

Cheer in the markets

But caution is warranted about headwinds

The stock markets responded positively to predictions in the exit polls that the incumbent National Democratic Alliance government would easily win re-election. Over the course of trading on Monday, market indices hit new all-time highs and posted their biggest one-day gains in 10 years. The rupee appreciated by 49 paise, the biggest single-day gain in two months, to close at 69.74 against the US dollar. Some exuberance at the prospect of a stable government is understandable. However, it is relevant to ask whether an over-reaction to opinion polls — or even to the final results on May 23 — is a product purely of sentiment or a rational response to the underlying fundamentals. Naturally, markets will react to any new information, such as was delivered by the exit polls. But the possibility of some volatility following the actual results should not be discounted. The markets have already rallied considerably, so investors will know there is scope for a correction.

The fundamentals deserve some attention. Emerging market shares have suffered as a result of renewed trade tension between the United States and China. Corporate India is still in the midst of its quarterly results season for the March quarter, but in spite of mixed results, analysts have pointed towards a trend of constrained demand. Analysts have reported a major shift in tone for the worse on the short-term demand narrative of companies reporting. Emerging from this situation will not be easy. Another brokerage firm reported that 60 per cent of the firms that it covered had reported lower-than-expected earnings. A demand slowdown in the automobile sector has received particular attention; and IT companies continue to struggle with their margins. It is not easy to identify the next big sources of earnings growth. Given that, and given also that the indices are already close to record levels, a certain degree of caution till the political and policy environment stabilises after the election seems warranted.

The question that will be asked on May 23 and after is: What the next government can and will do to support growth and earnings? If the markets are rising on hope, the new government has to deliver to keep that hope going. Once the noise around election results die down, the new government's policy and reform agenda to stimulate demand, boost consumption, revive capex and revive economic growth will thus be closely watched. The experience after the NDA government's assumption of power in 2014 was that there were no immediate big-bang reforms implemented. It is not likely that the first weeks and months would be any different this time even if the government were re-elected as the exit polls suggest. It will take some time to identify the policy priorities of the government, and even longer for those priorities to translate into action on the ground. Thus, any positive policy shock will take time to show up in the fundamentals. Till then, regardless of political volatility, the underlying trends of the market may well continue to be determined by broader, and global, factors. The trade and tariff war between the US and China, the developments in the Gulf and the prospects of a slowdown in the global economy are really as positive for the markets as the news from the exit polls.

Commission & omissions

EC has not upheld the spirit of the law

Whatever the final results for the 2019 Lok Sabha elections, it is fair to say that the Election Commission (EC) has emerged from the 36-day exercise with a marked diminution of its prestige. Having been prodded to consider complaints against gross transgressions by both ruling party and Opposition candidates in one of the least edifying campaigns on record, it now presents the spectacle of internal discord. One of the election commissioners, Ashok Lavasa, has recused himself from attending the EC meetings to discuss violations of the Model Code of Conduct, saying his minority dissenting view had gone unrecorded. Mr Lavasa has been at the centre of a controversy, having opposed five clearances that the EC gave to Prime Minister Narendra Modi and party president Amit Shah for making obvious references to religion in the course of their campaigns and invoking the Balakot strikes. Under EC rules, majority decisions prevail and the Chief Election Commissioner (CEC) has argued that minority decisions do not get recorded because code violations are not quasi-judicial decisions.

This view may hew to the letter of the EC's mandate but not to its spirit. It is an open question, for instance, whether it should have approved the use of government resources to televise the prime minister's visit to Kedarnath at a time when all campaigning had mandatorily ended; this would not have been an issue had the visit occurred during campaigning. It is also worth wondering why it allowed both Mr Modi and Mamata Banerjee a whole day to campaign in Bengal before it shortened the campaigning period over some reprehensible poll violence the day before.

Given the fierce whataboutery that dominates the public debate in recent years, it is fair to say that previous ECs have not exactly covered themselves in glory either, nor have political establishments in dealing with them. There is the 2009 example of CEC N Gopalaswami recommending the removal of his colleague Navin Chawla for political partisanship (Mr Chawla was considered close to the Congress party). In 2002, Mr Modi, then chief minister of Gujarat, had suggested that then CEC J M Lyngdoh had turned down his request to call early Assembly elections after communal riots in the state because he was Christian. The introduction of the three-member committee in 1989 was the result of the display of some unwarranted independence by then EC R V S Peri Sastri, who is credited with introducing some wide-ranging electoral reforms in his time. This was struck down by the Supreme Court only to be revived in 1993 to rein in T N Seshan, who displayed an inconvenient predilection for independent action that discomfited politicians of all hues. Both Peri Sastri and Mr Seshan set new standards of objectivity for the EC — till then a somewhat pliant institution — that earned it considerable public respect for institutional impartiality. This hard-won reputation has been whittled away since the 2000s. At least part of the weakness lies in the fact that EC appointments are in the hands of the executive that the EC has to govern. In that sense, Mr Lavasa has shown courage in speaking truth to power. It's a pity the EC has chosen to ignore his well-considered view.

ILLUSTRATION: AJAY MOHANTY



A second balance sheet deleveraging

This time round, it is the promoters who are grappling with intense liquidity shock

In India, over the past few years, we have seen an intense balance sheet deleveraging among large corporate houses. The infamous Credit Suisse "House of Debt" reports had chronicled how several large Indian companies had unsustainable capital structures, with no free cash flow, and a desperate need to deleverage. Their debt burden had to come down. This deleveraging has taken place over the past six to seven years, through asset sales, bank write-offs and in certain cases change in control. Both the banking system (with the non-performing assets peaking at near 15 per cent) and the economy have borne the pain of this debt workout. Just when we thought we were coming near the end of this deleveraging cycle, and could look forward to a pickup in private sector investment, we are now faced once again with excess leverage.

This excess leverage and balance sheet deleveraging will now be at the promoter level, at their personal balance sheet. This is where there is intense stress today, stress which can damage the credit markets and once again short circuit any potential recovery in private sector investments. All balance sheet deleveraging cycles involve debt pay-downs, which reduce investments and inevitably slow down the economy. If you are scrambling to deliver free cash flow, you will cut investments to the bone.

Post the IL&FS default in September, we have seen intense pressure on all except a handful of Non-bank-

ing Financial Companies (NBFs). They have had their access to long-term funds constrained and costs of funding have risen 100-200 basis points. Many NBFs have had simply no choice but to sell down assets to meet debt maturities. Most have limited ability to lend as they are unable to raise fresh funding. These same NBFs were major players in promoter funding and structured credit. With their inability to



AKASH PRAKASH

lend, they are no longer willing to role over maturing promoter funding structures, forcing promoters to scramble to raise the cash needed to pay off their liabilities. This has come as a shock to promoters used to rolling over their liabilities. A second source of promoter funding has been the debt mutual funds. Through various structures, we have seen funds subscribe to the debt of many promoter holding company entities, collateralised against listed company shares of the promoter. Market scuttlebutt has it that such funding is more ₹1 trillion. This is spooking the markets, as we do not know exactly where this promoter funding is sitting. We also do not know whether it is being marked-to-market accurately. Debt funds have had to take a markdown for their exposure to IL&FS paper, and it seems possible that more such markdowns may happen as more promoter funding structures come to light.

Most investors did not seem to realise the risks being taken by some funds on their behalf. Consequent to this realisation many debt funds are

Save wind energy from the doldrums

Public interest in renewable energy in India has picked up only in recent years. But the silhouettes of windmills on the horizon are no novelty to the country, having been around for more than two decades. With an installed capacity of 35.6 gigawatts (GW) and a total potential for over 300 GW at conservative estimates, onshore wind in India can accelerate the country's clean energy ambitions.

However, wind speeds have been slowing in the sector, causing much angst for developers and manufacturers. New capacity addition was less than 2 GW for the last two years. Despite a project pipeline of over 10 GW, the trend in low annual capacity addition is expected to continue this year. Wind turbine manufacturers are operating at unsustainable capacity utilisation rates of less than 20 per cent. According to the Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW), workforce needs in wind project implementation dropped to 1,140 in 2018, 73 per cent lower than in 2016. How can we save our homegrown wind industry before it is too late?

The first signs of trouble appeared soon after the sector shifted to reverse auctions, from the 15-year-old feed-in-tariff (FIT) regime. With an aggressive bid within the first year, the sector achieved the lowest tariff discovered for renewable power in the country, ₹2.43/kWh (in December 2017). After the auction, developers started scrambling to procure land and secure connectivity to evacuation infrastructure. Wind power relies on geographically concentrated resources where getting contiguous land can be arduous. More than 60 per cent of the capacity auctioned in 2017 has not yet been commissioned and is behind schedule owing to land and connectivity issues.

While these challenges seem common to both wind and solar photovoltaic, there are two reasons why the wind sector needs some urgent attention. One, even though there are seven wind-rich states, only two of them have sites with mean wind speeds high enough to provide the expected low tariffs

(₹2.85/kWh), causing stress on existing land and evacuation facilities. Two, unlike solar PV, the wind sector has a globally competitive domestic supply chain in India. Low annual capacity additions are gravely impacting small domestic turbine and parts manufacturers, while bigger (mostly international) players can survive the turbulence.

How do we solve these issues? Policymakers must choose between two approaches: To distribute the capacity or distribute the energy generated.

Distributing capacity means tapping into wind resources available in medium-to-low wind power density (WPD) regions. While Tamil Nadu and Gujarat have the highest wind speeds and account for 39 per cent of the total wind potential in India, (according to the National Institute of Wind Energy), there is an aggregate potential of 184 GW in other medium-to-low WPD regions. Commissioning wind farms in these states could reduce stress on land and evacuation facilities, potentially reduce the investment required for inter-state transmission infrastructure, and reduce the overall cost of

integrating wind power into the grid. However, lower wind speeds would mean higher levelised cost of electricity. CEEW analysis indicates a 6 to 36 per cent increase from current ceiling tariffs but comparable with the national average power purchase cost for conventional generation. In order to optimise energy production from low-WPD sites, there is need for policy support to give incentives to develop advanced turbine technologies, which could tap low wind speeds.

For the second approach — distributing the energy generated — to work, effective mechanisms are necessary to transfer power from point of generation to the nearest transmission network and to the periphery of oft-takers' networks. The Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) mechanism is meant to facilitate the inter-state transfer of power. But compliance of distribution companies with RPOs is staggeringly low,



INFLEXION POINTS

ARUNABHA GHOSH & SELNA SAJI

now facing redemption pressures. The regulator also seems to be taking a dim view of this type of lending. It is fair to say that going forward, debt funds will pull back their exposure to such promoter funding structures. There is no question of these structures being rolled over. Once again the promoters are being asked to repay maturing structures, there is no rollover.

The third source of funding for promoters was the structured credit book of private corporate banks. These banks are under intense pressure from investors to curtail such types of risk exposures. It is unlikely that this source of funding will continue to be extended. The biggest player in this space has serious capital and management challenges. It also seems determined to undergo a business model change, and de-risk its lending book.

There is therefore a severe liquidity shock for promoter balance sheets. Most business families are scrambling to cut their promoter funding exposures given the lack of alternative funding sources.

This promoter balance sheet deleveraging has many unintended consequences.

First of all, in certain cases, markets have hammered the stocks of the companies whose shares have been pledged. In many cases, wherever we see large pledged share exposures, the stocks have been hammered so as to trigger a default event, and create forced selling of the shares pledged as security for the loan. Companies which have no underlying operating issues, have seen their shares fall by 50-60 per cent because of these pledges.

Secondly, we have seen attempts by promoter families to sell large blocks of stocks to raise the cash to reduce their personal debt. These block sales will be much more common and may put pressure on stocks.

Thirdly, this scramble to reduce personal leverage has also driven most promoters to attempt to sell assets. In most cases all this leverage was taken to build infrastructure businesses or assets in their personal capacity. Once again, we have a buyer's market for assets, as numerous infrastructure and real estate assets are put up for sale by various promoter families. Given the amount of wealth destruction seen in infrastructure, it is amazing to me that anyone actually expects the private sector to invest again in greenfield assets in this space.

With this new balance sheet deleveraging cycle, just like the one we have just gone through, it will take time to repair balance sheets, and rebuild risk appetite. It will take time for the financial intermediaries to get comfortable. For the majority of Indian promoters, there is no chance they will invest in a hurry.

We are unfortunately back to where we were seven years ago. The government will have to drive and front-load investments in the economy, and the financial intermediaries in the system will take time to regain confidence. One can only hope that this work-out gets completed faster. We cannot afford another seven years of single digit earnings growth. The private sector has to rebound faster than the first balance sheet deleveraging cycle.

The writer is with Amansa Capital

Paeon to big business



BOOK REVIEW

MATHEW BISHOP

Progressive era, there are calls to break up Facebook and Google, the increasingly dominant tech platforms, while the titans of Silicon Valley are rebranded as 21st-century robber barons.

Amid so much criticism, who would dare dispute that there is something rotten about the state of corporate America today? Enter Tyler Cowen, an economics professor who has written a determinedly positive book about business. Mr Cowen did not become one of the world's most-read bloggers on economics without understanding the value of a well-timed contrarian blast. He showed this to great effect in 2011 in a best-selling e-book, *The Great Stagnation*, arguing that the rate of increase in median income had slowed since the early 1970s as a direct consequence of a falling rate of innovation in the American economy, which was thus likely to continue to struggle to grow for the foreseeable future. Now instincts. Voices demanding higher taxes, to per-and tougher regulations grow louder, suade you that it deserves more of your Echoing the vigorous trust busting of the love and less hate."

If you are hoping for a billet-doux to set your heart aflutter, remember that the author is a practitioner of the dismal science; the romance in his love letter is less *Harry Met Sally* than Demand Meets Supply. Still, there is no shortage of passion from Mr Cowen. His beloved is the source of "most of the stuff we enjoy and consume" and gives "most of us jobs." Mr Cowen also argues, persuasively, that America tops the world in the quality of its corporate management — if Chinese firms were managed equally well, they would be up to 50 per cent more productive. American business is also the leading innovator globally in many areas.

Some of his defence of business is less certain than his positive headline message suggests. He devotes a chapter to refuting accusations that Big Tech companies are evil, only to confess to worrying about the threat they pose to personal privacy, which he fears will get dramatically worse as facial recognition and voice-recording technologies become ever more ubiquitous. He

argues that business should be trusted more, despite so many high-profile scandals, because it is less prone to lying and cheating than governments or nonprofits. This could be read not as a ringing endorsement but as damning with faint praise.

For Mr Cowen, the real reason business is so unpopular is that we humans tend to anthropomorphise companies, turning corporations "into people in our minds, and also in our hearts" (and even writing love letters to them). Companies play along in this charade, because it pays them to do so, branding themselves with human characteristics like being friendly and listening to our concerns. Inevitably, we feel let down when they turn out instead to be "abstract, sharklike legal entities devoted to commercial profit."

Mr Cowen's explanation is not particularly convincing. Nor is his two-part advice for clearing the current atmosphere of distrust. First, the public should accept that business will always fall short of our unreasonably high expectations, and get over it. Second, rather unexpectedly from a member of the famously libertarian economics faculty at George Mason University, he wants business to try harder

at being socially responsible.

In 1970, *The New York Times Magazine* published an extraordinarily controversial article by Milton Friedman, titled "The Social Responsibility of Business Is to Increase Its Profits." At the time, this shocked even much of corporate America, never mind the regular *New York Times* reader. The article was intended to defend business against heavy-handed government regulation, including of prices and wages, that threatened to squeeze dynamism and innovation out of corporate America. Yet over the years, as deregulation spread across America and then the world, Friedman's words were, I believe, twisted into a simplistic justification for doing anything that increased profits regardless of the consequences for society and the planet.

Mr Cowen rejects Friedman's definition, arguing instead that the "social responsibility of business is to come up with the magic of a vision that will help us trust it more, whether as consumers or workers." For Mr Cowen, business at its best is a "fundamentally ethical enterprise" and (preserving his libertarian credentials by citing Ayn Rand in support of it) "can be a vehicle for the achievement of heroic goals."

This would have been a far better book had Mr Cowen focused more on how to overcome the negative consequences of the spread of the Friedman Doctrine, which I believe has helped socially irresponsible, greedy, unheroic business leaders flourish at the expense of the heroic kind.

Happily, a new generation of more socially responsible business leaders is emerging, like Marc Benioff of Salesforce, the Chobani founder Hamdi Ulukaya and Indra Nooyi (until recently at the helm of PepsiCo). If only Mr Cowen had shown less unconditional love for corporate America and instead concentrated on what needs to be done to ensure that being ethical and heroic becomes business as usual. That "love letter" would have left most readers hopeful that there might yet be a Happily Ever After.

©2019 The New York Times News Service

BIG BUSINESS:
A Love Letter to an American Anti-Hero

Tyler Cowen
St. Martin's Press; 272 pages, \$28.99