

- I am going to talk about two different ideas. Floats. And Moats.
- Over the last few months, I have been obsessed by these two ideas.
- I have spent a lot of time researching them and thinking about them and also about they might be related.
- It's been a fascinating journey so far.
- This talk is the story of that journey.



The story starts in 1964. Warren Buffett is a young, dynamic investment manager. He makes his first big bet.

Between 1964 and 1966, he buys 5% of American Express. That's 40% of his assets under management.

And Amex is embroiled in a scandal involving of things, salad oil.



This guy can't get credit from a bank because he is a convicted fraudster. So he comes up with a neat plan. Amex is a prosperous company with a stellar reputation. It also has a subsidiary which owns and rents warehouses.

Don't ask why in the world is Amex in the warehousing business. Anyway, Antonio De Angelis goes to Amex warehouse and deposits tank loads of sea water. Except that he tells the warehouse that those tanks contain salad oil. No one checks out this guy or the tanks. I guess there were issues with KYC even back in 1964.

The warehouse takes the sea water and issues a warehouse receipt certifying that it has in storage a large amount of vegetable oil. The receipt carries the name of American Express, which is a name that stands for trust. An elated De Angelis takes the warehouse receipt to a bank and offers it as collateral and gets a loan, whereupon he goes gambling in futures and options. As you'd expect, he loses, and promptly goes bankrupt. Now the bank has a warehouse receipt as collateral on what it thinks is valuable salad oil, except that it's sea water.



Shit hits the ceiling and Amex discovers that "it has a problem subsidiary." The extent of the problem? About \$150 mil. That's a very large sum of money in 1964. Amex's Warehouse sub files for bankruptcy but for Amex trust is everything. Its CEO says that Amex has a moral obligation to pay the bank even though its not legally obliged. So much for ring fencing using limited liability companies as subsidiaries. Recall this is what happened in the case of Tata Corus.

The market gets spooked. The stock drops from 60 to 35.

Ok, now let's look at the magnitude of the problem.



Cash is \$263 Mil. Securities are \$515 Mil. Some are quite liquid. The loss on account of the scandal is \$150 mil. So, what's the problem?

The half a billion dollar problem is that of the outstanding TCs. Those TCs are are cashable on demand. What if there's a run on Amex? The consequences could be devastating.

Death spiral is the word that comes to mind. Amex has not missed a dividend in 94 years and suddenly market feels that risk of insolvency is high.



Warren Buffett disagrees with the market. We know that because he goes out and puts \$13 million into the stock for a 5% stake in Amex. That's 40% of his partnership's money.

What was he thinking?

Let's speculate on that.

American Express Company nd Consolidated Subsidiary Companies				
Consolidated Balance Sheet, Decembe	er 31, 1964	and 1963		
SSETS	1964	1963		
ash and due from banks	\$ 263,841,861	\$ 266,637,122		
scutify investments – st con (rote 2): U. S. Government obligations State and municipal obligations Other bends and obligations Preferred stocks Common stocks Total security investments	142.652.911 230.015.226 103.641.723 18.859.390 12.587.800 507.757.050	141,208,249 229,784,429 39,614,783 18,968,863 14,198,704 443,775,028		
(current market valuation: 1964, \$\$15,677,000; 1963, \$450,500,000)				
S. Government depositary bonds (see contra) (note 2)	40,000,000	35,000,000		
oans and discounts	186,638,154	172,410,264		
ccounts receivable and accrued interest (less reserves: 1964, \$3,674,308; 1963, \$2,741,819)	70,703,625	51,660,293		
merican Express Company capital stock reacquired - at cost (1964, 32,965 shares; 1963, 33,340 shares) (note 3)	1,420,406	1,436,565		
vestments in subsidiary and affiliated companies not consolidated - at cost (equity in net assets: 1964, \$4,293,000; 1963, \$4,096,000)	3,996,501	3,580,002		
and, buildings and equipment — at cost (less reserves: 1964, \$13,546,032; 1963, \$11,927,151)	15,587,962	14,347,038	Г	
astomers' acceptance liability	16,297,890	18,873,203		What if this was
her assets	16,571,095	12,486,135		vviiat ii tills was
Total	\$1,122,814,544	\$1,020,205,650		Bank Debt of \$ 525
		_		
ABILITIES				Mil?
avelers Cheques and Travelers Letters of Credit	\$ 525,667,060	\$ 470,126,789		
istomers' deposits and credit balances held by The American Express Company, Incorporated	387,697,073	366,490,835		
eposit liability relating to U. S. Government depositary bonds (see contra).	40,000,000	35,000,000		
coeptances outstanding	16,799,768	18,903,238		
her liabilities	69,038,052	50,989,231		
Total	1,039,201,953	941,510,093		
areholders' equity:				
Capital stock — autorized, 5,000,000 shares of 55 par value; issued, 4,461,058 shares	22,305,290	22,305,290		
Surplus	61,307,301	56,390,267		
Total shareholders' equity	83,612,591	78,695,557		
Total	\$1,122,814,544			
See Notes to Financial Statements.				

First, imagine that instead of T/Cs, Amex had bank debt outstanding. Would Buffett have invested?

I think not. Why? Too risky.

But there's is no Bank debt! T/C outstanding: \$526 Mil.



Risk of run on Amex. Consequences of a run are severe but what's the probability? Buffett finds out by going shopping. He finds out that customers don't care. The tarnish on Wall Street has not spread to Main Street.

He buys the stock.

By 1968, he has sold his sake which cost him \$13 mil for \$33 mil.



When Buffett correctly figured that trust behind that half a billion dollar promise is not evaporating, he gets convinced about buying into Amex.

He also discovers something else. That AMEX T/Cs represent an unusually attractive form of financing. To see how, let's compare this with traditional debt.



Plain vanilla debt is onerous for three reasons. Buffett has discovered that Amex's half a billion dollar liability represented by T/Cs have none of these onerous terms.

When Amex took this money, it simply issued a piece of paper without giving any collateral. So there's no collateral.

There is no interest either. The paper is redeemable at demand, but there is a lag between issue and encashment and sometimes people don't en-cash them. More importantly, even if some people encase them, there are others who buy new ones, so the balance in the liability account has become a "revolving fund."

General point. When we look at a consolidated liability account or for that matter any account which consists of balances from a large number of accountholders, then what matters is not what the individual account holders are doing, but what the account balance is doing. Even if such a liability is classified as a "current liability" it could indeed be a perpetual one, if you are sure that the account balance won't shrink. I know this sounds like a ponzi scheme and it IS a ponzi scheme but without the derogatory connotation that goes with the world Ponzi.



Buffett wanted to be certain that the T/C account balance won't fall. That there won't be a run on the Amex bank.

And if is no run, Amex has collected half a billion dollars in cash, issued pieces of paper in return with no collateral, without any interest, and without any effective repayment because its a revolving fund.

Now let's invert this situation.



Suppose you bought a bond issued by a company, which

gives you no collateral
pays you no interest
and effectively will never return your money, then

What is that bond worth?



Let's return to our Amex story.

What's this liability worth if there's no run?

Liquidation value vs. Going concern value.

If it's not worth anything to the owner, then its worth nothing to the issuer too isn't it?

So what Buffett has discovered is something he writes about years later: "an unencumbered source of value"



Other People's Money. As addictive as Opium

Our man Buffett is hooked.

And why not? What other form of financing is better than this one? No collateral, no interest, no repayment.

So what's this type of OPM worth? To figure that out, let's do another thought experiment. Just like the value of someone is realized when he or she is no longer there, let's see what happens if we remove float and replace it with alternatives.

Equity – will lead to dilution Debt will lead to drop in earnings Both will result in drop in earnings on a per share basis.

No wonder Buffett LOVES this type of financing.



Float, he writes years later, is, in effect, the money that we are holding that eventually will go to other people, but of which we have temporary possession.



There's something about Amex's float that he absolutely hates.

What does he hate? Two things

1.He can't get his hands on it.

2. The money provided by the float tends to get invested into warehouses.

Now that REALLY sucks!

Buffett loves the magic on one side of the balance sheet but hates the tragedy on the other side.

Enter Blue Chip Stamps (1970).



Retailers buy blue chip stamps for cash. Shoppers given a certain number of stamps for each dollar spent in a store, which they pasted into books, then redeemed from Blue Chip for prizes such as toddler toys, toasters, mixing bowls, watches.

Stamp collecting takes time. People forgot to redeem.

Float!

Except this time, the money that float provides doesn't go into warehouses which end up storing salty sea water. Instead, it goes into a sweet little company called Sees Candy.



Buffett uses Blue Chip's float to buy See's Candies for \$25 Mil in 1972. Between 1972 and 2011, See's delivers pre-tax earnings totaling to \$1.65 billion. Almost all of that \$1.65 billion after paying taxes is paid to BRK (or earlier to Blue Chip) as dividend.

Buffett uses the cash to buy other attractive businesses which generate surplus cash. A virtuous circle is created.

By this time, Buffett has shifted from being a Graham kind of an investor who focused on statistical bargains to a Munger type of an investor who focused on buying stocks of great businesses and holding them for a long time.

This act of buying and holding stocks of high quality companies gives rise to another form of OPM for BRK.



In 1989 He tells his shareholders:

"We would owe taxes of more than \$1.1 billion were we to sell all of our securities at year-end market values. Is this \$1.1 billion liability equal, or even similar, to a \$1.1 billion liability payable to a trade creditor 15 days after the end of the year? Obviously not - despite the fact that both items have exactly the same effect on audited net worth, reducing it by \$1.1 billion."

On the other hand, is this liability for deferred taxes a meaningless accounting fiction because its payment can be triggered only by the sale of stocks that, in very large part, we have no intention of selling? Again, the answer is no.

In economic terms, the liability resembles an interest-free loan from the U.S. Treasury that comes due only at our election..."

so In DCF terms, the value of this liability is MUCH less than it's book value.



By end of 2011, that liability account has grown to a staggering \$38 billion.

So here is another very large unencumbered source of value for BRK's stockholders.



Not only does he get the best out of his businesses. He wants to get the best out of capital structures too.

This time he will take the help of a man from India.



Ajit Jain. With his help, they generate insurance float.

"Float" in the insurance business, says Buffett, "arises because most policies require that premiums be prepaid and, more importantly, because it usually takes time for an insurer to hear about and resolve loss claims."

"This float is "free" as long as insurance underwriting breaks even, meaning that the premiums we receive equal the losses and expenses we incur. Over our entire history, we've been profitable, and I expect we will average break-even results or better in the future. If we do that, our investments can be viewed as an unencumbered source of value for Berkshire shareholders."



This float has grown from \$17 million in 1967 to an astounding \$71 billion by the end of 2011,

"So how does this attractive float affect intrinsic value calculations? Our float is deducted in full as a liability in calculating Berkshire's book value, just as if we had to pay it out tomorrow and were unable to replenish it. But that's an incorrect way to view float, which should instead be viewed as a revolving fund. If float is both costless and long-enduring, the true value of this liability is far lower than the accounting liability."

Key words: Revolving Fund, Costless, Long-enduring



Andrea Frazzini, David Kabiller, and Lasse H. Pedersen*

First Draft: May 3. 2012

Table 3

Buffett's Cost of Leverage: The Case of His Insurance Float

This table shows the cost of Berkshire's funds coming from insurance float. The data is hand-collected from Buffett's comment in Berkshire Hathaway's annual reports. Rates are annualized, in percent.

	Fraction of years with negative cost	Average cost of funds (Trucated)*	Spread over benckmark rates				
			T-Bill	Fed Funds	1-Month	6-Month	10-Year
				rate	Libor	Libor	Bond
976-1980	0.79	1.67	-4.59	-5.65			-5.76
981-1985	0.20	10.95	1.10	-0.27			-1.28
986-1990	0.00	3.07	-3.56	-4.61	-4.80	-4.90	-5.30
991-1995	0.60	2.21	-2.00	-2.24	-2.46	-2.71	-4.64
996-2000	0.60	2.36	-2.70	-3.10	-3.33	-3.48	-3.56
2001-2005	0.60	1.29	-0.82	-0.96	-1.05	-1.19	-3.11
2006-2011	1.00	-4.00	-5.84	-6.06	-6.29	-6.59	-7.67
Full sample	0.60	2.20	-3.09	-3.81	-3.69	-3.88	-4.80

For 60% of the time, Buffett got paid to borrow money!

When he actually paid to borrow money, he paid an average of 2.2% p.a. which is 4.8% below 10-year treasury bonds yield. Buffett borrows cheaper than U.S Treasury!

And he did that with not just small sums. He is now doing it with \$71 billion!



He used the word "liabilities" and not "debt. That's key. The more of an asset that you can fund with a free float, the less the need to fund it with expensive debt or equity becomes.

Equity will lead to dilution.

So will Debt.



But that's not enough. He wants more.



He calls derivatives as financial weapons of mass destruction.

But he is tempted.



He is tempted by the derivatives can do for him to obtain the most optimum capital structure in the world's largest companies.

By 2008, BRK is is a party to 251 derivative contracts: equity puts, credit default swaps, and others. Describing these contracts, Buffett noted:

"As of yearend, the payments made to us less losses we have paid – our derivatives "float," so to speak – totaled \$8.1 billion. This float is similar to insurance float: If we break even on an underlying transaction, we will have enjoyed the use of free money for a long time. Our expectation is that we will do better than break even and that the substantial investment income we earn on the funds will be frosting on the cake."

Notice the similarities to insurance: an underwriting profit (implying less-than-free float), and freedom to invest that float in buying undervalued assets



Unencumbered source of value in what way?

- 1. The value of the liability is much less than book value.
- 2. Free or cheap float gives you a competitive advantage.
- 3. Cheap money levers ROA just like debt levers ROCE



Ok, so now Buffett has a great capital structure. Let's now shift focus from the liability side to the asset side.

If Buffett has created a super-efficient capital structure, isn't it natural for him to want to buy other businesses which also have super-efficient capital structures?

Businesses employ assets. These assets can be financed by (1) Equity; (2) Debt; and (3) Float. Float is preferable if it's free or cheap and if it's long-enduring. Recall float is Other People's Money. Who are the other people? They aren't equity, and they aren't debt. So who can they be? Well there are only four main categories: suppliers (trade credit, deposits from distributors), customers (advance from customers), employees and government (deferred taxes). Let's focus on suppliers and customers.

What kinds of businesses are those where suppliers and/or customers provide float? Those with moats.



Buffett loves moats. He uses the metaphor to illustrate a business's superiority "that make life difficult for its competitors."

"What we're trying to find is a business that for one reason or another — because it's the lost-cost producer in some area, because it has a natural franchise due to its service capabilities, because of its position in the consumer's mind, because of a technological advantage or any kind of reason at all – has this moat around it. And you throw crocodiles and sharks and piranhas in the moat to make it harder and harder for people to swim across and attack the castle."

A truly great business, says Buffett, must have an enduring moat around its economic castle that protects its excellent returns on invested capital."

Key term: INVESTED CAPITAL. Why did he use that term? How do you obtain excellent returns on invested capital? By getting your customers and suppliers to provide free financing of course.



Businesses which dominate their markets can dictate their terms.

Beggars can't be choosers. Suppliers will provide lenient credit and not charge higher prices (no implicit interest). Customers will pay in advance and not ask for cash discount (no implicit interest). Distributors will give interest free deposits.

Negative working capital without implicit interest.

Think Wal-mart. If you are a supplier to Wal-Mart, life is not cool! You cannot tell Wal-Mart, "Pay me tomorrow, I will give you a cash discount" because you cannot afford to give a cash discount! Doing so will wipe out or greatly diminish the margin you are currently making in the business of supplying to the mighty Wal-Mart.



Inventories: \$5 billion Accounts Receivable: \$ 2.5 billion Accounts payable, accrued expenses: \$15 billion.

Huge negative working capital. In fact, even fixed assets are financed by accounts payable. Why is Amazon debt-free? Because of float! Those boring current liabilities are not so boring after all. Source of float.

What's the value of Accounts payable? What if it's permanent, and costless? What if its a "revolving fund?" Does it not become an unencumbered source of value?

Here's what I have found when I look at the world of business from float's point of view. I have come up with seven thoughts.



<u>One</u>

Wherever you find large negative working capital, absence of debt, a liquid balance sheet, and high ROCE, it's very likely the result of a moat.

The moat, which gives it's owner market power allows it to dictate terms to its suppliers and customers. This results in the creation of long-enduring floats.



<u>Two</u>

You may also spot an enduring moat by simply monitoring the size and movement in floats.




I would change "puck" to "float."



When moat quality deteriorates floats will go down. Surplus cash will disappear, debt will appear, because float has disappeared.

MTNL. Invert, always invert. Quantitative criteria. You can measure the competitive threats by monitoring the size of float relative to assets and revenue over time.

As moats improve, floats will go up, debts will disappear, treasury will rise. It makes sense to monitor progress of float to see if improvement is happening or not.

Then there may be business which have a mediocre ROA but have high ROCE because they have large trade credit. Basic business is not great but looks attractive on ROCE basis. Weak link is trade credit. What if it goes away for some reason?



<u>Three</u>

Beware of floats created because of shortages.

They are not enduring.

Power shift in a value chain. It makes sense to monitor how power is shifting by quantitatively measuring float in an value chain.

For example, think about how power shifts in the "Iron ore-steel-auto ancillary-automobiles" value chain. In times of shortage, an iron ore supplier can not only command high prices, he can also insist on advance payments from buyers. But such good times won't last!



<u>Four</u>

Some companies will use financial shenanigans. They will create large amounts of trade credit with implicit cost to understate reported debt.

Presence of genuine cost-less float will make debt unnecessary. But some people will try to game the system.



<u>Five</u>

Value of surplus cash.

What happens when a debt-free company is sitting on a lot of cash but that cash has been supplied by other people – i.e. it does not belong to shareholders.



Is this Rs 2,300 cr. cash surplus? Should we deduct it from its current market cap of 8,400 cr (at current stock price of Rs 249) to arrive at EV of Rs 6,100 cr?

			as at 31-Mar-12 ₹ IN LAKHS		1-Mar-11 LAKHS
A)	Trade Payables		58810.97 58810.97		30815.3 30815.3
B)	Other Current Liabilities :				
	Security Deposits & Retentions		23816.59		14814.1
	Advances Received from Clients		1841.51		1885.4
	Capital Creditors		687.88		16.8
	Income Received in Advance		37588.28		86895.3
	Service Tax Payable		975.07		2634.7
	Unpaid Dividend * Other Payables :		60.56		70.
	- Withholding for Employees including Employers Contribution	948.48		1081.24	
	- Withholding for Income Taxes	1742.23		1144.17	
	- Accrued Employees Benefits	6578.39		9014.84	
	- Amount held on behalf of Clients	1210.10		5563.46	
	- Others	149.39	10628.59	116.28	16919.9
		1 582	75598.48		123237.3

Security deposits +advances received from clients+ income received in

advance = 632 cr.

EIL Annual Repo	Engineers India Limited					
CONSOLIDATED BA AS AT 31ST MARCH 2012 PARTICULARS	LANCE SHEET	as at 31-M			-MAR-11	
	NOTENO.	₹ IN LA	AKHS	₹ IN I	AKHS	
EQUITY AND LIABILITIES						
Shareholders`funds				1000000		
Share Capital	2.1	16846.84		16846.84		Security deposits
Reserves & Surplus	2.2		189877.73	132140.02	148986.86	occurry acposits
Non-Current Liabilities	2.3					+advances received
Other Long term Liabilities		519.48		471.43		Tauvances received
Long Term Provisions		2153.40	2672.88	1755.35	2226.78	from clients+ incom
Current Liabilities	2.4					, from clients+ incom
Trade Payables		58810.97		30815.39		
Other Current Liabilities		75598.48		123237.30		received in advance
Short term Provisions		53400.96	187810.41	46931.09	200983.78	(22
	TOTAL		380361.02		352197.42	= 632 cr.
ASSETS						
Non Current Assets						
Fixed Assets:	2.5					
Tangible assets		5486.25		6055.82		
Intangible assets		162.81		268.47		Cash: Rs
Capital work-in-progress		5159.54	10808.60	1307.94	7632.23	Casil. Ks
Non Current Investments	2.6	Г	5750.00		0.00	2,300 cr.
Deferred Tax Asset (Net)	2.27	L	21495.87		17611.87	2,500 Cf.
Long Term Loans and Advances	2.7		5773.21		7543.16	
Other Non Current Assets	2.8		234.90		4445.87	
Current Assets:	2.9					
Current Investments		57100.54		51279.05		
nventories		82.60		87.49		
rade Receivables		31578.55		31903.79		
Cash and Bank Balances		168702.11		175398.34		
hort Term Loans and Advances		18597.38		22518.27		
Other Current Assets		60237.26	336298.44	33777.35	314964.29	
	TOTAL		380361.02		352197.42	

Is this Rs 2,300 cr. cash surplus? Should we deduct it from its current market cap of 8,400 cr (at current stock price of Rs 249) to arrive at EV of Rs 6,100 cr?

The answer depends on how big the float is and how permanent it is and if its free.

We know its big. If we can figure out if its free and if its permanent, then we know its fair value is like that of our hypothetical perpetual, zero coupon bond we talked about a while back.

So if we erase the book value of this liability and replace it with its very low fair value, doesn't the cash on the other side of the balance sheet becomes unencumbered? And if so, why should we not deduct it from the company's market cap to determine EV?



<u>Six</u>

I would modify this to:



Free Float is the best form of leverage.



<u>Seven</u>

Floats and Moats Go Together

