

Global Credit Research - 22 Sep 2011

Rosmalen, Netherlands

Ratings

Category	Moody's Rating
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating -Dom Curr	Aa3
Enexis B.V.	
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating -Dom Curr	Aa3

Contacts

Analyst	Phone
Richard Miratsky/Prague	420.224.222.929
Niel Bisset/London	44.20.7772.5454
Andrew Blease/London	

Key Indicators

[1]Enexis Holding N.V.

	6/30/2011	12/31/2010	12/31/2009
(FFO + Interest) / Interest Expense	6.9x	6.2x	7.9x
Net Debt / Fixed Assets	31.2%	32.3%	36.2%
FFO / Net Debt	34.4%	32.3%	35.0%
RCF / CAPEX	1.2x	1.1x	1.5x

[1] All ratios are calculated using Moody's Standard Adjustments. Source: Moody's Financial Metrics TM

Note: For definitions of Moody's most common ratio terms please see the accompanying [User's Guide](#).

Opinion

Corporate Profile

Enexis Holding N.V. (Enexis) is a holding company of Enexis B.V. that owns and manages the gas and electricity distribution networks in several Dutch regions. Enexis B.V. generates more than 90% of the group's revenue and represents 99% of group assets and liabilities. Enexis is one of the three largest electricity and gas network operators in the Netherlands responsible for the maintenance, management and development of the medium-voltage electricity and gas distribution grids. It operates around 130,000 km of electricity cable and 40,000 km of gas pipelines, delivering electricity to approximately 2.6 million customers and gas to 2 million customers. Enexis is fully owned by Dutch provinces and municipalities, with the largest owners being Noord Brabant (31%), Overijssel (19%), Limburg (16%), Groningen (6%) and Drenthe (2%). The remaining 26% share is owned by 1 other small province and approximately 120 municipalities where Enexis provides its network services.

Recent Developments

ACQUISITION OF INTERGAS ENERGIE BV

On May 31 2011 Enexis bought Intergas Energie BV (Intergas), a gas distribution network owner and operator in the region of 21 municipalities at the western part of the Noord - Brabant province, for an approximate acquisition price of EUR190 million. Intergas distributes gas to approximately 2% of the market in the Netherlands, which represents approximately 150,000 connections and a total annual turnover of around EUR30 million.

Given that Enexis's financial position is supported by its cash reserve, we perceive it as strong enough for the company to absorb the acquisition price of Intergas without its current rating position being materially threatened. We recognise that the Intergas acquisition offers synergies as Enexis already owns and operates the electricity distribution network on Intergas's territory and is in line with Enexis's strategy of becoming one of the leaders in the long-term development of the Dutch regional network sector.

Rating Rationale

Given its 100% ownership by Dutch provinces and municipalities, Enexis falls within the scope of Moody's rating methodology for government-related issuers (GRIs). In accordance with the methodology, Enexis's Aa3 rating incorporates two-notch uplift to its stand-alone credit assessment, which is expressed by Moody's as a BCA of 6 (on a scale of 1 to 21, where 1 represents the lowest risk and 6 is equivalent to an A2 rating).

Enexis's Baseline Credit Assessment (BCA) of 6, representing the company's credit quality before taking into account any support from its owners, is characterised by the low risk of its domestic electricity and gas distribution operations, which generate more than 90% of its earnings and cash flows, supported by a well-defined, transparent and cost-efficient Dutch regulatory framework. The efficiency X and quality Q factors, applied to a Consumer Prices Index (CPI)-adjusted revenue cap, are based on an industry average mechanism that encourages companies to improve profitability by outperforming the industry through enhanced efficiency and increased quality.

Rating Drivers

When assessing Enexis's BCA, Moody's applies its Rating Methodology for Regulated Electric and Gas Networks, published in August 2009, which identifies key areas of focus for assessing the relative fundamental credit quality of regulated electric and gas network companies. The methodology focuses on the assessment of the regulatory environment, ownership model, operational performance, stability of business model and key credit metrics. Based on historical financial performance, the methodology grid indicates a BCA of 5 for Enexis, reflecting Enexis historically strengthened capital structure by shareholder loans provided during the unbundling process and strong debt protection metrics. Any positive pressure on Enexis's BCA, narrowing the difference between the methodology grid outcome and the actual BCA of 6 would also depend on the company's ability and willingness to adjust the increasing investments and acquisition activity, in order not to constrain Enexis's financial performance in the medium term.

RATING FACTOR 1 - Regulatory Environment and Asset Ownership Model

Currently in its fifth regulatory period, the Dutch regulatory framework, applied since 2001, allows the country's electricity and gas distribution companies to earn a return on their regulated asset base, adjusted for consumer price index (CPI) and an efficiency incentive X factor. The regulation incorporates incentives based on a "yardstick" mechanism, which defines the efficiency X and quality Q factors based on industry averages and encourages network companies to improve profitability by outperforming the sector through improved efficiency and increased quality. The solid score (Aa) for the "Stability and Predictability of Regulatory Regime" sub-factor reflects the consistent application of transparent regulatory methodologies by the Dutch regulator.

We view positively that the negative X-factor, set by the Dutch regulator for the fifth regulatory period (2011-13), allows a gradual increase of tariffs and positively impacts the financial profile of the distribution network operators through strengthened cash flow generation, as already evidenced by Enexis's financial results for the first half of 2011. However, we keep the score for the "Cost and Investment Recovery" sub-factor at A, as the mechanism of setting the X-factor has not changed and the negative X-factor rather reflects the regulator's recognition of network operators' needs to cover growing investment costs.

The regulatory mechanism based on the revenue cap model and a gradual introduction of capacity-based payments reduces exposure of network companies to volume volatility risk, thus resulting in Enexis scoring Aa for the "Revenue Risk" sub-factor. We assign the same score to Enexis for the "Asset Ownership Model" sub-factor, given the company's full ownership of the network assets under a licence.

RATING FACTOR 2 - Efficiency and Execution Risk

Enexis's overall score for Factor 2 is supported by the high technical operating performance of Dutch networks, which is generally solid compared with European peers. The low average annual outage time reflects the extremely high reliability of Enexis's network assets. The Baa score, assigned to Enexis for the "Cost Efficiency" sub-factor, has been historically constrained by the relatively higher X-factor compared with the other main Dutch distribution network operators. We might consider improving the score under this sub-factor in the future as Enexis continues to invest significantly in maintenance and upgrade of its network asset base and continues consistently executing efficiency measures. Enexis's annual investment plan, which is expected to gradually increase from its current level of EUR 300 million over the next five years, results in Baa score under the "Scale and Complexity of Capital Programme" sub-factor.

RATING FACTOR 3 - Stability of Business Model and Financial Structure

With the exception of the public lighting and traffic management services, which have been separated into a joint venture with neighbouring distribution company Alliander (rated Aa3, stable) and do not exceed 10% of Enexis's revenues, the company strategically focuses on its core business of regulated activities based on its distribution network assets, resulting in a solid A score for the "Targeted Proportion of Profit outside Core Regulated Activities" sub-factor. Enexis's A score for the "Ability and Willingness to Pursue Opportunistic Corporate Activity" sub-factor might weaken over the time, as the company plans to play an active role in the long-term strategy for consolidation of the Dutch distribution network sector as evidenced by the recent acquisition of Intergas. Although the scope, timing and funding of Enexis's potential future acquisitions within the envisaged consolidation is not certain, the Baa score for the "Ability and Willingness to increase Leverage" sub-factor incorporates Moody's expectation that the company would need to increase its leverage to finance such acquisitions.

RATING FACTOR 4 - Key credit metrics

Although Enexis's 2010 financial performance resulted in a slightly weaker financial profile, its debt coverage metrics remain safely within the company's financial policy targets and our ratio guidance for the current BCA category (funds from operations (FFO)/interest coverage ratio above 4x and a FFO/net debt ratio above 20%). Furthermore, we expect Enexis financial profile to strengthen over the next three years as the negative X-factor, set by the Dutch regulator for the current regulatory period, enables a gradual increase of tariffs resulting in growing revenues and strengthening cash flow generation as already evidenced by strengthened 2011 half-year results. However, we point out that the positive impact is conditioned by the continuing successful execution of the cost efficiency measures and might be constrained by a need to finance potential future acquisitions of smaller network operators as envisaged within the overall strategy for consolidation of the Dutch distribution network segment. Furthermore, the need to fund the growing invest programme might restrict the future strengthening of Enexis's financial profile especially if the smart metering project gets expedited compared to company's expectations.

OTHER GRI FACTORS

Following unbundling, Enexis retained the same shareholding structure, - i.e. 100% ownership by a number of Dutch regional and local

governments, with public ownership of the networks required by the current legislation. Therefore, Enexis is considered a GRI under our methodology. Our assumption of strong systemic support reflects Enexis's strategic importance as a pure network company, and the high reputation risk to its owners. Although the ownership is relatively fragmented among approximately 125 provinces and municipalities, we perceive the shareholders to be capable and willing to act in conjunction with one another. In determining the probability of systemic support as strong, we have also taken into account the 72% ownership share of the four largest provinces and their historically proven ability to reach consensus in case of need. Furthermore, in our view, the legal and political mechanisms established in Netherlands, including the legal requirement for public ownership of distribution network assets, increase the probability of systemic support being provided to a strategically important network operator in the case of extraordinary need.

Our assessment of a very high level of dependence (i.e. degree of exposure to common drivers of credit quality) reflects our expectation that almost all of Enexis's revenues will continue to be derived from domestic sources, similarly to those of its owners.

Liquidity Profile

As a result of prudent financial strategy the company's liquidity position and capital structure strengthened providing comfortable headroom under both the regulatory minimum ratio requirements and financial covenants included in the company's EUR 450 million back-up overdraft facility. The comfortable maturity profile on the shareholder loan, solid headroom under the overdraft facility and reasonable dividend policy that has been agreed at 50% further support Enexis's solid liquidity position.

CROSS-BORDER LEASE AGREEMENTS

Enexis successfully managed to terminate all of its CBLs. These were signed on network assets by Enexis's predecessor and represented significant financial exposure in the event of early termination. Enexis's exposure to CBLs is currently limited to the CBL taken over within the acquisition of Intergas and is at an immaterial level in relation to the company's size.

Structural Considerations

The shareholder loan, provided to Enexis Holding through a special-purpose vehicle (SPV), Vordering op Enexis B.V, which is fully owned by Enexis's shareholders, was on-lent to the operating company (Enexis B.V.) via an inter-company loan under essentially the same terms as the shareholder loan. We understand that future bond issuances, aimed at refinancing the shareholder loan at maturity of its tranches, are planned at the Enexis Holding level with the proceeds to be on-lent to the operating company via a back-to-back intercompany loan in the same amount and with the same conditions and maturity as the bond issuance. We also note that Enexis's committed revolving overdraft facility, originally provided directly to the operating company (Enexis B.V.), has been transferred to the Enexis Holding level. On the basis of these funding policies and actions, we currently regard the risk of structural subordination for lenders at the holding level as low.

Rating Outlook

The stable outlook reflects Moody's expectation that Enexis will remain a pure electricity and gas distribution network operator that derives most of its revenues and cash flow from regulated activities. Furthermore, we expect Enexis to continue to follow its conservative financial policy, building on the successful developments of the unbundling process.

What Could Change the Rating - Up

The rating could be upgraded if (FFO)/interest coverage ratio is likely to be sustainably above 4x and the FFO/net debt ratio sustainably above 20%. Although the negative X-factor enables Enexis's tariffs and revenues to gradually grow over the current regulatory period, we point out that in order to exceed the credit metrics set out above, Enexis would also need to manage its growing investment programme to allow sustainable strengthening of its financial profile. Furthermore, the future positive pressure on Enexis's BCA and rating might be constrained by potential future acquisitions of other smaller distribution networks that might require external funding and increased leverage level.

What Could Change the Rating - Down

To remain safely positioned within its current BCA of 6, Moody's expects Enexis to exhibit on a sustainable basis the following minimum credit metrics: an FFO/interest coverage ratio at or above 3.5x and an FFO/net debt ratio above 15%. If the company's debt protection metrics decline substantially below these levels, mainly due to an increase in indebtedness above the forecast levels and/or weakening of cash flow generation, the BCA and rating might come under downward pressure.

Rating Factors

Enexis Holding N.V.

Regulated Electric and Gas Networks [1][2]	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B
Factor 1: Regulatory Environment & Asset Ownership Model (40%)						
a) Stability and Predictability of Regulatory Regime		X				
b) Asset Ownership Model		X				
c) Cost and Investment Recovery			X			
d) Revenue Risk		X				
Factor 2: Efficiency & Execution Risk (10%)						
a) Cost Efficiency				X		
b) Scale and Complexity of Capital Programme				X		
Factor 3: Stability of Business Model & Financial Structure (10%)						
a) Ability and Willingness to Pursue Opportunistic Corporate Activity			X			
b) Ability and Willingness to Increase Leverage				X		
c) Targeted Proportion of Operating Profit Outside Core Regulated Activities			X			

Factor 4: Key Credit Metrics (40%)					
b) (FFO + Interest) / Interest Expense (3-Year Average)			4.9x		
d) Net Debt / Fixed Assets (3 Year Avg)		41.7%			
e) FFO / Net Debt (3 Year Avg)		25.0%			
f) RCF / CAPEX (3 Year Avg)				1.2x	
Rating:					
a) Indicated BCA from Grid factors 1-4			A1		
d) Actual BCA Assigned			A2		

Government-Related Issuer	Factor
a) Baseline Credit Assessment	6
b) Government Local Currency Rating	Aaa
c) Default Dependence	Very High
d) Support	Strong

[1] All ratios are calculated using Moody's Standard Adjustments. [2] As of 12/31/2010. Source: Moody's Financial Metrics



© 2011 Moody's Investors Service, Inc. and/or its licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ARE MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC.'S ("MIS") CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MIS DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT CONSTITUTE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS ARE NOT RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MIS ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources Moody's considers to be reliable, including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process. Under no circumstances shall MOODY'S have any liability to any person or entity for (a) any loss or damage in whole or in part caused by, resulting from, or relating to, any error (negligent or otherwise) or other circumstance or contingency within or outside the control of MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees or agents in connection with the procurement, collection, compilation, analysis, interpretation, communication, publication or delivery of any such information, or (b) any direct, indirect, special, consequential, compensatory or incidental damages whatsoever (including without limitation, lost profits), even if MOODY'S is advised in advance of the possibility of such damages, resulting from the use of or inability to use, any such information. The ratings, financial reporting analysis, projections, and other observations, if any, constituting part of the information contained herein are, and must be construed solely as, statements of opinion and not statements of fact or recommendations to purchase, sell or hold any securities. Each user of the information contained herein must make its own study and evaluation of each security it may consider purchasing, holding or selling. NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

MIS, a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MIS have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MIS for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations

that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moodys.com under the heading "Shareholder Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Any publication into Australia of this document is by MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657, which holds Australian Financial Services License no. 336969. This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, credit ratings assigned on and after October 1, 2010 by Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") are MJKK's current opinions of the relative future credit risk of entities, credit commitments, or debt or debt-like securities. In such a case, "MIS" in the foregoing statements shall be deemed to be replaced with "MJKK". MJKK is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO.

This credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness or a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors. It would be dangerous for retail investors to make any investment decision based on this credit rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.