

## Engineers India Ltd — Aug 2022 Quarterly Analysis

### 1. VERDICT & BUSINESS QUALITY SNAPSHOT

*The punchline. Read this first — it frames everything below.*

**Result:** Inline on Revenue / Miss on Standalone Margins **One-line:** Core engineering margins were suppressed by ₹18 Cr in provisions and delayed "change orders," but the thesis is supported by a significant turnaround in Joint Ventures (RFCL) and stable dividend income from Numaligarh Refinery.

| Dimension                             | This Quarter                                   | Signal / Evidence                                                   | Sentiment |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Beat/Miss vs Guidance / Prior Quarter | Standalone Miss / Consol Beat                  | Standalone PAT ₹50.51 Cr vs Consol PAT ₹64.81 Cr (JV turnaround).   | □         |
| Earnings Quality                      | Moderate (Impacted by provisions)              | ₹18 Cr provision for doubtful debts hit Consultancy margins.        | □         |
| Guidance Confidence                   | Neutral                                        | Needs ₹2,395 Cr revenue in 9 months to hit ₹3,200 Cr target.        | □         |
| Management Credibility                | Neutral                                        | Blamed "cyclic nature" for margin dip; must deliver catch-up.       | □         |
| Business Quality Signal               | Stable                                         | Order book remains healthy at ₹8,840 Cr; JV assets maturing.        | □         |
| Key Q&A Exchange                      | Q1: Margin compression in Consultancy          | Mgmt insists full-year margins will recover to 25-28%.              | □         |
| The Street's Primary Anxiety          | Consultancy Margin Sustainability              | Analysts pressed on why margins dropped despite revenue growth.     | □         |
| Capital Cycle Stage                   | Harvesting                                     | Large investments in RFCL and NRL are now yielding returns/profits. | □         |
| Margin / Return Ratio Trajectory      | Deteriorating (Quarterly) / Improving (Annual) | Q1 Consultancy margins ~11.6% vs 25-28% annual target.              | □         |
| Pricing Power                         | Stable                                         | Negotiation for "change orders" is a routine but delayed process.   | □         |
| FCF Conversion & Quality              | Distorted                                      | Cash balance of ₹1,200 Cr; impacted by non-receipt of debts.        | □         |
| Competitive Moat Signals              | Stable                                         | Entry into niche Salt Caverns and Bio-ethanol sectors.              | □         |
| Balance Sheet Strength                | Strong                                         | ₹1,200 Cr cash; no debt mentioned.                                  | □         |
| Working Capital Efficiency            | Deteriorating                                  | Increase in provision for doubtful debts (₹18 Cr).                  | □         |
| Mgmt Guidance Track Record            | Mixed                                          | Historically conservative; currently projecting high recovery.      | □         |
| Key Vulnerability / Red Flag          | Working Capital Drag                           | Reliance on "change orders" to hit profitability targets.           | □         |
| Management Tone                       | Guarded but Optimistic                         | Focused on "cyclic" recovery and JV performance.                    | □         |

Sentiment: □Neutral

**Key Takeaways (Positives & Negatives):** \* **Positives:** Ramagundam Fertilizer (RFCL) has turned profitable (₹13.85 Cr share vs ₹89.95 Cr loss YoY), significantly de-risking the consolidated bottom line. Numaligarh Refinery (NRL) remains a cash cow, contributing ~₹48 Cr in annual dividends. The entry into "Salt Caverns" and bamboo-based bio-ethanol provides long-term diversification beyond traditional oil & gas. \* **Negatives:** Core Consultancy margins were uncharacteristically low this quarter due to a ₹18 Cr doubtful debt provision and delayed change orders. The LSTK (Turnkey) business continues to be a high-revenue, low-margin drag (3-4% margin) that dilutes overall returns. \* **Street Concern:** Analysts are skeptical of the "cyclic" explanation for margin compression and are watching for the reversal of provisions in Q2/Q3. \* **Forward Watchpoint:** Monitoring the realization of "change orders" worth ₹1,700 Cr (gross) to see if they flow into the P&L as high-margin catch-up income.

## 2. BUSINESS PERFORMANCE

### 2A. KEY METRICS

DATA SOURCE: PPT figures used as primary source. Concall used for Mgmt Commentary column.

| Metric               | Current Qtr | YoY Change  | QoQ Change  | Trend | Mgmt Commentary                                              |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Total Income (₹Cr)   | 805         | ↑ 9.5%      | First entry | ↑     | Growth driven by LSTK execution (₹455 Cr).                   |
| EBITDA (Seg. Profit) | 40.80       | ↓ 59%       | First entry | ↓     | Hit by ₹18 Cr provision and lack of change orders.           |
| Standalone PAT (₹Cr) | 50.51       | Not in doc  | First entry | →     | Saved by other income/lower tax; Standalone only.            |
| Consol. PAT (₹Cr)    | 64.81       | ↑ 2,318%    | First entry | ↑     | Massive jump due to RFCL turning profitable.                 |
| Net Debt / (Cash)    | (1,200)     | First entry | First entry | →     | Strong liquidity position maintained.                        |
| Order Book (₹Cr)     | 8,840       | ↓ 8% (est)  | First entry | ↓     | Mix: 54% Consultancy / 46% Turnkey.                          |
| Order Inflows (₹Cr)  | ~170        | First entry | First entry | →     | Based on "Business Secured" vs historical run-rates.         |
| Execution Rate (%)   | ~9.1%       | First entry | First entry | →     | Calculated as Qtr Turnover / Opening Order Book.             |
| Book-to-bill (x)     | 2.76x       | First entry | First entry | →     | Based on trailing turnover; indicates 2.5+ years visibility. |
| RFCL Contribution    | 13.85       | ↑ Swing     | First entry | ↑     | Project stabilized; targeting 100%+ capacity.                |

### 2B. SEGMENT BREAKDOWN

| Segment       | Revenue (₹ Cr) | YoY Growth | Margin (%)  | Trend | vs Company Avg | Key Development                          |
|---------------|----------------|------------|-------------|-------|----------------|------------------------------------------|
| Consultancy   | 350            | ↓ 1.4%     | ~11.6%*     | ↓     | Below Avg      | Impacted by ₹18 Cr provision.            |
| Turnkey/ LSTK | 455            | ↑ 23%      | ~3-4% (est) | ↑     | Dilutive       | Primary driver of revenue growth this Q. |

\*Note: Margin calculated based on segment profit of 40.80 Cr allocated primarily to consultancy.

### 3. MANAGEMENT OUTLOOK & EXECUTION TRACKER

| Dimension | Category                | Management Target / Claim | Required Run-Rate / Mathematical Feasibility              | Historical Delivery | Risk Flag |
|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Guidance  | Revenue (FY23)          | >₹3,200 Cr                | Needs ₹798 Cr/qtr. (Current: ₹805 Cr). <b>Feasible.</b>   | First entry         | Low       |
| Guidance  | Standalone PAT (FY23)   | ₹350 - ₹360 Cr            | Needs ₹100 Cr/qtr. (Current: ₹50.5 Cr). <b>High Risk.</b> | First entry         | High      |
| Guidance  | Consultancy Margins     | 25% - 28%                 | Requires massive catch-up in Q2-Q4. <b>Aggressive.</b>    | First entry         | Medium    |
| Guidance  | Order Inflow (FY23)     | ₹4,500 - ₹5,000 Cr        | Needs ~₹1,500 Cr per remaining quarter.                   | First entry         | Medium    |
| Strategy  | Capital Allocation      | 60% Dividend Payout       | Supported by NRL/RFCL cash flows.                         | Consistent          | Low       |
| Strategy  | Competitive Positioning | Salt Cavern Storage       | Diversifying into niche underground storage.              | New initiative      | Low       |
| Macro     | Industry Headwinds      | Energy Transition         | Shifting focus to Green Hydrogen/ Bio-ethanol.            | On-track            | Medium    |
| Balance   | Cash Management         | ₹1,200 Cr liquidity       | No immediate buyback planned.                             | Stable              | Low       |

## 4. ANALYST Q&A

---

| Q# | Relevance | Analyst / Firm                 | Theme Cluster       | Category   | Underlying Concern                                                                                                       | Management Response & Investment Implication                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Evaded / Not Addressed                | Credibility | Verdict               |
|----|-----------|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1  | 4.5       | Deepak Narnolia, Birla Sunlife | Consultancy Margins | Financials | "I just wanted to have little more clarity on the profitability... quantum of that provision for doubtful debts."        | Management confirmed an ₹18 Cr provision for doubtful debts was made in Q1, which they expect to realize and potentially reverse later. This non-cash hit directly suppressed consultancy margins, making the quarterly performance appear weaker than the underlying operations; the action signal is to watch for reversals in H2. | Exact client names for provisions.    | 3.5         | Directional with data |
| 1a | 4.0       | Deepak Narnolia                | Change Orders       | Financials | "In this quarter also I think in your LSTK you had seven change order... will it have any impact on your profitability?" | Management is currently negotiating change orders and noted that while they cannot specify amounts, the impact will be visible in Q2 and Q3 results. This creates a "margin backlog" that should theoretically lead to higher-than-average profitability in subsequent quarters once settlements are reached.                        | Exact value of pending change orders. | 3.0         | Vague timing          |

| Q# | Relevance | Analyst / Firm                | Theme Cluster    | Category              | Underlying Concern                                                                           | Management Response & Investment Implication                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Evaded / Not Addressed     | Credibility | Verdict             |
|----|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| 2  | 3.5       | Ranjith Shivaram, Mahindra MF | Margin Risks     | Financials            | "Is that normalized rate of 25% in consultancy and 5% in LSTK... is there any risk to that?" | The team reiterated confidence in achieving 25-28% consultancy margins for the full year, citing the "cyclic" nature of project-oriented revenue. Failure to hit these targets would signal a structural decline in pricing power or project mix quality.        | None                       | 4.0         | Quantified Target   |
| 2a | 4.0       | Ranjith Shivaram              | FY23 Guidance    | Management Commentary | "How much is the kind of revenues we are looking at both these segment for this year?"       | Management targets ₹3,200 Cr+ turnover with a 50/50 mix between Consultancy and LSTK, aiming for PAT of ₹350-360 Cr. This implies a significant ramp-up in profitability is required in the remaining nine months of the fiscal year to meet the full-year goal. | None                       | 4.0         | Clear Guidance      |
| 3  | 4.5       | Rajan Pillai, Sun Capitals    | JV Profitability | Financials            | "How about the profits from the joint venture... will they be in the similar line?"          | Management highlighted the turnaround of RFCL, which contributed ₹13.85 Cr profit this quarter compared to a                                                                                                                                                     | Specific monthly run-rate. | 4.5         | Verifiable Specific |

| Q# | Relevance | Analyst / Firm                   | Theme Cluster       | Category   | Underlying Concern                                                                                                        | Management Response & Investment Implication                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Evaded / Not Addressed | Credibility | Verdict                |
|----|-----------|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------------|
|    |           |                                  |                     |            |                                                                                                                           | massive loss last year. This asset is now stabilized and expected to reach 100%+ capacity, acting as a structural tailwind for consolidated earnings going forward.                                                                                                             |                        |             |                        |
| 3a | 3.0       | Rajan Pillai                     | Shareholder Rewards | Financials | "Is there any plan for buyback or rewarding shareholders with more dividends?"                                            | Management intends to maintain at least a 60% dividend payout ratio but explicitly ruled out a share buyback for the current financial year. This prioritizes yield for investors while keeping cash on the balance sheet for potential (unspecified) investment opportunities. | None                   | 5.0         | Definite No on Buyback |
| 4  | 3.0       | Nimish Maheshwari, RSPN Ventures | Cost Increases      | Financials | "Why [technical assistance/ subcontract charges] increased so much like last year comparison it increased by almost 50%?" | Management clarified that these costs are pass-throughs associated with the increased LSTK revenue (₹455 Cr), where EIL retains only a 3-4% margin. This explains the revenue-cost                                                                                              | None                   | 4.0         | Logical explanation    |

| Q# | Relevance | Analyst / Firm           | Theme Cluster  | Category              | Underlying Concern                                                                                               | Management Response & Investment Implication                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Evaded / Not Addressed           | Credibility | Verdict                |
|----|-----------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|
|    |           |                          |                |                       |                                                                                                                  | correlation and confirms the low-margin nature of the EPC segment's growth.                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                  |             |                        |
| 4a | 3.5       | Nimish Maheshwari        | NRL Dividends  | Financials            | "Can you explain little bit more about the dividend from Numaligarh... when are we expecting?"                   | EIL received ~₹48 Cr in dividends from NRL last year and expects an additional ₹5/share (approx ₹15-20 Cr) to be accounted for in Q2 following the AGM. This non-operating income provides a high-margin floor to PAT, regardless of project execution volatility. | None                             | 5.0         | Quantified             |
| 5  | 4.0       | Digant Haria, Green Edge | Revenue Growth | Management Commentary | "When do you think that this breakout will happen... to say something like ₹2,000 crores [consultancy] revenue?" | Management is aggressively pursuing "sustainability" and "green energy" projects to break the ₹1,500-1,600 Cr consultancy revenue ceiling. Achieving this depends heavily on the "Ratnagiri Refinery" project, which management hopes will restart under           | Specific timeline for Ratnagiri. | 2.5         | Speculative<br>Hopeful |

| Q# | Relevance | Analyst / Firm              | Theme Cluster    | Category              | Underlying Concern                                                   | Management Response & Investment Implication                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Evaded / Not Addressed           | Credibility | Verdict           |
|----|-----------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
|    |           |                             |                  |                       |                                                                      | the new Maharashtra state government.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                  |             |                   |
| 6  | 3.5       | Ravi Nanda, Indiv. Investor | Cash Utilization | Management Commentary | "What do you intend to do with this cash...Investors are suffering?" | Management defended the cash balance as a buffer for the "cyclic" hydrocarbon sector and noted they are seeking new investment opportunities with low capex and high revenue. The lack of a concrete plan for ₹1,200 Cr suggests an inefficient balance sheet in the short term. | Specific M&A or expansion plans. | 2.0         | Evasive / Generic |

### PATTERN FLAGS & SENTIMENT

The primary anxiety among analysts is the "lumpiness" and perceived deterioration of the core Engineering Consultancy margins. Management's defense—blaming the "cyclic nature" of the business and accounting provisions—was met with cautious skepticism, as seen in follow-up questions regarding the specific required run-rate to hit year-end targets. Analysts are effectively treating this quarter as a "temporary dip" but have signaled that they will not accept the same excuse in Q2, especially if change orders don't materialize.

Analyst sentiment was **neutral to slightly skeptical** on standalone operations but **positive** on the consolidated turnaround. The friction point was clearly the margin compression in consultancy, which management countered by highlighting the massive swing in RFCL profitability. Overall, management's credibility remains intact but is now "on probation" regarding their ability to deliver the promised 25%+ margins for the full year.

### GUIDANCE GAPS REVEALED IN Q&A

| Topic               | What Mgmt Claimed (PPT/ Opening)   | What Q&A Revealed         | Gap / Walk-back                                                        | Risk to Thesis                                            |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Consultancy Margins | Historical 25-30%                  | Q1 actually ~11.6%        | Significant quarterly gap; reliance on "reversals" and "negotiations." | Medium: Risk of lower annual margin if negotiations fail. |
| Buyback             | PPT/Prior tone implies cash return | "No planning for buyback" | Explicitly ruled out for FY23.                                         | Low: Impact on capital return expectations.               |

## 5. WHAT CHANGED vs PRIOR QUARTER

---

*First entry — no prior quarter to compare.*

| What Changed | Prior Quarter | This Quarter | Direction |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| N/A          | N/A           | N/A          | N/A       |

---

**Senior Research Analyst Note:** This quarter represents a structural shift from a pure-play engineering firm to a diversified holding company of energy assets. While the "engine" (Consultancy) sputtered this quarter due to provisions, the "investments" (RFCL/NRL) are now providing the heavy lifting for the bottom line. The thesis remains intact as long as RFCL maintains its 100% capacity trajectory and standalone margins mean-revert in Q2. Management's refusal to buy back shares despite ₹1,200 Cr in cash suggests they are either hoarding for a large diversification play or are being overly conservative. Watch the Q2 NRL dividend and Consultancy margin recovery as the primary conviction triggers.