) (.30) = 12.37%
II. Estimating Cashflows and Growth
Defining Cashflow

Cash flows can be measured to

All claimholders in the firm

- EBIT (1 - tax rate)
  - (Capital Expenditures - Depreciation)
  - Change in non-cash working capital
  = Free Cash Flow to Firm (FCFF)

Just Equity Investors

- Net Income
  - (Capital Expenditures - Depreciation)
  - Change in non-cash Working Capital
  - (Principal Repaid - New Debt Issues)
  - Preferred Dividend

- Dividends
  + Stock Buybacks

Aswath Damodaran
From Reported to Actual Earnings

- Firm's history
- Comparable Firms

Normalize Earnings

- Operating leases
  - Convert into debt
  - Adjust operating income
- R&D Expenses
  - Convert into asset
  - Adjust operating income

Cleanse operating items of
- Financial Expenses
- Capital Expenses
- Non-recurring expenses

Measuring Earnings

- Update
  - Trailing Earnings
  - Unofficial numbers
Dealing with Operating Lease Expenses

- Operating Lease Expenses are treated as operating expenses in computing operating income. In reality, operating lease expenses should be treated as financing expenses, with the following adjustments to earnings and capital:

- Debt Value of Operating Leases = Present value of Operating Lease Commitments at the pre-tax cost of debt

- When you convert operating leases into debt, you also create an asset to counter it of exactly the same value.

- Adjusted Operating Earnings
  \[
  \text{Adjusted Operating Earnings} = \text{Operating Earnings} + \text{Operating Lease Expenses} - \text{Depreciation on Leased Asset}
  \]
  
  - As an approximation, this works:

  \[
  \text{Adjusted Operating Earnings} = \text{Operating Earnings} + \text{Pre-tax cost of Debt} \times \text{PV of Operating Leases}.
  \]
Operating Leases at The Gap in 2003

- The Gap has conventional debt of about $1.97 billion on its balance sheet and its pre-tax cost of debt is about 6%. Its operating lease payments in the 2003 were $978 million and its commitments for the future are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commitment (millions)</th>
<th>Present Value (at 6%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$899.00</td>
<td>$848.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$846.00</td>
<td>$752.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$738.00</td>
<td>$619.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$598.00</td>
<td>$473.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$477.00</td>
<td>$356.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&amp;7</td>
<td>$982.50 each year</td>
<td>$1,346.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Value of leases = $4,396.85 (Also value of leased asset)

- Debt outstanding at The Gap = $1,970 m + $4,397 m = $6,367 m
- Adjusted Operating Income = Stated OI + OL exp this year - Deprec’n
  = $1,012 m + 978 m - 4397 m /7 = $1,362 million (7 year life for assets)
- Approximate OI = $1,012 m + $4397 m (.06) = $1,276 m
The Collateral Effects of Treating Operating Leases as Debt

### Table: Conventional Accounting vs. Operating Leases Treated as Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Accounting</th>
<th>Operating Leases Treated as Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT &amp; Leases = 1,990</td>
<td>EBIT &amp; Leases = 1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Op Leases = 978</td>
<td>- Deprec: OL = 628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT = 1,012</td>
<td>EBIT = 1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest expense will rise to reflect the conversion of operating leases as debt. Net income should not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Sheet</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off balance sheet (Not shown as debt or as an asset). Only the conventional debt of $1,970 million shows up on balance sheet</td>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OL Asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt = 4397 + 1970 = $6,367 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of capital = 8.20% (7350/9320) + 4% (1970/9320) = 7.31%</td>
<td>Cost of capital = 8.20% (7350/13717) + 4% (6367/13717) = 6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of equity for The Gap = 8.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-tax cost of debt = 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market value of equity = 7350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on capital = 1012 (1-.35)/(3130+1970) = 12.90%</td>
<td>Return on capital = 1362 (1-.35)/(3130+6367) = 9.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R&D Expenses: Operating or Capital Expenses

- Accounting standards require us to consider R&D as an operating expense even though it is designed to generate future growth. It is more logical to treat it as capital expenditures.
- To capitalize R&D,
  - Specify an amortizable life for R&D (2 - 10 years)
  - Collect past R&D expenses for as long as the amortizable life
  - Sum up the unamortized R&D over the period. (Thus, if the amortizable life is 5 years, the research asset can be obtained by adding up 1/5th of the R&D expense from five years ago, 2/5th of the R&D expense from four years ago...:}
### Capitalizing R&D Expenses: Cisco in 1999

- R & D was assumed to have a 5-year life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>R&amp;D Expense</th>
<th>Unamortized portion</th>
<th>Amortization this year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999 (current)</td>
<td>1594.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1594.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1026.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>820.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>698.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>418.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>399.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>159.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>211.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>42.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,035.40</td>
<td>$484.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of research asset = $3,035.4 million 

Amortization of research asset in 1998 = $484.6 million 

Adjustment to Operating Income = $1,594 million - 484.6 million = 1,109.4 million
The Effect of Capitalizing R&D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Accounting</th>
<th>R&amp;D treated as capital expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT &amp; R&amp;D = 5,049</td>
<td>EBIT &amp; R&amp;D = 5,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- R&amp;D = 1,594</td>
<td>- Amort: R&amp;D = 485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT = 3,455</td>
<td>EBIT = 4,564 (Increase of 1,109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT (1-t) = 2,246</td>
<td>EBIT (1-t) = 2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignored tax benefit = (1594-485)(.35) = 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted EBIT (1-t) = 2967 + 388 = 3354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Increase of $1,109 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Income will also increase by $1,109 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Balance Sheet           |                                   |
| Off balance sheet asset. Book value of equity at $11,722 million is understated because biggest asset is off the books. |
|                         | Asset                              |
|                         | R&D Asset 3035 Book Equity +3035   |
|                         | Total Book Equity = 11722 + 3035 = 14757 |

| Balance Sheet           |                                   |
|                         | Liability                          |
|                         | Net Cap ex = 98 + 1594 – 485 = 1206 |

| Capital Expenditures    |                                   |
| Conventional net cap ex of $98 million |
|                         | Capital Expenditures               |
|                         | Net Cap ex = 98 + 1594 – 485 = 1206 |

| Cash Flows              |                                   |
| EBIT (1-t) = 2246       | EBIT (1-t) = 3354                 |
| - Net Cap Ex = 98       | - Net Cap Ex = 1206               |
| FCFF = 2148             | FCFF = 2148                       |

Return on capital = 2246/11722 (no debt) = 19.16%  
Return on capital = 3354/14757 = 22.78%
The tax rate that you should use in computing the after-tax operating income should be:
- The effective tax rate in the financial statements (taxes paid/Taxable income)
- The tax rate based upon taxes paid and EBIT (taxes paid/EBIT)
- The marginal tax rate for the country in which the company operates
- The weighted average marginal tax rate across the countries in which the company operates
- None of the above
- Any of the above, as long as you compute your after-tax cost of debt using the same tax rate
Capital expenditures should include

- **Research and development expenses**, once they have been re-categorized as capital expenses. The adjusted net cap ex will be:
  \[
  \text{Adjusted Net Capital Expenditures} = \text{Net Capital Expenditures} + \text{Current year’s R&D expenses} - \text{Amortization of Research Asset}
  \]

- **Acquisitions of other firms**, since these are like capital expenditures. The adjusted net cap ex will be:
  \[
  \text{Adjusted Net Cap Ex} = \text{Net Capital Expenditures} + \text{Acquisitions of other firms} - \text{Amortization of such acquisitions}
  \]

Two caveats:

1. Most firms do not do acquisitions every year. Hence, a **normalized measure of acquisitions** (looking at an average over time) should be used.
2. The best place to find acquisitions is in the statement of cash flows, usually categorized under **other investment activities**.
Cisco’s Net Capital Expenditures in 1999

Cap Expenditures (from statement of CF) = $ 584 mil
- Depreciation (from statement of CF) = $ 486 mil
Net Cap Ex (from statement of CF) = $ 98 mil
+ R & D expense = $ 1,594 mil
- Amortization of R&D = $ 485 mil
+ Acquisitions = $ 2,516 mil
Adjusted Net Capital Expenditures = $3,723 mil

(Amortization was included in the depreciation number)
Working Capital Investments

- In accounting terms, the working capital is the difference between current assets (inventory, cash and accounts receivable) and current liabilities (accounts payables, short term debt and debt due within the next year).
- A cleaner definition of working capital from a cash flow perspective is the difference between non-cash current assets (inventory and accounts receivable) and non-debt current liabilities (accounts payable).
- Any investment in this measure of working capital ties up cash. Therefore, any increases (decreases) in working capital will reduce (increase) cash flows in that period.
- When forecasting future growth, it is important to forecast the effects of such growth on working capital needs, and building these effects into the cash flows.
Dealing with Negative or Abnormally Low Earnings

A Framework for Analyzing Companies with Negative or Abnormally Low Earnings

Why are the earnings negative or abnormally low?

- Temporary Problems
  - Cyclicality: Eg. Auto firm in recession
  - Life Cycle related reasons: Young firms and firms with infrastructure problems
  - Leverage Problems: Eg. An otherwise healthy firm with too much debt.
  - Long-term Operating Problems: Eg. A firm with significant production or cost problems.

Normalize Earnings

- If firm’s size has not changed significantly over time
  - Average Dollar Earnings (Net Income if Equity and EBIT if Firm made by the firm over time)
- If firm’s size has changed over time
  - Use firm’s average ROE (if valuing equity) or average ROC (if valuing firm) on current BV of equity (if ROE) or current BV of capital (if ROC)

Value the firm by doing detailed cash flow forecasts starting with revenues and reduce or eliminate the problem over time:

(a) If problem is structural Target for operating margins of stable firms in the sector.
(b) If problem is leverage: Target for a debt ratio that the firm will be comfortable with by end of period, which could be its own optimal or the industry average.
(c) If problem is operating Target for an industry-average operating margin.
## Normalizing Earnings: Amazon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Margin</th>
<th>EBIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr12m</td>
<td>$1,117</td>
<td>-36.71%</td>
<td>-$410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,793</td>
<td>-13.35%</td>
<td>-$373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,585</td>
<td>-1.68%</td>
<td>-$94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$9,774</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>$407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$14,661</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$19,059</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>$1,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$23,862</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>$2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$28,729</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
<td>$2,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$33,211</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
<td>$3,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$36,798</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
<td>$3,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$39,006</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
<td>$3,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY(11)</td>
<td>$41,346</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>$4,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Industry Average*
Estimating FCFF: Titan Cement

- EBIT = 232 million Euros
- Tax rate = 25.47%
- Net Capital expenditures = Cap Ex - Depreciation = 109.5 - 60.3 = 49.2 million
- Change in Working Capital = +51.80 million

**Estimating FCFF**

\[
\text{Current EBIT} \times (1 - \text{tax rate}) = 232 \times (1 - 0.2547) = 172.8 \text{ Million} \\
- \text{(Capital Spending - Depreciation)} = 49.2 \\
- \text{Change in Working Capital} = 51.8 \\
\text{Current FCFF} = 71.8 \text{ Million Euros}
\]
Estimating FCFF: Amazon.com

- EBIT (Trailing 1999) = -$410 million
- Tax rate used = 0% (Assumed Effective = Marginal)
- Capital spending (Trailing 1999) = $243 million
- Depreciation (Trailing 1999) = $31 million
- Non-cash Working capital Change (1999) = -80 million

Estimating FCFF (1999)

\[
\text{Current EBIT} \times (1 - \text{tax rate}) = -410 \times (1-0) = -$410 \text{ million}
\]

- (Capital Spending - Depreciation) = $212 million
- Change in Working Capital = -$80 million

Current FCFF = -$542 million
Growth in Earnings

- Look at the past
  - The historical growth in earnings per share is usually a good starting point for growth estimation

- Look at what others are estimating
  - Analysts estimate growth in earnings per share for many firms. It is useful to know what their estimates are.

- Look at fundamentals
  - Ultimately, all growth in earnings can be traced to two fundamentals - how much the firm is investing in new projects, and what returns these projects are making for the firm.
Fundamental Growth when Returns are stable

Expected Growth

Net Income
- Retention Ratio = 1 - Dividends/Net Income
- Return on Equity = Net Income/Book Value of Equity

Operating Income
- Reinvestment Rate = (Net Cap Ex + Chg in WC)/EBIT(1-t)
- Return on Capital = EBIT(1-t)/Book Value of Capital

X
Measuring Return on Capital (Equity)

\[
\text{ROC} = \frac{\text{EBIT} \times (1 - \text{tax rate})}{\text{Book Value of Equity} + \text{Book value of debt} - \text{Cash}}
\]

Adjust EBIT for:
- Extraordinary or one-time expenses or income
- Operating leases and R&D
- Cyclicality in earnings (Normalize)
- Acquisition Debris (Goodwill amortization etc.)

Use a marginal tax rate to be safe. A high ROC created by paying low effective taxes is not sustainable.

Adjust book equity for:
1. Capitalized R&D
2. Acquisition Debris (Goodwill)

Adjust book value of debt for:
- Capitalized operating leases

Use end of prior year numbers or average over the year but be consistent in your application.
## Normalizing Reinvestment: Titan Cement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cp Ex</td>
<td>$50.54</td>
<td>$81.00</td>
<td>$113.30</td>
<td>$102.30</td>
<td>$109.50</td>
<td>$456.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$39.26</td>
<td>$40.87</td>
<td>$80.94</td>
<td>$73.70</td>
<td>$60.30</td>
<td>$295.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT</td>
<td>$162.78</td>
<td>$186.39</td>
<td>$200.60</td>
<td>$222.00</td>
<td>$231.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT(1-t)</td>
<td>$121.32</td>
<td>$138.92</td>
<td>$149.51</td>
<td>$154.42</td>
<td>$172.76</td>
<td>$736.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cap Ex as % of EBIT(1-t)</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>28.89%</td>
<td>21.64%</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>622.7</td>
<td>982.9</td>
<td>1036.1</td>
<td>1035.7</td>
<td>1104.4</td>
<td>4781.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cashh Current assets</td>
<td>248.55</td>
<td>342.95</td>
<td>352.93</td>
<td>$402.10</td>
<td>$398.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-debt current liabilities</td>
<td>133.33</td>
<td>177.15</td>
<td>194.57</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cash WC</td>
<td>115.22</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>158.36</td>
<td>147.1</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>795.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as % of revenues</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
<td>16.87%</td>
<td>15.28%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>18.92%</td>
<td>16.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expected Growth Estimate: Titan Cement

- Normalized Change in working capital = (Working capital as percent of revenues) * Change in revenues in 2004 = 0.1663 \times (1104.4 - 1035.7) = 11.4 \text{ mil Euros}

- Normalized Net Cap Ex = Net Cap ex as % of EBIT(1-t) * EBIT(1-t) in 2004 = 0.2192 \times (232 (1-0.2547)) = 37.90 \text{ million Euros}

- Normalized reinvestment rate = \frac{11.4 + 37.9}{232(1-0.2547)} = 28.54\%

- Return on capital = \frac{232 (1-0.2547)}{(499+399)} = 19.25\%
  - The book value of debt and equity from last year was used.

- Expected growth rate = 0.2854 \times 0.1925 = 5.49\%
Fundamental Growth when return on equity (capital) is changing

- When the return on equity or capital is changing, there will be a second component to growth, positive if the return is increasing and negative if the return is decreasing.
- If $\text{ROC}_t$ is the return on capital in period $t$ and $\text{ROC}_{t+1}$ is the return on capital in period $t+1$, the expected growth rate in operating income will be:
  
  $$\text{Expected Growth Rate} = \text{ROC}_{t+1} \times \text{Reinvestment rate} + \left(\frac{\text{ROC}_{t+1} - \text{ROC}_t}{\text{ROC}_t}\right)$$
An example: Motorola

- Motorola’s current return on capital is 12.18% and its reinvestment rate is 52.99%.
- We expect Motorola’s return on capital to rise to 17.22% over the next 5 years (which is half way towards the industry average)
  
  Expected Growth Rate
  
  \[
  \text{Expected Growth Rate} = \text{ROC}_{\text{New Investments}} \times \text{Reinvestment Rate}_{\text{current}} + \left\{ [1+\left(\frac{\text{ROC}_{\text{in 5 years}}}{\text{ROC}_{\text{Current}}}-\text{ROC}_{\text{Current}}\right)/\text{ROC}_{\text{Current}}]^{1/5}-1 \right\}
  \]

  \[
  = .1722 \times .5299 + \left\{ [1+\left(\frac{.1722-.1218}{.1218}\right)/.1218]^{1/5}-1 \right\}
  \]

  \[
  = .174 \text{ or } 17.40\%
  \]

- One way to think about this is to decompose Motorola’s expected growth into
  
  - Growth from new investments: .1722*5299 = 9.12%
  - Growth from more efficiently using existing investments: 17.40%-9.12%=8.28%
Revenue Growth and Operating Margins

- With negative operating income and a negative return on capital, the fundamental growth equation is of little use for Amazon.com.
- For Amazon, the effect of reinvestment shows up in revenue growth rates and changes in expected operating margins:

  \[
  \text{Expected Revenue Growth in $} = \text{Reinvestment (in $ terms)} \times (\text{Sales/ Capital})
  \]

- The effect on expected margins is more subtle. Amazon’s reinvestments (especially in acquisitions) may help create barriers to entry and other competitive advantages that will ultimately translate into high operating margins and high profits.
Growth in Revenues, Earnings and Reinvestment: Amazon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue Growth</th>
<th>Chg in Revenue</th>
<th>Chg in Reinvestment</th>
<th>Chg Rev/ Chg Reinvestment</th>
<th>ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00%</td>
<td>$1,676</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-76.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$2,793</td>
<td>$931</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>$4,189</td>
<td>$1,396</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>$4,887</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>25.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>$4,398</td>
<td>$1,466</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>21.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.20%</td>
<td>$4,803</td>
<td>$1,601</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>22.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>$4,868</td>
<td>$1,623</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>$4,482</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>21.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>$3,587</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>21.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$2,208</td>
<td>$736</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assume that firm can earn high returns because of established economies of scale.
III. The Tail that wags the dog…
Terminal Value
A publicly traded firm potentially has an infinite life. The value is therefore the present value of cash flows forever.

\[
\text{Value} = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{CF_t}{(1+r)^t}
\]

Since we cannot estimate cash flows forever, we estimate cash flows for a “growth period” and then estimate a terminal value, to capture the value at the end of the period:

\[
\text{Value} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{CF_t}{(1+r)^t} + \frac{\text{Terminal Value}}{(1+r)^N}
\]
Ways of Estimating Terminal Value

Terminal Value

- Liquidation Value
  - Most useful when assets are separable and marketable

- Multiple Approach
  - Easiest approach but makes the valuation a relative valuation

- Stable Growth Model
  - Technically soundest, but requires that you make judgments about when the firm will grow at a stable rate which it can sustain forever, and the excess returns (if any) that it will earn during the period.
Stable Growth and Terminal Value

- When a firm’s cash flows grow at a “constant” rate forever, the present value of those cash flows can be written as:
  \[
  \text{Value} = \frac{\text{Expected Cash Flow Next Period}}{(r - g)}
  \]
  where,
  \[
  r = \text{Discount rate (Cost of Equity or Cost of Capital)}
  \]
  \[
  g = \text{Expected growth rate}
  \]

- This “constant” growth rate is called a **stable growth rate** and cannot be higher than the growth rate of the economy in which the firm operates.

- While companies can maintain high growth rates for extended periods, they will all approach “stable growth” at some point in time.
Limits on Stable Growth

The stable growth rate cannot exceed the growth rate of the economy but it can be set lower.

- If you assume that the economy is composed of high growth and stable growth firms, the growth rate of the latter will probably be lower than the growth rate of the economy.
- The stable growth rate can be negative. The terminal value will be lower and you are assuming that your firm will disappear over time.
- If you use nominal cashflows and discount rates, the growth rate should be nominal in the currency in which the valuation is denominated.

One simple proxy for the nominal growth rate of the economy is the riskfree rate.
Strange though this may seem, the terminal value is not as much a function of stable growth as it is a function of what you assume about excess returns in stable growth.

In the scenario where you assume that a firm earns a return on capital equal to its cost of capital in stable growth, the terminal value will not change as the growth rate changes.

If you assume that your firm will earn positive (negative) excess returns in perpetuity, the terminal value will increase (decrease) as the stable growth rate increases.
Getting to stable growth: Determinants

- **Size of the firm**
  - Success usually makes a firm larger. As firms become larger, it becomes much more difficult for them to maintain high growth rates.

- **Current growth rate**
  - While past growth is not always a reliable indicator of future growth, there is a correlation between current growth and future growth. Thus, a firm growing at 30% currently probably has higher growth and a longer expected growth period than one growing 10% a year now.

- **Barriers to entry and differential advantages**
  - Ultimately, high growth comes from high project returns, which, in turn, comes from barriers to entry and differential advantages.
  - The question of how long growth will last and how high it will be can therefore be framed as a question about what the barriers to entry are, how long they will stay up and how strong they will remain.
Stable Growth Characteristics

- In stable growth, firms should have the characteristics of other stable growth firms. In particular,
  - The risk of the firm, as measured by beta and ratings, should reflect that of a stable growth firm.
    - Beta should move towards one
    - The cost of debt should reflect the safety of stable firms (BBB or higher)
  - The debt ratio of the firm might increase to reflect the larger and more stable earnings of these firms.
    - The debt ratio of the firm might moved to the optimal or an industry average
    - If the managers of the firm are deeply averse to debt, this may never happen
  - The reinvestment rate of the firm should reflect the expected growth rate and the firm’s return on capital
    - Reinvestment Rate = Expected Growth Rate / Return on Capital
## Titan and Amazon.com: Stable Growth Inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Growth</th>
<th>Stable Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Titan Cement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Ratio</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Capital</td>
<td>19.25%</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Capital</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Growth Rate</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinvestment Rate</td>
<td>28.54%</td>
<td>3.41%96.57% = 51.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amazon.com</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Ratio</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Capital</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Growth Rate</td>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinvestment Rate</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
<td>6%/20% = 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>