# MFG Core Infrastructure

#### **Key Facts**

Portfolio Manager	Dennis Eagar & Gerald Stack
Strategy Inception Date	18 January 2012
Total Infrastructure Assets <sup>1</sup>	USD \$5,313.0 million
Total Strategy Assets	USD \$3,213.6 million

#### USD Performance<sup>2</sup>

	Composite (Gross)	Composite (Net) <sup>3</sup>	Index <sup>4</sup>	Excess Return
3 Months	-1.4	-1.6	2.6	-4.0
6 Months	2.0	1.6	7.3	-5.3
1 Year	16.2	15.4	13.6	2.6
3 Years (% p.a.)	11.6	10.8	6.2	5.4
4 Years (% p.a.)	11.8	11.0	7.6	4.2
Since Inception (% p.a.)	12.8	12.0	7.9	4.9

	Composite (Gross)	Composite (Net) <sup>3</sup>	Index <sup>4</sup>	Excess Return
2012 (%)*	16.4	15.5	7.0	9.4
2013	14.0	13.2	14.4	-0.4
2014	17.4	16.6	14.1	3.3
2015	-0.1	-0.8	-12.2	12.1
2016 (CYTD)	13.2	12.6	16.4	-3.2

### USD 4 Year Risk Measures<sup>5</sup>

	Against Benchmark <sup>4</sup>	Against Global Equities⁵
Upside Capture	1.0	0.8
Downside Capture	0.7	0.3
Beta	0.8	0.6
Correlation	0.9	0.6

## Top 10 Holdings<sup>6</sup>

	Sector	%
Atlantia SpA	Toll Roads	3.1
Enbridge Inc	Energy Infrastructure	3.1
Aena SA	Airports	3.1
TransCanada Corp	Energy Infrastructure	3.0
Power Assets Holdings	Integrated Power	3.0
Transurban Group	Toll Roads	3.0
National Grid PLC	Transmission and Distribution	3.0
Snam Rete Gas SpA	Gas Utilities	2.9
Abertis Infraestructuras	Toll Roads	2.6
Crown Castle International	Communications	2.3
	TOTAL:	29.1

# Industry Exposure<sup>6</sup>



# Geographical Exposure<sup>6</sup>



1 Comprised of all Infrastructure strategies. 2 Returns are for the Global Core Infrastructure Composite and denoted in USD. Performance would vary if Teturns were denominated in a currency other than USD. Refer to the GIPS Disclosure section at the end of this document for further information. 3 Composite (Net) returns are net of fees charged to clients and have been reduced by the amount of the

highest fee charged to any client employing that strategy during the period under consideration. Actual fees may vary depending on, among other things, the applicable fee schedule and portfolio size. Fees are

available upon request. 4 S&P Global Infrastructure Index Net Total Return spliced with UBS Developed Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index. Note: as the UBS Developed Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index. Note: as the UBS Developed Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index. Note: as the UBS Developed Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index. Note: as the UBS Developed Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index. Note: as the UBS Developed Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index. Net Total Return Spliced Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index. Net Total Return Spliced Infrastructure and Utilities Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index. Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index Net Total Return Index Net Total Retur ceased to be published from 31 March 2015, it was replaced on 1 January 2015 with the S&P Global Infrastructure Index Net Total Return.

Returns are only for part year

5 Risk measures are for the Global Core Infrastructure Composite. The Global Equity Index is the MSCI World Net Total Return. 6 Representative portfolio. The exposures are by domicile of listing.

# Performance

Over the September 2016 quarter, in US dollar terms, the Strategy returned -1.4% before fees. This was 4.0% lower than the benchmark return of +2.6% and 3.6% lower than the Dow Jones Brookfield Global Infrastructure Index return of +2.2%. The 12-month return for the Strategy was +16.2%. This was 2.6% better than the benchmark return of +13.6%.

The quarter was dominated by a heavy sell-off of US utilities which made up 27 of the 30 worst performing stocks in the strategy. US stocks declined by an average 5.7% for the quarter, led by Aqua America (Total Shareholder Return of -14.0%), American Water Works (-11.0%) and Southwest Gas (-10.7%). This was offset by relatively strong performances by Canadian stocks (+3.9%) and European stocks (+1.9%). In total, Infrastructure stocks held in the Fund were up an average 3.3% for the quarter while utility stocks were down an average 4.1%.

In regard to stocks excluded from the MFG Asset Management investment universe but included in commonly used benchmarks, the September 2016 quarter saw oil & gas pipeline companies increase by an average of 21.5% for the quarter while US/Canadian rail companies rose by over 14%. Japanese regulated utilities declined by 2.1% for the quarter.

The Strategy's returns for the quarter by sector and region are shown in the following graphs:



Source: MFG Asset Management.



## Strategy

The Strategy remains consistent with previous periods and is not expected to change over the long term.

The Strategy seeks to provide investors with attractive riskadjusted returns from the infrastructure asset class. It does this by investing in a portfolio of listed infrastructure companies that meet our strict definition of infrastructure at discounts to their assessed intrinsic value. We expect the Strategy to provide investors with real returns of approximately 5% to 6% over the longer term.

We believe that infrastructure assets, with requisite earnings reliability and a linkage of earnings to inflation, offer attractive, long-term investment propositions. Furthermore, given the predictable nature of earnings and the structural linkage of those earnings to inflation, investment returns generated by infrastructure assets are different from standard asset classes and offer investors valuable diversification when included in an investment portfolio. In the current uncertain economic and investment climate, the reliable financial performance of infrastructure investments makes them particularly attractive and an investment in listed infrastructure can be expected to reward patient investors with a three to five year timeframe.

# Topic in Focus - What's a toll road worth?

Given the recent strength in toll roads and the broader infrastructure sector, a number of market commentators have suggested share prices for these stocks have run too hard. From our observations though, it appears that many of these conclusions are underpinned by crude valuation measures that fail to account for the unique characteristics of these assets.

In this brief note, we talk about our approach to valuing toll roads and how it differs from approaches that are often applied to valuing equities.

### Introduction

Toll roads are a key segment of the global infrastructure market. However, these assets also have some rather unique characteristics. This means that shorthand valuation measures/metrics (eg. PE ratios and EV/EBITDA) can generate misleading outcomes. This paper aims to provide clarification of why this is the case.

# Key characteristics that have an impact on valuing toll roads

The key characteristics to consider when valuing a toll road are as follows:

- Toll roads operate under a concession agreement (or contract) with a government that, among other things, sets out two critical factors:
  - The date at which the concession agreement terminates; and
  - The basis on which the tolls will increase.
- When the concession actually terminates, the asset is handed back to the government, i.e. unlike most other enterprises, there is no terminal value.
- Toll roads operate on relatively high EBITDA margins (EBITDA being revenue minus expenses before

depreciation, interest and tax), typically around 80%-90% for urban toll roads and 70% for inter-urban roads. This means that, for a typical urban toll road, only 10%-20% of revenue is used to run the toll road, including regular maintenance.

Toll roads involve significant upfront build costs and accounting standards dictate that an asset must be depreciated over its useful life to reflect expected maintenance or replacement expenditure. However, in the case of a road, maintenance is a relatively small proportion of revenue (say 2% p.a.), and is generally expensed rather than capitalised. This means that the depreciation entrv for accounting purposes significantly overstates the actual expenditure needed to maintain the road. An example of this is Australian toll road company, Transurban, which incurred an accounting depreciation expense of A\$550 million but had a cash maintenance cost of only A\$55 million.

### PE ratios are meaningless when looking at toll roads. Not only is the cashflow generated by the business almost always higher than the published earnings, but the ratio also ignores the fundamental nature of toll roads – that they are limited life assets.

- For most normal industrial companies, depreciation is a good proxy for the maintenance costs needed to keep a business operating competitively. However, for toll roads, given the disparity between accounting depreciation and the real cost of maintaining toll roads, accounting earnings can significantly understate the underlying position of the business and the free cash it generates.
- This disparity has another indirect benefit to the underlying value of the business. Accounting earnings are lower and hence so is the tax that the business will have to pay, thus actual post-tax <u>cashflow</u> is higher.
- PE is a proxy for the net present value of the cashflow from the earnings of a business, however for toll roads, the valuation needs to be based on the underlying free cashflow generation.

# Is an EV to EBITDA multiple a good measure when valuing toll roads?

Another short hand measure often used when valuing normal industrial companies is the Enterprise Value (EV) to EBITDA ratio. To determine the EV in each case we use a discounted cashflow methodology to value the toll road by forecasting the cash flows generated by the toll road under the assumptions set out below<sup>1</sup>.

The following graph is based on a standard toll road model where the key assumptions are as follows:

- Traffic in Year 1 grows at 2% with the growth rate reducing by 0.1% per annum.
- The EBITDA margin is 75% in year 1, growing each year by 0.5% to a maximum 90%.
- Tolls increase with inflation of 2% p.a.





As the graph highlights, the EV/EBITDA ratio appropriate to the valuation of this hypothetical toll road increases with the concession length, so a rational investor would value the toll road at 15 times current EBITDA if there were only 20 years remaining on the concession but would be prepared to pay 22 times if there were 40 years remaining and almost 25 times if there were 70 years remaining.

But concession length isn't the only important variable in valuing a toll road. Given that toll roads have a largely fixed cost base, the rate of growth of revenues can clearly be a critical factor in a toll road's worth. The following graph shows the shape of the above curve under two additional scenarios:

- Scenario 2: as per the standard model shown above but with tolls increasing by 1% in real terms instead of inflation; and
- Scenario 3: as per Scenario 2 but with traffic growth starting at 4% growth instead of 2% in year 1 (and also fading at 0.1% p.a).





As this graph highlights, a rational investor would be prepared to pay approximately 15 times EBITDA for a standard toll road with 20 years remaining in the concession period but as high as 45 times Year 1 EBITDA if it was a scenario 3 toll road with 70 years remaining on the concession.

Every aspect of the toll road's earnings in the three scenarios in Year 1 is identical, i.e. they all have the same revenue, EBITDA and earnings. Yet the actual NPV of each asset's future cash flows varies enormously. Thus EV/EBITDA is also not useful for valuing and comparing toll roads as a fair multiple will be determined by the length of the concession, expected traffic and price growth, none of which are reflected in the current EBITDA of the toll road under analysis.

#### **Concluding comments**

The conclusion is clear. Any use of current year financial results such as PEs or EV/EBITDA ratios as a means to determine the value of a toll road is problematic at best and most likely misleading. The corollary is that there is only one way to effectively value a toll road business – model each asset over its entire concession period and aggregate the sum of those assets. On that basis, our analysis suggests that a number of the world's highest quality toll roads remain attractively priced.

 $^1$  Valuing the future cash flows of the road using a Weighted Average Cost of Capital of 6.8% based on a Nominal Cost of Equity of 7.0%, a nominal Cost of Debt of 6.0% and assuming 40% gearing. For simplicity the hypothetical toll road Enterprise Value is determined pre-tax and interest costs.

#### IMPORTANT NOTICE

This material is being furnished to you to provide summary information regarding Magellan Asset Management Limited 'doing business as'/'trading as' MFG Asset Management ('MFG Asset Management') and an investment fund or investment strategy managed by MFG Asset Management ('Strategy'). No distribution of this material will be made in any jurisdiction where such distribution is not authorised or is unlawful. This material is not intended to constitute advertising or advice of any kind and you should not construe the contents of this material as legal, tax, investment or other advice.

The investment program of the Strategy presented herein is speculative and may involve a high degree of risk. The Strategy is not intended as a complete investment program and is suitable only for sophisticated investors who can bear the risk of loss. The Strategy may lack diversification, which can increase the risk of loss to investors. The Strategy's performance may be volatile. The past performance of the Strategy is not necessarily indicative of future results and no person guarantees the performance of the Strategy or the amount or timing of any return from it. There can be no assurance that the Strategy will achieve any targeted returns, that asset allocations will be met or that the Strategy will be able to implement its investment Strategy or achieve its investment objective. The management fees, incentive fees and allocation and other expenses of the Strategy will reduce trading profits, if any, or increase losses. The Strategy will have limited liquidity, no secondary market for interests in the Strategy is expected to develop and there are restrictions on an investor's ability to withdraw and transfer interests in the Strategy. In making an investment decision, you must rely on your own examination of any offering documents relating to the Strategy.

No representation or warranty, express or implied, is made with respect to the correctness, accuracy, reasonableness or completeness of any of the information contained in this material. This information is subject to change at any time and no person has any responsibility to update any of the information provided in this material. MFG Asset Management will not be responsible or liable for any losses, whether direct, indirect or consequential, including loss of profits, damages, costs, claims or expenses, relating to or arising from your use or reliance upon any part of the information contained in this material including trading losses, loss of opportunity or incidental or punitive damages.

This material is strictly confidential and is being provided to you solely for your information and must not be copied, reproduced, published, distributed, disclosed or passed to any other person at any time without the prior written consent of MFG Asset Management. Any trademarks, logos, and service marks contained herein may be the registered and unregistered trademarks of their respective owners. Nothing contained herein should be construed as granting by implication, or otherwise, any licence or right to use any trademark displayed without the written permission of the owner.

<u>United Kingdom</u> - This material does not constitute an offer or inducement to engage in an investment activity under the provisions of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 (FSMA). This material does not form part of any offer or invitation to purchase, sell or subscribe for, or any solicitation of any such offer to purchase, sell or subscribe for, any shares, units or other type of investment product or service. This material or any part of it, or the fact of its distribution, is for background purposes only. This material has not been approved by a person authorised under the FSMA and its distribution in the United Kingdom and is only being made to persons in circumstances that will not constitute a financial promotion for the purposes of section 21 of the FSMA as a result of an exemption contained in the FSMA 2000 (Financial Promotion) Order 2005 as set out below. This material is exempt from the restrictions in the FSMA as it is to be strictly communicated only to 'investment professionals' as defined in Article 19(5) of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 (Financial Promotion) Order 2005 (FPO).

<u>United States of America</u> - This material is not intended as an offer or solicitation for the purchase or sale of any securities, financial instrument or product or to provide financial services. It is not the intention of MFG Asset Management to create legal relations on the basis of information provided herein. Where performance figures are shown net of fees charged to clients, the performance has been reduced by the amount of the highest fee charged to any client employing that particular strategy during the period under consideration. Actual fees may vary depending on, among other things, the applicable fee schedule and portfolio size. Fees are available upon request and also may be found in Part II of MFG Asset Management's Form ADV.

The Global Infrastructure Benchmark is comprised of the following: from inception to 31 December 2014 the benchmark is UBS Developed Infrastructure & Utilities Index Net Total Return and from 1 January 2015 the benchmark is S&P Global Infrastructure Net Total Return Index. The benchmark changed because UBS discontinued their index series.

The UBS Developed Infrastructure & Utilities Index Net Total Return is a market capitalisation weighted index that is designed to measure the equity performance of listed Infrastructure and Utility stocks. Index results assume the reinvestment of all distributions of capital gain and net investment income using a tax rate applicable to non-resident institutional investors who do not benefit from double taxation treaties.

The S&P Global Infrastructure Net Total Return Index is a market capitalisation weighted index that is designed to track 75 companies from around the world diversified across three infrastructure sectors energy, transportation and utilities. Index results assume the reinvestment of all distributions of capital gain and net investment income using a tax rate applicable to non-resident institutional investors who do not benefit from double taxation treaties.

#### GLOBAL INVESTMENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (GIPS®) DISCLOSURE

Magellan Asset Management Limited, doing business as MFG Asset Management in jurisdictions outside Australia and New Zealand, (MFG Asset Management) claims compliance with the Global Investment Performance Standards (GIPS ®)

For the purpose of complying with GIPS, the Firm is defined as all discretionary portfolios managed by MFG Asset Management.

The Global Core Infrastructure composite is a global strategy investing in strictly defined or "pure" infrastructure companies (typically 80-120). The filtered investment universe is comprised of stocks that 1. generate reliable income streams, 2. benefit from inflation protection and have an appropriate capital structure. The investment objective of the strategy is to minimise the risk of permanent capital loss; and achieve superior risk adjusted investment returns over the medium to long-term. The composite was created in February 2012.

To achieve investment objectives, the composite may also use derivative financial instruments including, but not limited to, options, swaps, futures and forwards. Derivatives are subject to the risk of changes in the market price of the underlying securities instruments, and the risk of the loss due to changes in interest rates. The use of certain derivatives may have a leveraging effect, which may increase the volatility of the composite and may reduce its returns.

A list of composites and descriptions, as well as policies for valuing investments, calculating performance, and preparing compliant presentations are available upon request by emailing data@magellangroup.com.au

The representative portfolio is an account in the composite that closely reflects the portfolio management style of the strategy. Performance is not a consideration in the selection of the representative portfolio. The characteristics of the representative portfolio may differ from those of the composite and of the other accounts in the composite. Information regarding the representative portfolio and the other accounts in the composite is available upon request.