

Valuation of HUL

Dr. Anjala Kalsie

Assistant Professor

Department of Management Studies

University of Delhi

Delhi 110007

India

Ashima Arora

Research Scholar

Faculty of Management Studies

University of Delhi

Delhi 110007

India

Abstract:

The objective of the papers is to do the valuation of HUL. The data was collected from the various annual reports of HUL. The valuation of the company was done through Discounted cash flows method (DCF), EBIDTA multiple and P/E multiple. The paper concludes that the fair value of HUL share is calculated by taking the simple average of all the three methods. It was observed that share price calculated with the help of DCF and EBIDTA multiple methods are much higher than the ruling market price. The share price calculated from P/E multiple method turns out to be much lower than the market price. As the average of the three method gives the fair value of the HUL share and it is close to the ruling market price.

Key Words: Valuation, DCF, EV/EBITDA, P/E multiple

1. Introduction

Acquiring companies for the sole purpose of sustaining growth rates may also not help unless and until the acquisition fits well with the company's strategic growth plans and vision. The FMCG sector does need economies of scale but this need not necessarily come through M&A's, given the current trend of high valuations for target companies, too much money is chasing too few brands. Companies need to figure out whether acquisitions would give them the necessary scale or is building own brands a more viable option. So, the business also needs to come at the right price.

Acquiring companies for the sole purpose of sustaining growth rates may also not help unless and until the acquisition fits well with the company's strategic growth plans and vision. The FMCG sector does need economies of scale but this need not necessarily come through M&A's, given the current trend of high valuations for target companies, too much money is chasing too few brands.

Valuation also plays a central role in acquisition analysis. The bidding firm or individual has to decide on a fair value for the target firm before making a bid and the target firm has to determine reasonable value for itself before deciding to accept or reject the offer. If the objective in corporate finance is the maximization of firm value, the relationship between financial decisions, corporate strategy and the firm value has to be delineated.

2. HUL Company Background

HUL is the largest FMCG manufacturer in India, having presence in Soaps, Detergents, Skin care, and Oral care, Hair Care, Staple Foods and Beverages. HUL was formed in 1933 as Lever Brothers India Ltd and came into being in 1956 as Hindustan Lever Ltd (HLL) through a merger of Lever Brothers, Hindustan Vanaspasti Manufacturing Company Ltd and United Traders Ltd. Later in mid 2007, the company was renamed as "Hindustan Unilever Ltd." HUL is owned by the European company Unilever and owns approximately 52% majority stake. HUL is one of the key script in the stock indices and carries greater than 3% weightage in the BSE SENSEX.

Despite the fact that HUL had maintained leadership position in most of the categories, the concern factor is losing volume and value market share. Companies with higher current in their River (Range, Innovation, Value weightage, Engage and Reach) will lead the game.

Brand's range (coverage of price points and wide variety) should be considered as a key trait. HUL's leadership in soaps, detergent, skin care, shampoo market is owing to strong range of its products. In each of the category HUL has 2-3 brands with each brand having more than variations; so this provides large option for customers.

3. Objectives and Methodology:

The objective of the papers is to do the valuation of HUL. The paper also analyses the tentative bid value of HUL by applying the relevant valuation techniques. One of the objective of the paper is also to analyses the financial health of the company.

3.1 Data Sources:

The data was collected from the various annual reports of HUL for the time period 2009 to 2011.

3.2 Methodology:

The top company from the FMCG sector, i.e. HUL was selected and its pro- forma financial statements were formulated for the next 5 years. The valuation of the company was done by the below mentioned methods:

1. Discounted cash flows method (DCF)
2. Multiples

3.2.1 Discounted Cash Flows Method (DCF):

This method is the most thorough way to value a company. There are two ways to value a company using the DCF approach: the Adjusted Present Value (APV) method and the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) Method. Both methods require calculation of a company's free cash flows (FCF) as well as the net present value (NPV) of these FCFs.

For WACC, the discount rate is calculated with the following formula:

$$rdWACC = (E)(reL) / (D + E) + (D) (1 - t)(rD) / (D + E)$$

Here:

D = Market value of debt

E = Market value of equity

rD = Discount rate for debt = Average interest rate on long-term debt

reL = Discount rate for (leveraged) equity (calculated using the CAPM)

To capture the characteristics of an all-equity firm recalculate a company's cash flows as if the firm had no debt. The free cash flow (FCF) of an all-equity firm in a year can be calculated as:

FCFE = Earnings Before Interest and Taxes x (1 - t) + Depreciation & Amortization - Capital Expenditure (—CapExp) - Net increase in working capital (or + net decrease in working capital) + Other relevant cash flows for an all equity firm

The value of the terminal year cash flows is given as:

$$TY FCF = FCF_{10} (1 + g) / (rd - g)$$

Adding the value of the terminal year free cash flows (TY FCF) and future cash flows (FCFs) up to the terminal year gives us the value of the company under the DCF analysis. These cash flows need to be discounted to the present value.

3.2.2 Multiples:

There is not enough information to determine the valuation using the comparable transactions method. In these cases, one can value a company based on market valuation multiples. Examples of these valuation multiples include price/earning multiples (also known as P/E ratios, this method, which compares a company's market capitalization to its annual income, is the most commonly used multiple) EBITDA multiples. When using this method, one look at what multiples are used for other companies in the industry.

4. Analysis and Interpretation

The projected income statement i.e., the projected profit and loss account and projected balance sheets are prepared on the basis of assumptions shown in table 1 below.

Table 1 Assumption

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Revenue Growth	30%	32.50%	35.20%	38.20%	41.40%	44.80%	CAGR
RM Consumption	45%	45%	45%	45%	45%	45%	
Wages & labor charges	1.40%	1.40%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.60%	CAGR
Other Manufacturing expenses	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	
Personnel Expenses	5.00%	5.40%	5.80%	6.10%	6.60%	7.00%	CAGR
Other admin expenses	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	

	2009	2010	20.11	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Interest/Average debt	-	21.0%	4.60%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
Dep/Gross block	45.90 %	40.00 %	42.70 %	50.00 %	50.00 %	50.00 %	50.00 %	50.00 %	50.00 %

	2009	2010	20.11	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Interest/Average debt		21.00%	4.60%	9.00 %	9.00 %	9.00 %	9.00 %	9.00 %	9.00 %
Dep/Gross block	45.90 %	40.00%	42.70 %	50.0 0%	50.0 0%	50.0 0%	50.0 0%	50.0 0%	50.0 0%
FA/sales	-	19.70%	18.60 %	19.6 0%	20.8 0%	22.0 0%	23.3 0%	24.6 0%	26.0 0%
Inventory/ RM	24.00 %	25.00%	31.00 %	20.0 0%	20.0 0%	20.0 0%	20.0 0%	20.0 0%	20.0 0%
Debtor/Sales		3.70%	4.60%	4.60 %	4.60 %	4.60 %	4.60 %	4.60 %	11.0 0%
Cash Balance (No. of month expenses)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
YoY Inc in L&A		-159	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Creditors/Expenses	31.30 %	36.80%	36.40 %	39.3 0%	42.4 0%	45.7 0%	49.3 0%	53.2 0%	57.4 0%
NWC/Sales	- 10.10 %	- 16.80%	- 13.40 %	- 18.9 0%	- 21.4 0%	- 24.1 0%	- 27.2 0%	- 30.4 0%	- 27.7 0%

Table 2 Projected Profit and Loss Account

Profit & Loss Account	Historical			Projected					
	12/31/2009	12/31/2010	12/31/2011	12/31/2012	12/31/2013	12/31/2014	12/31/2015	12/31/2016	12/31/2017
INR cr									
Sales	17541.78	18462.34	20598.89	26778.56	35484.05	47984.47	66302.43	93730.22	135747.31
Other Income	221.23	199.73	439.48	439.48	439.48	439.48	439.48	439.48	439.48
Less Excise duty	1138.32	693.20	908.90	908.90	908.90	908.90	908.90	908.90	908.90
Stock Adjustments	347.44	19.47	295.08	295.08	295.08	295.08	295.08	295.08	295.08
Total Revenue	16972.14	17988.34	20424.55	26604.22	35309.71	47810.13	66128.09	93555.88	135572.97
Raw material Consumption	9104.04	9003.97	10494.33	11971.90	15889.37	21514.56	29757.64	42100.14	61007.84
% of sales	53.64	50.05	51.38	45.00	45.00	45.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
Wages and Labour Charges	241.10	244.34	274.74	367.49	500.86	696.42	989.16	1437.07	2138.50
% of sales	1.42	1.36	1.35	1.38	1.42	1.46	1.50	1.54	1.58
Other Manufacturing expenses	237.87	412.19	551.25	996.42	1322.47	1790.65	2476.72	3503.98	5077.66
% of sales	1.40	2.29	2.70	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75
Total Direct Costs	9583.01	9660.50	11320.32	13335.81	17712.70	24001.63	3324.00	47041.20	68224.00
Gross Profit	7389.13	8327.84	9104.23	13268.41	17597.01	23808.50	32905.00	46514.68	67348.97
Gross Profit % (GP/	43.54	46.30	44.57	49.87	49.84	49.80	49.80	49.72	49.68

Profit & Loss Account	Historical			Projected					
	12/31/2009	12/31/2010	12/31/2011	12/31/2012	12/31/2013	12/31/2014	12/31/2015	12/31/2016	12/31/2017
Sales)									
Personnel Expenses	921.70	936.30	961.27	1338.59	1899.30	2749.29	4065.28	6148.63	9525.39
% of sales	5.43	5.21	4.71	5.03	5.38	5.75	6.15	6.57	7.03
Other Administration expenses	3874.23	4394.09	5038.91	6651.05	8827.43	11952.53	16532.02	23388.97	33893.24
% of sales	22.83	24.43	24.67	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
Total Overheads	4795.93	5330.39	6000.18	7989.64	10726.72	14701.83	20597.30	29537.59	43418.64
EBITDA	2593.20	2997.45	3104.05	5278.77	6870.29	9106.67	12307.00	16977.08	23930.34
EBITDA % (EBITDA/ Total Revenue)	15.28	16.66	15.20	19.84	19.46	19.05	18.60	18.15	17.65

Interest	25.32	6.98	0.24	2.94	5.64	5.64	5.64	5.64	5.64
Depreciation	1301.15	1452.88	1630.69	2628.25	3685.24	5273.36	7710.27	11533.83	17675.78
PBT	1266.73	1537.59	1473.12	2647.58	3179.40	3827.67	4591.00	5437.62	6248.92
EBIT	1292.05	1544.57	1473.36	2650.52	3185.04	3833.31	4597.00	5443.26	6254.56
Tax	430.56	522.63	500.71	899.91	1032.00	1242.00	1490.00	1764.00	2027.00
PAT	836.17	1014.96	972.41	1747.67	2148.00	2586.00	3102.00	3673.00	4221.00
PAT %	4.93	5.64	4.76	6.57	6.10	5.40	4.70	3.90	3.09

Table 3 Projected Balance Sheet

Balance Sheet	Historical			Projected					
	12/31/2009	12/31/2010	12/31/2011	12/31/2012	12/31/2013	12/31/2014	12/31/2015	12/31/2016	12/31/2017
INR million									
Equity Share capital	217.99	218.17	215.95	215.95	215.95	215.95	215.95	215.95	215.95
Reserves & Surplus	1919.49	2450.76	2493.40	3241.42	4295.18	5808.30	8025.60	11345.61	16431.58
NET WORTH	2137.48	2668.93	2709.35	3457.37	4511.13	6024.25	8241.55	11561.56	16647.53
Secured Loans	56.00	10.49	0.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00
Unsecured Loans	277.85	0.35	2.66	2.66	2.66	2.66	2.66	2.66	2.66
TOTAL DEBT	333.85	10.84	2.66	62.66	62.66	62.66	62.66	62.66	62.66
Other Liabilities (Min Interest)	52.80	62.10	79.75	79.75	79.75	79.75	79.75	79.75	79.75
Total Liabilities	2524.13	2741.87	2791.76	3599.78	4653.54	6166.66	8383.96	11703.97	16789.94
Gross Block	2835.11	3636.37	3821.20	5256.50	7370.49	10546.72	15420.54	23067.65	35351.56
Accumulated Depreciation	1301.15	1452.88	1630.69	2628.25	3685.24	5273.36	7710.27	11533.83	17675.78
Net Block	1533.96	2183.49	2190.51	2628.25	3685.24	5273.36	7710.27	11533.83	17675.78
CWIP	477.87	279.98	299.69	2183.51	3043.51	4313.51	7421.51	12779.51	13546.51
Total Fixed Assets (including WIP)	2011.83	2463.47	2490.20	4811.76	6728.76	9586.87	15131.78	24313.34	31222.29
Investments	287.64	1224.42	1188.46	1802.11	2732.60	4143.54	6283.00	9527.15	14446.37
Fix	1627.8	1718.0	1450.1	1450.1	1450.1	1450.1	1450.1	1450.1	1450.1

deposits	8	3	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Current assets, loans and advances	4532.81	4201.25	5189.18	5220.56	7196.62	10182.86	13672.00	18880.22	35596.92
Inventories	2558.87	2209.41	2846.84	2394.38	3177.87	4302.91	5951.53	8420.03	12201.57
Sundry debtors	560.56	687.76	951.85	1237.41	1639.68	2217.30	3063.76	4331.16	14932.20
Cash and bank balances	209.46	258.76	295.58	444.28	1184.98	2418.97	3364.00	4786.17	7070.70
Loans and advances	1203.92	1045.32	1094.91	1144.50	1194.09	1243.68	1293.27	1342.86	1392.45
Less :- Current liabilities and provisions	6029.56	6971.59	7638.05	9797.01	13566.02	19308.35	25265.00	42579.15	66037.67
Current liabilities	4494.66	5520.81	6302.12	8371.48	12044.90	17685.21	26533.00	40731.01	64065.58
Provisions	1534.90	1450.78	1335.93	1425.52	1521.12	1623.14	1731.99	1848.15	1972.09
Net current assets	1496.75	2770.34	2448.87	4576.44	6369.41	9125.48	14593.00	23698.93	30440.75
Miscellaneous expenses not written off	93.81	106.37	111.78	111.78	111.78	111.78	111.78	111.78	111.78
Total Assets	2524.41	2741.95	2791.76	3599.40	4653.92	6166.90	8384.00	11703.53	16789.88
NWC excluding cash	-1706.21	-3029.10	-2744.45	-5020.72	-7554.38	-11544.45	-17957.00	-28485.10	-37511.45

On the basis of projected profit and loss account and balance sheet valuation is done applying DCF method. The terminal growth rate is assumed as 3%. The valuation of HUL is shown in table 4 below.

Table 4 Valuation by DCF

		1	2	3	4	5	
Year End		31-Dec-12	31-Dec-13	31-Dec-14	31-Dec-15	31-Dec-16	Perpetuity
No of Months		12	12	12	12	12	
EBITDA		5278.77	6870.29	9106.67	12307.00	16977.08	16977.08
EBIT *t		874.67	1051.06	1264.99	1491.00	1796.27	1796.27
(Increase)/ Decrease in Gross Block		-1435.30	-2113.99	-3176.23	-4873.82	-7647.11	-7647.11
(Increase)/ Decrease in Investments		613.65	930.49	1410.94	2139.46	3244.15	3244.15
(Increase)/ Decrease in Working Capital		2276.27	2533.66	3990.07	6412.00	10529.00	10529.00
FCFF		5858.72	7169.39	10066.46	14493.60	21336.60	21366.60
Discount rate -	15.66%					142520.49	
PV of cash flows	35628.00						
Terminal Value	69578.00						
Enterprise Value as at December 31, 2011	105206.00						
Less: Net Debt	-292.92						
Equity Value as at December 31, 2011	105499.00						

The WACC of HUL is calculated in table 5 below. The cost of equity is calculated using CAPM method.

Table 5 : HUL COST OF EQUITY

rRF	7.90%
Beta	0.456
MRP	17%
rd	8.02%
S	3118
D	2
wd	0.064%
WACC	15.66%

The valuation of HUL using P/E and EBIDTA multiple is shown in table 6 and table 7 below

Table 6: Valuation using P/E multiple

PE Multiple	2011	2012	2013
PAT	972.406512	1748	2148
PE Multiple	32.14	31.3	27.1
Equity Value	31253.1453	54702.01275	58206.62
Weights	100%	100%	100%
Equity Valuation as at December 31, 2011	31253.1453	54702.01275	58206.62

Table 7 Valuation using EBITDA Multiple

EV/ EBITDA Multiple	2011	2012	2013
EBITDA	3104.05	5278.770402	6870.287064
EV/ EBITDA Multiple	29.8	23.5	20
Enterprise Value	92500.69	124051.1044	137405.7413
Less: Net Debt	292.92	381.6201375	1122.316026
Less: Contingent Liabilities	0	0	0
Add: Surplus Investments	0	0	0
Equity Valuation	92793.61	124432.7246	138528.0573

Table 8 calculates the share price of HUL under three methods namely, DCF, EBIDTA multiple and P/E multiple which comes out to be Rs.488.185, Rs. 429.394 and Rs.144.621 respectively. The simple average of these price turns out to be Rs 354 which is close to the actual share price as on that date i.e., Rs 385.1.

Table 8

Valuation Methodology	Equity Value	No of Outstanding Shares in crores	Share Price
DCF	105499	216.1044	488.185
EV/ EBITDA Multiple	92794	216.1044	429.394
PE Multiple	31253.1453	216.1044	144.621
Actual Share Price December 31, 2011	385.1		

5. Conclusions

The paper calculates the valuation of HUL under three different methods namely DCF, EBIDTA multiple and P/E multiple. It was observed that share price calculated with the help of DCF and EBIDTA multiple methods are much higher than the ruling market price. The share price calculated from P/E multiple method turns out to be much lower than the market price. The average of the three method gives the fair value of the HUL share and it is close to the ruling market price. Hence one can conclude that the valuation for valuation of HUL an FMCG company all the three method chosen namely DCF, EBIDTA multiple and P/E multiple are appropriate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alacra store. (n.d.). P&G: A company history. Retrieved 2015, from Alacra store: http://www.pg.com/translations/history_pdf/english_history.pdf

Damodaran, A. (2005). The value of synergy. Available at SSRN 841486.

Damodaran, A. (2007). *Valuation approaches and metrics: a survey of the theory and evidence*. Now Publishers Inc.

Damodaran, A. (2009). The octopus: Valuing multi-business, multi-national companies. *Multi-National Companies (November 17, 2009)*.

Fernández, P. (2007). Company valuation methods. The most common errors in valuations. *Research Paper no, 449*.

Fernández, P. (2007). Valuing companies by cash flow discounting: ten methods and nine theories. *Managerial Finance, 33(11)*, 853-876.

Fernandez, P. (2013). Valuation using multiples: How do analysts reach their conclusions?. Available at SSRN 274972.

Hindustan Unilever Limited. (n.d). *Annual reports*. Retrieved February, 2015, from <http://www.hul.co.in>: <http://www.hul.co.in/investorrelations/AnnualReports/>

Hindustan Unilever Limited. (n.d). *Balance sheets*. Retrieved April, 2015, from <http://www.alacrastore.com>: http://www.alacrastore.com/mergers-acquisitions/Hindustan_Unilever_Ltd-1046021

Hindustan Unilever. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.moneycontrol.com>: <http://www.moneycontrol.com/financials/hindustanunilever/balance-sheet/HU#HU>

Kumar, B. R., & Suhas, K. M. (2008). Valuation of Indian Companies—An Analytical Perspective. *Asia Pacific Business Review, 4(1)*, 93-104.

Market Line. (2011, May 1). The Procter & Gamble Company - Mergers & Acquisitions (M&A), Partnerships & Alliances and Investment Report. Retrieved 2015, from Alacrastore: <http://www.alacrastore.com/storecontent/MarketLine-Financial-Deals/The-Procter-Gamble-Company-Mergers-Acquisitions-M-A-Partnerships-Alliances-and-Investment-Report-2052-12131>

P&G likely to make GBP 38 billion bid for Unilever; HUL stock rises. (2011). Retrieved April 10, 2015, from http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-06-02/news/29612963_1_hul-stock-hindustan-unilever-procter-gamble

Pande, S. (2011, June 2). P&G bid for Unilever. Retrieved May 2015, from India Today: <http://indiatoday.intoday.in: http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/p&g-bid-for-unilever-why-such-a-deal-spells-trouble-for-both/1/140196.html>

Rizvi, Y. (2008). 'Picking the flowers'; Acquisition strategy as a tool for survival and growth. A case analysis of the acquisition of Gillette India Limited by Procter & Gamble. In 11th Strategic Management Forum, IIT Kanpur.

Srivastava, S. (2011, June 23). Should P&G and Unilever Merge? . Retrieved 2015, from Forbes India: Should P&G and Unilever Merge?

Trefis. (2011, June 3). Why P&G Buying Unilever is Unlikely. Retrieved 2015, from Trefis: <http://www.trefis.com/stock/pg/articles/60538/pg-buying-unilever-is-unlikely/2011-06-03>