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Test 1: Are you pricing or valuing?
Test 2: Are you pricing or valuing?

Rating

Buy

Company

BB BIOTECH

Europe

Switzerland

Biotechnology

Biotechnology

Strong sector and stock-picking continue

Impressive performance

Over the past two years, BB Biotech shares have roughly tripled, which could tempt investors to take profits. However, this performance has been well backed by a deserved revival of the biotech industry, encouraging fundamental news, M&A, and increased money flow into health care stocks. In addition, BB returned to index outperformance by modifying its stock-picking approach. Hence, despite excellent performance, the shares still trade at a 23% discount to the net asset value of the portfolio. Hence, the shares are an attractive value vehicle to capture growth opportunities in an attractive sector.

Biotech industry remains attractive

With the re-rating of the pharma sector, investors have also showed increased interest in biotech stocks. Established biotech stocks have delivered encouraging financial results and approvals, while there has also been substantial industry consolidation, which is not surprising in times of “cheap” money and high liquidity. BB Biotech remains an attractive vehicle to capture the future potential of the biotech sector. In addition, investors benefit from a 23% discount to NAV and attractive cash distribution policy of 5% yield p.a. Hence, we reiterate our Buy on BB Biotech shares.

BB Biotech shares remain attractive

In the first 6M of 2013, BB Biotech increased its NAV by 36%, which marks good outperformance against the Nasdaq Biotech Index (NBI)’s 27%. This is a remarkable performance after 2012, when BB’s NAV increase of 45% also
The Essence of Relative Valuation (Pricing)

- In relative valuation, the value of an asset is compared to the values assessed by the market for similar or comparable assets.

- To do relative valuation then,
  - we need to identify comparable assets and obtain market values for these assets
  - convert these market values into standardized values, since the absolute prices cannot be compared. This process of standardizing creates price multiples.
  - compare the standardized value or multiple for the asset being analyzed to the standardized values for comparable assets, controlling for any differences between the firms that might affect the multiple, to judge whether the asset is under or over valued.
Relative valuation is pervasive...

- Most asset valuations are relative.
- Most equity valuations on Wall Street are relative valuations.
  - Almost 85% of equity research reports are based upon a multiple and comparables.
  - More than 50% of all acquisition valuations are based upon multiples
  - Rules of thumb based on multiples are not only common but are often the basis for final valuation judgments.
- While there are more discounted cashflow valuations in consulting and corporate finance, they are often relative valuations masquerading as discounted cash flow valuations.
  - The objective in many discounted cashflow valuations is to back into a number that has been obtained by using a multiple.
  - The terminal value in a significant number of discounted cashflow valuations is estimated using a multiple.
Why relative valuation?

“If you think I’m crazy, you should see the guy who lives across the hall”

Jerry Seinfeld talking about Kramer in a Seinfeld episode

“A little inaccuracy sometimes saves tons of explanation”

H.H. Munro

“If you are going to screw up, make sure that you have lots of company”

Ex-portfolio manager
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Relative valuation is much more likely to reflect market perceptions and moods than discounted cash flow valuation. This can be an advantage when it is important that the price reflect these perceptions as is the case when
- the objective is to sell a security at that price today (as in the case of an IPO)
- investing on “momentum” based strategies

With relative valuation, there will always be a significant proportion of securities that are under valued and over valued.

Since portfolio managers are judged based upon how they perform on a relative basis (to the market and other money managers), relative valuation is more tailored to their needs

Relative valuation generally requires less information than discounted cash flow valuation (especially when multiples are used as screens)
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Multiples are just standardized estimates of price...

\[
\text{Numerator} = \text{What you are paying for the asset} \\
\text{Denominator} = \text{What you are getting in return}
\]

\[
\text{Multiple} = \frac{\text{Cash flow}}{\text{Revenues}}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{Revenues} & \quad \text{Earnings} & \quad \text{Cash flow} & \quad \text{Book Value} \\
a. \text{Accounting revenues} & a. \text{To Equity investors} & a. \text{To Equity} & a. \text{Equity} \\
b. \text{Drivers} & - \text{Net Income} & - \text{Net Income} + \text{Depreciation} & = \text{BV of equity} \\
- \# \text{Customers} & - \text{Earnings per share} & - \text{Free CF to Equity} & b. \text{Firm} \\
- \# \text{Subscribers} & - \text{Operating income (EBIT)} & - \text{EBIT + DA (EBITDA)} & = \text{BV of debt + BV of equity} \\
= \# \text{units} & & - \text{Free CF to Firm} & c. \text{Invested Capital} \\
\end{align*}
The Four Steps to Deconstructing Multiples

- Define the multiple
  - In use, the same multiple can be defined in different ways by different users. When comparing and using multiples, estimated by someone else, it is critical that we understand how the multiples have been estimated.

- Describe the multiple
  - Too many people who use a multiple have no idea what its cross sectional distribution is. If you do not know what the cross sectional distribution of a multiple is, it is difficult to look at a number and pass judgment on whether it is too high or low.

- Analyze the multiple
  - It is critical that we understand the fundamentals that drive each multiple, and the nature of the relationship between the multiple and each variable.

- Apply the multiple
  - Defining the comparable universe and controlling for differences is far more difficult in practice than it is in theory.
Definitional Tests

- Is the multiple consistently defined?
  - Proposition 1: Both the value (the numerator) and the standardizing variable (the denominator) should be to the same claimholders in the firm. In other words, the value of equity should be divided by equity earnings or equity book value, and firm value should be divided by firm earnings or book value.

- Is the multiple uniformly estimated?
  - The variables used in defining the multiple should be estimated uniformly across assets in the “comparable firm” list.
  - If earnings-based multiples are used, the accounting rules to measure earnings should be applied consistently across assets. The same rule applies with book-value based multiples.
Example 1: Price Earnings Ratio: Definition

\[ PE = \frac{\text{Market Price per Share}}{\text{Earnings per Share}} \]

- There are a number of variants on the basic PE ratio in use. They are based upon how the price and the earnings are defined.

  **Price:**
  - is usually the current price
  - is sometimes the average price for the year

  **EPS:**
  - EPS in most recent financial year
  - EPS in trailing 12 months
  - Forecasted earnings per share next year
  - Forecasted earnings per share in future year
Example 2: Staying on PE ratios

- Assuming that you are comparing the PE ratios across technology companies, many of which have options outstanding. What measure of PE ratio would yield the most consistent comparisons?
  a. Price/ Primary EPS (actual shares, no options)
  b. Price/ Fully Diluted EPS (actual shares + all options)
  c. Price/ Partially Diluted EPS (counting only in-the-money options)
  d. Other
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Example 3: Enterprise Value /EBITDA Multiple

- The enterprise value to EBITDA multiple is obtained by netting cash out against debt to arrive at enterprise value and dividing by EBITDA.

\[
\text{Enterprise Value} = \frac{\text{Market Value of Equity} + \text{Market Value of Debt} - \text{Cash}}{\text{EBITDA}}
\]

1. Why do we net out cash from firm value?
2. What happens if a firm has cross holdings which are categorized as:
   - Minority interests?
   - Majority active interests?
Example 4: A Housing Price Multiple

The bubbles and busts in housing prices has led investors to search for a multiple that they can use to determine when housing prices are getting out of line. One measure that has acquired adherents is the ratio of housing price to annual net rental income (for renting out the same house). Assume that you decide to compute this ratio and compare it to the multiple at which stocks are trading. Which valuation ratio would be the one that corresponds to the house price/rent ratio?

a. Price Earnings Ratio
b. EV to Sales
c. EV to EBITDA
d. EV to EBIT
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Descriptive Tests

- What is the average and standard deviation for this multiple, across the universe (market)?
- What is the median for this multiple?
  - The median for this multiple is often a more reliable comparison point.
- How large are the outliers to the distribution, and how do we deal with the outliers?
  - Throwing out the outliers may seem like an obvious solution, but if the outliers all lie on one side of the distribution (they usually are large positive numbers), this can lead to a biased estimate.
- Are there cases where the multiple cannot be estimated? Will ignoring these cases lead to a biased estimate of the multiple?
- How has this multiple changed over time?
1. Multiples have skewed distributions...

**PE Ratios: US companies in January 2016**

- **Current**
- **Trailing**
- **Forward**
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2. Making statistics “dicey”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current PE</th>
<th>Trailing PE</th>
<th>Forward PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of firms</td>
<td>7480</td>
<td>7480</td>
<td>7480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number with PE</td>
<td>3,344.</td>
<td>3,223.</td>
<td>2,647.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td>46.04</td>
<td>29.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>16.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>32,269.00</td>
<td>6,900.00</td>
<td>2,748.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>777.02</td>
<td>256.06</td>
<td>81.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>37.27</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>24.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

US firms in January 2016
3. Markets have a lot in common: Comparing Global PEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>25th perc.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>75th perc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>29.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>26.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>24.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Markets</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>39.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aus, NZ &amp; Canada</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>27.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>32.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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