VALUATION SERIES

No. 18 / DECEMBER 2018

PUBLIC CHOICE ALTERNATIVES

Liquid and Rich, for Now

A VALUATION OF THE LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD OF ONTARIO

BY IAN MADSEN

FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Ideas that change your world / www.fcpp.org

IAN MADSEN

Ian Madsen, B.A. (Alberta), M.B.A. (Toronto), CFA, is a Senior Fellow at the Frontier Centre for Public Policy. He has extensive experience in investment management and financial analysis, managing investment portfolios, writing, structuring, and editing research reports, and managing investment research operations, including operations overseas. He lives in Surrey, B.C.

FRONTIER CENTRE
FOR PUBLIC POLICY

203-2727 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada R3J 0R2
Tel: 204-957-1567
Email: newideas@fcpp.org

The Frontier Centre for Public Policy is an independent, non-profit organization that undertakes research and education in support of economic growth and social outcomes that will enhance the quality of life in our communities. Through a variety of publications and public forums, Frontier explores policy innovations required to make the prairie region a winner in the open economy. It also provides new insights into solving important issues facing our cities, towns and provinces. These include improving the performance of public expenditures in important areas such as local government, education, health and social policy. The author(s) of this study have worked independently and the opinions expressed are therefore their own, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the board of the Frontier Centre for Public Policy.

Valuation Series No. 18 • Date of First Issue: December 2018.

ISSN 1491-78

Ideas that change your world / www.fcpp.org

VALUATION SERIES
No. 18 / DECEMBER 2018

PUBLIC CHOICE ALTERNATIVES:

Liquid and Rich, for Now

A VALUATION OF THE LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD OF ONTARIO

BY IAN MADSEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Introduction: The Liquor Control Board of Ontario, A History	5
Intrinsic Value: Valuation of the LCBO as a Business, Using Discounted Free Cash Flow	6
Market-based Value: Valuation of the LCBO Using Stock Market and Financial Metrics	7
Conclusion	8
Appendix I: Rationale for Divestiture or Privatization	9

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Using an **intrinsic value method,** and discounting to the present, the Liquor Control Board of Ontario's, 'LCBO's' projected future free cash flows, as the company is today, but taxed at statutory rates, the range of estimates is $12.13B to $84.91B, with a tighter range of a median (midpoint of the array of estimated values) of $21.23 to a mean (simple average of the array of estimated values) of $27.32B. A more realistic, narrower range becomes a median of $20.20B to a mean of $25.99B. This version used adjustments to the free cash flow calculation which may not be fully reliable.

Under the **market-based valuation system,** the current, 'as is'—but now fully taxed-value ranges from $51B to $359B, with a median of $95B and a mean (average) of $136B. Seven valuation metrics were usable, and the averages were inflated by some anomalous comparison companies' metrics applied against financial numbers from LCBO that could be more optimistic than could pertain in the future, as its monopoly profit margins may not be permanently sustainable.

The minimum value is $49.53B, the maximum is an extremely unlikely $357.46B, and the tighter range goes from a median of $93.05B to a mean of a very doubtful $134.93B.

Intensive examination of the assets of the LCBO, evaluation of its business practises and appraisal of its assets, plus scrutiny of its accounting would be necessary for a much more precise valuation range for the company, and that is beyond the scope of this study.

INTRODUCTION

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario, A History

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO) is an Ontario government or 'Crown' enterprise and one of the world's largest buyers and retailers of beverage alcohol. Through more than 650 retail stores, catalogues, special order services and more than 210 agency stores, which provide cost effective, convenient and socially responsible access for rural consumers, the LCBO offers nearly 24,000 products annually to consumers and licensed establishments from more than 80 countries. LCBO has been able to raise its dividend (roughly equal to its free cash flow) to the provincial government every year for the past twenty-three years.

LCBO began operations in 1927, with 86 stores. It commenced licensing of restaurants and hotels in 1934. Liquor laws were gradually relaxed over the next several decades. The first specialty department, later stores called Vintages, opened in 1972. LCBO became a Crown corporation in 1975. A new computer system linked all stores in 1991. All stores were capable of handling credit and debit cards by 1995. In 2002 an arrangement was made with retailers in small communities to allow for non-LCBO liquor stores. Major improvements were made in inventory management over the next several years. Efforts were also made to reduce packaging and other environmental waste. Plastic bags were phased out in the 2010's.[1]

1. LCBO website, About Us, see http://www.lcbo.com/content/lcbo/en/corporate-pages/about.html#.W_Mtw-hKhPY.

INTRINSIC VALUE: VALUATION OF THE LCBO AS A BUSINESS, USING DISCOUNTED FREE CASH FLOW

The intrinsic value model uses a perpetuity with a constant growth rate and constant cost of capital. This is appropriate for a stable company in a slow-growth, mature sector and low risk of total failure. For the intrinsic value of LCBO, projecting future cash flow growth, and bringing it to a net present value, a relatively conservative approach was taken which could undervalue the company (see Table 1). The company's free cash flow growth rate range was kept to a restrained 2 to 4 percent, and the required rate of return or cost of capital range was held from 5 to 9 percent. Projecting higher growth in the future could be reasonable. However, alcoholic beverage production is a very mature industry, although gambling and cannabis are higher growth, but more uncertain. In current policy, cannabis sales are either through private retail outlets that have not yet been approved to open, or via the government website. It is unclear what the government's margins or volume of profits are likely to be, or if LCBO will be the ultimate conduit for them.

LCBO's cost of capital, given low expectations and high current valuations in the stock market, could well be lower than the range used (and thus raise its estimated value), although there is also a chance that interest rates and the rate of return investors demand on equity (share) investment could increase. There was an unusual inflow of cash from the sale of the LCBO headquarters' property in fiscal 2016, which was excluded from the free cash flow trends and projections.

The statutory tax rate used in calculations may be lower in the future, as there is continued global pressure to lower corporate tax rates, exemplified by the recent drop in US corporation income tax rates.

The range of estimates is $21.9B to $153.0B [an extreme, anomalous figure that is an artifact of the process], with a tighter range of a median (mid-point of the range of the array of estimates) of $38.3B to a mean (simple average of the array of estimates) of $49.2B.

Table 1

Intrinsic Value, Using Present Value of Discounted Future Cash Flows

Present Value of Discounted Free Cash Flow = Estimated Next Year Free Cash Flow (Required Rate of Return ['r'] = Growth Rate ['g'])
Projected Fully Taxed Free Cash Flow Estimate for FY2018 ($B): $ 1.53

Matrix Values ($B) g==v; r==>	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	9.00%	10.00%
0.00%	$ 38.25	$ 30.60	$ 25.50	$ 21.86	$ 19.13	$ 17.00	$ 15.30
1.00%	$ 51.01	$ 38.25	$ 30.60	$ 25.50	$ 21.86	$ 19.13	$ 17.00
2.00%	$ 76.51	**$ 51.01**	**$ 38.25**	**$ 30.60**	**$ 25.50**	**$ 21.86**	$ 19.13
3.00%	$ 153.02	**$ 76.51**	**$ 51.01**	**$ 38.25**	**$ 30.60**	**$ 25.50**	$ 21.86
4.00%	--	**$ 153.02**	**$ 76.51**	**$ 51.01**	**$ 38.25**	**$ 30.60**	$ 25.50
5.00%	–$ 153.02	--	$ 153.02	$ 76.51	$ 51.01	$ 38.25	$ 30.60
6.00%	–$ 76.51	–$ 153.02	$ --	$ 153.02	$ 76.51	$ 51.01	$ 38.25
7.00%	–$ 51.01	–$ 76.51	–$ 153.02	$ --	$ 153.02	$ 76.51	$ 51.01

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean (Average)
Value ($B)	**$ 21.86**	**$ 153.02**	**$ 38.25**	**$ 49.23**

Source: Company annual reports, valuation model formulas.

MARKET-BASED VALUE: VALUATION OF THE LCBO USING STOCK MARKET AND FINANCIAL METRICS

As noted in the Executive Summary, the 'as is' current value of the company, but also being taxable, which it, as a Crown, is not currently, but as it would be should it be sold off, ranges from $1.8B to $44.9B, with a median (mid-point of the range of the array of estimates) of $23.6B and a median (simple average of the array of estimates) of $29.4B. Seven of the eight available valuation metrics were usable: Trailing and Forward Price to Earnings Ratio (P/E); Price to Sales (P/S), Price to Book Value (P/BV), Enterprise Value/ Revenue (EV/Rev), Enterprise Value to Earnings before Interest, Depreciation and Amortization (EV/EBITDA); and Price to Free Cash Flow (P/FCF). Please see the details of the model results in Table 2.

Table 2

Market Valuation Using Financial Metrics from Comparable Companies

Valuation metrics applied to LCBO; Figures in $B.	Trailing P/E (Market Value to Net Income	Forward P/E (Market Value to Estimated Net Income	Price to Sales	Price to Book	Enterprise Value/Revenue (subtracting net debt)	Enterprise Value/EBITDA (subtracting net debt)	Price to Free Cash Flow
Average Two Canada Liquor Retail Companies		$ 118.81	$ 2.33	$ 5.55	$ 2.89	$ 71.92	
Average Eight Canadian Specialty Retail Companies	$ 42.05	$ 28.06	$ 5.65	$ 1.05	$ 6.97	$ 27.15	$ 42.59
Average Four Canadian Liquor Manufacturers or Gaming Conpanies	$ 57.86	$ 40.22	$ 13.76	$ 1.60	$ 14.82	$ 36.75	$ 7.21
Average of All Above, Evenly Weighted by Company	$ 44.93	$ 37.85	$ 7.27	$ 1.80	$ 8.43	$ 35.15	$ 29.44

Market Value Using Comparable Companies and Seven Viable Valuation Ratios:

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean (Average)
Total Market Value ($B)	$ 1.80	$ 44.93	$ 23.55	$ 29.44

Source: Source: Capital IQ via Yahoo!Finance; additional material from BMO Investorline; valuation model formulas.
Note: Blank cells indicate either small sample, or negative, or very extreme result(s).

CONCLUSION

This study used detailed financial statements, but the trends in net income, capital expenditures and other adjustments on free cash flow made some estimates of future net income and free cash flow not fully reliable. A more thorough appraisal of assets, operations, business strategy, and rigorous examination of accounts prior to a proposed floating of LCBO shares on a stock market or before the company would be sold to private investors could and should determine a very different value for the company.

As far as is known, the proceeds of such a sale would go to the provincial government of Ontario. Proceeds of at least $20B, and perhaps much more than that, could help lower, if only temporarily, the trajectory of escalating provincial debt. However, once it loses its monopoly status it could also lose its inflated profit margins. It is certain that there will always be retail liquor stores owned and operated by private investors. This is no longer a crucial sector, if it ever was, hence there is no obvious need to have a large government presence in it.

APPENDIX I:

RATIONALE FOR DIVESTITURE OR PRIVATIZATION

While it is up to the people through their elected representatives to decide if a Crown corporation or other government agency or entity should be sold or otherwise privatized and the proceeds used for the benefit of all citizens and taxpayers, there are some established reasons to embark on such a path, some or all of which are cited for divestiture of such enterprises but may not be applicable in any single case.

1. The government has no mandate to own or run a commercial enterprise. Libertarians, 'Classical Liberals' and free-market conservatives believe that the provision of citizens' safety, security and justice is the government's primary role, and its involvement in the economy should generally not extend beyond this.

2. Regulation can usually accomplish any public policy reason for direct involvement in an industry. If regulation is not easily feasible, then a direct contract or subsidy to any affected individuals, entity or entities may be more efficient or effective and less economically disruptive or costly.

3. If a government-controlled or sponsored enterprise has a monopoly position, near-monopoly, or effective monopoly in a line or lines of business or businesses, then opportunities are lost in one or more commercial or potentially commercial sectors for entrepreneurs and investors to try to create and grow businesses to enrich and sustain themselves, employees, suppliers, and others.

4. A monopoly, near-monopoly, or effective monopoly market position by a government-owned or sponsored entity could result in far higher prices for customers, the general public, or a section of the public, than would be the case in a fully competitive marketplace for the industry involved.

5. A government-owned or -sponsored enterprise may compete directly against private sector firms, which are owned by or employ citizens, or against individual citizens, all of whom the government is supposed to serve, not disadvantage.

6. The government-owned or -sponsored enterprise may compete unfairly against its private sector rivals in that it had or has access to lower-cost government-sourced and -guaranteed capital (debt). It may have a much larger debt component in its capital versus that which would be tolerated in the private sector. Thus, it may not have to meet high standards for profit and cost control, allowing it to offer lower than true free market-based competitive pricing.

7. Government-owned firms may not need to pay provincial or federal income taxes. This can allow such firms to supply goods or services more cheaply than the private sector companies they are competing with.

8. Government-owned or -sponsored enterprises may not have any kind of profit orientation or target, may be used as public policy vehicles and may be given preference in their activities or even in their transgressions, such as labour or environmental abuses.

9. Government-owned or -sponsored enterprises, by virtue of being public sector vehicles overseen by bureaucrats and politicians, may be places where favoured individuals find employment, particularly at management levels.

10. Since profit is a secondary goal of a government-owned or -sponsored enterprise, it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency or productivity of the enterprise or its employees. Consequently, these employees and assets may not be very productive or effective.

11. In some cases, government-owned entities are monopolies or effective monopolies, and use their market-dominating power to charge higher prices than would be the case in a fully competitive sector with several viable companies in intense rivalry to offer customers the best product or service at the best price.

12. Government-owned or -sponsored enterprises are often creations of certain time-fixed circumstances and outlive whatever use or public policy role their creators may have conceived. Often, advances in technology; the modernization of transport, telecommunication or information technology; the evolution of the economy and available products and services and the increasing standard of living make these enterprises potentially obsolete. In the private sector, firms and individuals must adapt and evolve, or decline.

13. Government-owned or -sponsored enterprises perpetuate their possibly obsolete existences by virtue of the constituencies that build up around them: employees, managers, directors and bureaucrats, customers, suppliers and associated advocates or consultants. They can lobby to keep the enterprise going, despite dysfunction or losses. They are far more motivated to do so than are the taxpayers, whose average cost is much less per person and may be indirect, hidden or difficult to calculate.

14. Because they are not profit-oriented, government-owned or -sponsored enterprises are usually less efficient, and thus they lower the overall efficiency of the entire economy. This can make a whole nation less competitive than its global rivals are, whether nations or individual companies. The effects are worse the greater the government involvement in the economy. When taken to its most extreme, as happened in 20th-century communist nations, the countries were unable to compete against capitalist companies, despite their immense direct and indirect subsidies, government support and the lack of profit requirement.

15. Funds tied up in the capital of government-owned or -sponsored enterprises could be used to reduce government debt or lower taxes on individuals or corporations, which they could then spend or invest as they freely choose, and thus they could inject money back into the economy in more-lucrative ways.

16. The greater the number and size of government owned or government sponsored enterprises in an economy, the greater the size and power of the government, which is usually the largest single entity in society, increasing the dangers of abuse of power, including injuring individual citizens, companies, or groups. Effective capacity of opposition or recourse against this power diminishes as the proportion of the economy the government occupies increases.

FRONTIER CENTRE
FOR PUBLIC POLICY