EQUITY RESEARCH - RESULTS FLASH



PATRANGSIT HEALTHCARE GROUP

PHG TB

THAILAND / HEALTH CARE SERVICES



2Q24 results at first glance

TARGET PRICE THB21.00 CLOSE THB16.00 UP/DOWNSIDE +31.3% TP vs CONSENSUS +0.0%

Core profit grew 17% y-y to THB37m in 2Q24; excluding one-off, it would grow 65% y-y to THB51m

Highlights

- PHG reported a core profit of THB37m in 2Q24 (+17% y-y, -45% q-q).
- In this quarter, PHG booked a Social Security Office (SSO) revenue reversal of THB18m following the insufficient budget for high-cost care (RW>=2), which was revised down to THB7,200/RW from THB12,000/RW for the treatments during Oct to Dec-23. Excluding this item, 2Q24 core profit would be THB51m (+65% y-y).
- Hospital revenue grew by 8% y-y in 2Q24. Revenue from self-pay patients grew by 12% y-y due to a strong OPD volume. Revenue from SSO patients grew by 7% y-y thanks to a higher number of registered insurers. Excluding the SSO revenue reversal, total revenue and SSO revenue would grow by 12% y-y and 18% y-y, respectively.
- COGS increased by 11% y-y following the higher patient volume.
 SG&A decreased by 4% y-y due to the absence of IPO expenses in 2Q23 and the reversal of expected credit losses.
- As a result, the 2Q24 EBITDA margin slightly improved to 13.1% (vs 12.9% in 2Q23). Excluding the SSO revenue reversal, the EBITDA margin would improve to 16%.
- 1H24 core profit grew by 36% y-y to THB103m and accounted for 34% of our 2024 core profit forecast of THB303m.

Outlook

 We expect the strong earnings growth momentum to continue in 3Q24, which is the high healthcare season.

KEY STOCK DATA

YE Dec (THB m)	2023	2024E	2025E	2026E
Revenue	2,138	2,384	2,545	2,778
Net profit	259	303	335	383
EPS (THB)	0.86	1.01	1.12	1.28
vs Consensus (%)	-	-	-	-
EBITDA	417	479	538	614
Recurring net profit	259	303	335	383
Core EPS (THB)	0.86	1.01	1.12	1.28
EPS growth (%)	(27.4)	16.9	10.5	14.2
Core P/E (x)	18.5	15.8	14.3	12.5
Dividend yield (%)	3.3	3.8	4.2	4.8
EV/EBITDA (x)	9.2	8.5	7.5	6.7
Price/book (x)	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.0
Net debt/Equity (%)	(48.9)	(34.2)	(33.8)	(29.2)
ROE (%)	17.7	14.9	15.3	16.3



Share price performance	1 Month	3 Month	12 Month
Absolute (%)	(5.9)	11.9	29.0
Relative to country (%)	(3.4)	18.3	52.6
Mkt cap (USD m)			136
3m avg. daily turnover (USD m)			0.4
Free float (%)			42
Major shareholder	Tuangj	ai Trakulch	ang (17%)
12m high/low (THB)		1	7.20/11.10
Issued shares (m)			300.00

Sources: Bloomberg consensus; FSSIA estimates



Teerapol Udomvej, CFAFundamental Investment Analyst on Securities; License no. 080523 teerapol.udo@fssia.com, +66 2646 9969

Exhibit 1: PHG – 2Q24 results summary

	2Q23	3Q23	4Q23	1Q24	2Q24	Char	ıge	2023	2024E	Change
	(THB m)	(q-q %)	(y-y %)	(THB m)	(THB m)	(y-y %)				
Revenue	488	568	597	567	527	(7)	8	2,138	2,384	12
Cost of sales (Incl. depreciation)	(380)	(409)	(416)	(426)	(423)	(1)	11	(1,565)	(1,738)	11
Gross profit	108	159	181	141	103	(27)	(4)	573	646	13
SG&A	(69)	(59)	(64)	(67)	(66)	(2)	(4)	(262)	(286)	9
Operating profit	39	100	117	74	37	(49)	(4)	312	360	15
Other operating income	4	4	11	10	8	(15)	133	23	24	4
Equity income	(0)	(0)	(0)	0	(0)			(0)	-	
EBIT	43	104	128	84	46	(45)	7	334	383	15
Interest expense	(4)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(44)	(91)	(10)	(4)	(57)
EBT	39	103	127	83	46	(45)	16	325	379	17
Income tax	(8)	(21)	(26)	(17)	(9)	(46)	14	(65)	(76)	16
Minority interests	0	0	0	0	0			-	-	
Core profit	31	82	102	67	37	(45)	17	259	303	17
Extraordinaries										
Net income	31	82	102	67	37	(45)	17	259	303	17
Core EPS (THB)	0.13	0.27	0.34	0.22	0.12	(45)	(4)	0.86	1.01	17
No of share (m)	246	300	300	300	300	0	22	300	300	(
Cost (Excl. depreciation)	(359)	(388)	(394)	(403)	(400)	(1)	11	(1,482)	(1,643)	11
Depreciation & amortization	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(23)	1	15	(83)	(96)	16
EBITDA	63	126	151	107	69	(35)	10	417	479	15
Key ratios	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(ppt)	(ppt)	(%)	(%)	(ppt
Gross margin	22	28	30	25	20	(5)	(3)	27	27	(
SG&A/Revenue	14	10	11	12	13	1	(2)	12	12	(0)
EBITDA margin	13	22	25	19	13	(6)	0	20	20	1
Net profit margin	6	14	17	12	7	(5)	1	12	13	1
Operating stats	(y-y %)									
Self-pay patient revenue	12	16	14	15	12					
Self-pay patient OPD revenue	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	(100)					
Self-pay patient IPD revenue	N/A	N/A	N/A	23	(100)					
SSO revenue	(28)	3	75	19	3					
SSO registered members ('000)	155	156	155	155						
SSO revenue per head	4,393	4,801	6,025	5,061						

Sources: PHG; FSSIA estimates

Financial Statements

Patrangsit Healthcare Group

Profit and Loss (THB m) Year Ending Dec	2022	2023	2024E	2025E	2026E
Revenue	2,040	2,138	2,384	2,545	2,778
Cost of goods sold	(1,432)	(1,565)	(1,738)	(1,853)	(2,007)
Gross profit	608	573	646	691	771
Other operating income	14	23	24	24	25
Operating costs	(242)	(262)	(286)	(293)	(314)
Operating EBITDA	450	417	479	538	614
Depreciation	(70)	(83)	(96)	(115)	(132)
Goodwill amortisation	-	-	-	-	-
Operating EBIT	380	334	383	423	482
Net financing costs	(12)	(10)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Associates	0	0	0	0	0
Recurring non-operating income	0	0	0	0	0
Non-recurring items	0	0	0	0	0
Profit before tax	368	325	379	419	478
Tax	(75)	(65)	(76)	(84)	(96)
Profit after tax	293	259	303	335	383
Minority interests	0	0	0	0	0
Preferred dividends	-	-	-	-	_
Other items	_	-	_	-	_
Reported net profit	293	259	303	335	383
Non-recurring items & goodwill (net)	0	0	0	0	0
Recurring net profit	293	259	303	335	383
Per share (THB)					
Recurring EPS *	1.19	0.86	1.01	1.12	1.28
Reported EPS	1.19	0.86	1.01	1.12	1.28
DPS	0.95	0.52	0.61	0.67	0.77
Diluted shares (used to calculate per share data)	246	300	300	300	300
Growth					
Revenue (%)	3.5	4.8	11.5	6.7	9.2
Operating EBITDA (%)	(6.8)	(7.3)	14.8	12.4	14.1
Operating EBIT (%)	(8.0)	(12.0)	14.6	10.3	14.1
Recurring EPS (%)	(62.5)	(27.4)	16.9	10.5	14.2
Reported EPS (%)	(62.5)	(27.4)	16.9	10.5	14.2
Operating performance	(02.0)	(=)	10.0	10.0	
Gross margin inc. depreciation (%)	29.8	26.8	27.1	27.2	27.8
Gross margin exc. depreciation (%)	33.2	30.7	31.1	31.7	32.5
	22.0		20.1		22.1
Operating EBITDA margin (%)	18.6	19.5		21.2	17.4
Operating EBIT margin (%)		15.6	16.1	16.6	
Net margin (%)	14.4	12.1	12.7	13.2	13.8
Effective tax rate (%)	20.3	20.1	20.0	20.0	20.0
Dividend payout on recurring profit (%)	79.5	60.1	60.0	60.0	60.0
Interest cover (X)	31.8	34.2	91.9	101.4	115.7
Inventory days	11.4	12.2	12.8	13.1	12.9
Debtor days	58.0	55.7	46.7	40.9	36.3
Creditor days	63.7	64.9	65.5	66.9	66.3
Operating ROIC (%)	30.9	26.3	25.0	22.9	23.4
ROIC (%)	30.6	26.0	24.7	22.7	23.3
ROE (%)	33.5	17.7	14.9	15.3	16.3
ROA (%)	19.5	13.4	12.5	12.9	13.7
* Pre exceptional, pre-goodwill and fully diluted					
Revenue by Division (THB m)	2022	2023	2024E	2025E	2026E
Self pay patient revenue	1,051	1,142	1,299	1,405	1,549
SSO patient revenue	712	750	810	851	920
NHSO patient revenue	278	246	275	289	309

Sources: Patrangsit Healthcare Group; FSSIA estimates

Financial Statements

Patrangsit Healthcare Group

Patrangsit Healthcare Group					
Cash Flow (THB m) Year Ending Dec	2022	2023	2024E	2025E	2026E
Recurring net profit	293	259	303	335	383
Depreciation Depreciation	70	83	96	115	132
Associates & minorities	-	-	-	-	102
Other non-cash items	(3)	3	0	0	0
Change in working capital	(28)	37	49	34	23
Cash flow from operations	332	382	448	484	538
Capex - maintenance	(87)	(152)	(530)	(261)	(386)
Capex - new investment	-	-	-	-	-
Net acquisitions & disposals	0	0	0	0	0
Other investments (net)	-	-	-	-	_
Cash flow from investing	(87)	(152)	(530)	(261)	(386)
Dividends paid	(233)	(380)	(156)	(182)	(201)
Equity finance	146	1,108	0	0	0
Debt finance	(58)	(280)	0	0	0
Other financing cash flows	0	0	0	0	0
Cash flow from financing	(145)	448	(156)	(182)	(201)
Non-recurring cash flows	-	-	-	-	-
Other adjustments	0	0	0	0	0
Net other adjustments	0	0	0	0	0
Movement in cash	100	678	(238)	42	(49)
Free cash flow to firm (FCFF)	256.85	239.94	(77.62)	227.67	155.74
Free cash flow to equity (FCFE)	186.83	(49.49)	(81.79)	223.50	151.57
Per share (THB)					
FCFF per share	0.86	0.80	(0.26)	0.76	0.52
FCFE per share	0.62	(0.16)	(0.27)	0.76	0.52
Recurring cash flow per share	1.46	1.15	1.33	1.50	1.71
<u> </u>					
Balance Sheet (THB m) Year Ending Dec	2022	2023	2024E	2025E	2026E
Tangible fixed assets (gross)	1,660	1,781	2,311	2,572	2,958
Less: Accumulated depreciation	(764)	(816)	(911)	(1,027)	(1,158)
Tangible fixed assets (net)	896	965	1,400	1,545	1,799
Intangible fixed assets (net)	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term financial assets	-	-	-	-	_
Invest. in associates & subsidiaries	6	6	6	6	6
Cash & equivalents	334	1,012	775	816	767
A/C receivable	336	316	294	276	276
Inventories	44	55	60	64	69
Other current assets	1	1	1	1	2
Current assets	716	1,385	1,131	1,158	1,114
Other assets	6	7	7	7	7
Total assets	1,624	2,363	2,543	2,716	2,926
Common equity	975	1,963	2,110	2,263	2,445
Minorities etc.	0	0	0	0	0
Total shareholders' equity	975	1,963	2,110	2,263	2,445
Long term debt	332	52	52	52	52
Other long-term liabilities	40	44	44	44	44
Long-term liabilities	372	96	96	96	96
A/C payable	247	279	310	328	354
Short term debt	0	0	0	0	0
Other current liabilities	29	24	27	29	31
Current liabilities Total liabilities and abarahalders' aguitat	276	304	337	357	385
Total liabilities and shareholders' equity	1,624	2,363	2,543	2,716	2,926
Net working capital	106	68	19	(15)	(38)
Invested capital * Includes convertibles and preferred stock which is being	1,014	1,046	1,432	1,543	1,774
includes convertibles and preferred stock which is being	treated as debt				
Per share (THB)					
Book value per share	3.97	6.54	7.03	7.54	8.15
Tangible book value per share	3.97	6.54	7.03	7.54	8.15
Financial strength					
Net debt/equity (%)	(0.2)	(48.9)	(34.2)	(33.8)	(29.2)
Net debt/total assets (%)	(0.1)	(40.6)	(28.4)	(28.1)	(24.4)
Current ratio (x)	2.6	4.6	3.4	3.2	2.9
CF interest cover (x)	16.6	(4.1)	(18.6)	54.6	37.4
Valuation	2022	2023	2024E	2025E	2026E
Recurring P/E (x) *	13.4	18.5	15.8	14.3	12.5
Recurring P/E @ target price (x) *	17.6	24.3	20.8	18.8	16.5
Reported P/E (x)	13.4	18.5	15.8	14.3	12.5
Dividend yield (%)	5.9	3.3	3.8	4.2	4.8
Price/book (x)	4.0	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.0
Price/tangible book (x)	4.0	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.0
EV/EBITDA (x) **	8.7	9.2	8.5	7.5	6.7
EV/EBITDA @ target price (x) **	11.5	12.8	11.6	10.3	9.1
EV/invested capital (x)	3.9	3.7	2.8	2.6	2.3
	DA includes associate i				-

Sources: Patrangsit Healthcare Group; FSSIA estimates

Disclaimer for ESG scoring

ESG score	Methodoles	V			Rating						
The Dou	Methodolog	-	transparant miles h	d component salastics		nd invited to t	an annual COD C	Slobal Camara	ato		
The Dow Jones Sustainability	process base from the ann	ed on the computed on the computer in the comp		ility Scores resulting lity Assessment (CSA).	Sustainability A ESG Score of le	ssessment (C ess than 45%	ne annual S&P G SA) for DJSI. Co of the S&P Glob	mpanies with al ESG Score	an S&P Globa of the highest		
Indices (<u>DJSI</u>) By S&P Global	Only the top- inclusion.	ranked compa	anies within each indust	ry are selected for	scoring compar selected from the		fied. The constitution of	uents of the D	JSI indices are		
Sustainability			ity in Environmental an	,			ion, verified data				
nvestment ₋ist (<u>THSI</u>)			ansparency in Governaı preemptive criteria, witl	nte, updated annually. n two crucial conditions:	minimum of 50% for each indicator, unless the company is a part of Duduring the assessment year. The scoring will be fairly weighted agains:						
y The Stock	1) no irregula	ar trading of th	e board members and	executives; and 2) free	nature of the relevant industry and materiality.						
Exchange of Thailand			and combined holding alifying criteria include:		SETTHSI Index is extended from the THSI companies whose 1) market capitalization > THB5b (~USD150b); 2) free float >20%; and 3) liquidity >0.5% of paid-up capital for at least 9 out of 12 months. The SETTHSI laddy is a market capitalisation weighted index cap 5% quarterly weight						
(SET)	70%; 2) inde	pendent direct	tors and free float violat	ion; 3) executives'							
			social & environmental arnings in red for > 3 ye		Index is a market capitalisation-weighted index, cap 5% quarterly weigh maximum, and no cap for number of stocks.						
CG Score by Thai			n in sustainable develop with support from the St				ories: 5 for Excell -79), 2 for Fair (6				
Institute of	Thailand (SE	T). The result	s are from the perspect	and not rated for	r scores belov	w 50. Weightings	include: 1) th	ne rights; 2) an			
Directors Association	an evaluation	n of operations	S.				olders (weight 25 sure & transpare				
(Thai IOD)					responsibilities			110y (1070), ai	id 0) board		
AGM level By Thai			hich shareholders' right into business operation				four categories: (80-89), and not		· //		
Investors	transparent a	and sufficiently	disclosed. All form imp	ortant elements of two	, (00	00), 0 .0 u	(00 00), a.i.a iio				
Association (TIA) with			ents to be evaluated an ures before the meeting	nually. The assessment							
support from		•	neeting (10%). (The first	, , ,,							
he SEC			ion for voting; and 2) facilite es 1) the ease of attending i	ating how voting rights can be							
	and verifiability	; and 3) openne:		res the meeting minutes that							
Thai CAC	The core ele	ments of the C	Checklist include corrupt	tion risk assessment,			ed by a committe				
By Thai Private Sector			ols, and the monitoring sood for three years.	and developing of	•		r granting certific re twelve highly r	,			
Collective	•		e a CAC certified member :	start by submitting a	professionalism			copedica inai	viduais iii		
Action Against			an 18-month deadline to su essment, in place of policy a	ibmit the CAC Checklist for							
Corruption (CAC)	managers and		ablishment of whistleblowing								
<u>Morningstar</u>	The Sustaina	alytics' ESG ris	sk rating provides an ov				score is the sum		ed risk. The		
<u>Sustainalytics</u>			of how much of a compa to be reviewed include con	more risk is unmanaged, the higher ESG risk is scored.							
	regulatory filing information, co	gs, news and oth Impany feedback	er media, NGO reports/wel , ESG controversies, issue	bsites, multi-sector	NEGL	Low	Medium	High	Severe		
	regulatory filing information, co reports, and qu	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revi	er media, NGO reports/wei k, ESG controversies, issue ews.	osites, multi-sector r feedback on draft ESG	0-10	10-20	20-30	30-40	40+		
ESG Book	regulatory filing information, correports, and quality The ESG screen positioned to	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies so o outperform ov	er media, NGO reports/well s, ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The n	bsites, multi-sector r feedback on draft ESG hat are better nethodology considers	0-10 The total ESG s	10-20 score is calculateriality-base	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled	40+ features		
ESG Book	regulatory filing information, correports, and quality and positioned to the principle	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies so outperform ov of financial ma	er media, NGO reports/weit, ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The nateriality including inforr	bates, multi-sector r feedback on draft ESG that are better methodology considers mation that significantly	0-10 The total ESG s	10-20 score is calculateriality-base	20-30 ated as a weight	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled	40+ features		
ESG Book	regulatory filing information, correports, and queen the ESG score positioned to the principle helps explain over-weighting.	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie pre identifies s to outperform on of financial man future risk-ading features with	er media, NGO reports/well c, ESG controversies, issue- ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The n ateriality including inforr ljusted performance. Man th higher materiality and	hat are better nethodology considers nation that significantly ateriality is applied by	0-10 The total ESG s	10-20 score is calculateriality-base	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled	40+ features		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and queen the ESG scipositioned to the principle helps explair over-weighting weights on a	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies s o outperform of of financial man in future risk-ading features with rrolling quarter	er media, NGO reports/well , ESG controversies, issue- ews. ustainable companies to ver the long term. The materiality including informations. Mathin the serior mance. Mathin this higher materiality and the serior material m	hat are better methodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi	10-20 score is calcul ateriality-base gher scores in	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better p	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance.	40+ features I between 0		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter The ESG scipositioned to the principle helps explair over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial	gs, news and oth mpany feedback ality & peer revieus ore identifies so outperform of financial man future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to not y leaders and stry leaders and other process.	er media, NGO reports/well , ESG controversies, issue- ews. ustainable companies to ver the long term. The manateriality including informateriality including informance. Manateriality and the higher materiality and the properties of the second of th	hat are better nethodology considers nation that significantly ateriality is applied by	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi	10-20 score is calculateriality-base gher scores in	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance.	40+ features d between 0		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter The ESG scipositioned to the principle helps explair over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management of the second of the	gs, news and oth mpany feedback vality & peer revieus or eidentifies so of financial man future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to ristry leaders an 8.571-10.000	er media, NGO reports/well , ESG controversies, issue- ews. ustainable companies to ver the long term. The materiality including informate. Mathin the serior materiality and the higher materiality and the serior material seri	hat are better nethodology considers nation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi	10-20 score is calculateriality-base gher scores in a score in a s	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better positive and the second	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers.	40+ features d between 0		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter the ESG scipositioned to the principle helps explair over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA	gs, news and oth mpany feedback vality & peer review or eidentifies so of financial man future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to noty leaders an 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570	er media, NGO reports/well, (ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies to wer the long term. The nateriality including inforr lijusted performance. Math higher materiality and rily basis. neasure a company's mathematical diaggards according to the long term.	hat are better nethodology considers nation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these nanagement of financially of their exposure to ESG rise	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi	10-20 score is calculateriality-base gher scores in a score in a s	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better positive and the second	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers.	40+ features d between 0		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter The ESG scorpositioned to the principle helps explain over-weightin weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA AA A	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies s o outperform on of financial man in future risk-anding features with ir rolling quarter atings aim to in stry leaders an 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142	er media, NGO reports/weil k, ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The n ateriality including inforr ligusted performance. Ma th higher materiality and rly basis. neasure a company's m d laggards according to Leader:	hat are better nethodology considers nation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these nanagement of financially of their exposure to ESG rise	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG ristsks and how well anaging the most si	10-20 score is calcul ateriality-base gher scores in a score single score scor	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relations sks and opportunities	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers.	features d between 0		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter The ESG screpositioned to the principle helps explain over-weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA BBBB	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies s o outperform or of financial ma in future risk-ad- ing features with irrolling quarter atings aim to in stry leaders an 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713	er media, NGO reports/weik, ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies to ver the long term. The nateriality including informity in the second performance. Math higher materiality and the second performance in the sec	hat are better methodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these management of financially is their exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in ma	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG ristsks and how well anaging the most si	10-20 score is calcul ateriality-base gher scores in a score single score scor	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relations sks and opportunities	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers.	features d between 0		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter The ESG scripositioned to the principle helps explain over-weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA BBBB BB	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies s o outperform oo of financial man in future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to n stry leaders an 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713 2.857-4.285	er media, NGO reports/wei k, ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The n ateriality including inforr lijusted performance. Ma th higher materiality and rly basis. neasure a company's m d laggards according to Leader: Average:	hat are better nethodology considers nation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these nanagement of financially their exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in ma	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG ristsks and how well anaging the most si	10-20 score is calcul ateriality-base gher scores in a score single score scor	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relations sks and opportunities	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers.	features di between 0		
	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter The ESG screpositioned to the principle helps explain over-weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA BBBB	gs, news and oth impany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies s o outperform or of financial ma in future risk-ad- ing features with irrolling quarter atings aim to in stry leaders an 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713	er media, NGO reports/weil (, ESG controversies, issue- ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The n ateriality including inforr lijusted performance. Ma th higher materiality and rly basis. neasure a company's m d laggards according to Leader: Average: Laggard:	hat are better nethodology considers nation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these nanagement of financially their exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in ma	0-10 The total ESG socres using mand 100 with himperelevant ESG risks and how well anaging the most significant for the socretain structure of the socretain structure.	10-20 score is calcul ateriality-base gher scores in a sand opportunity of they manage gnificant ESG risenaging the mos	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relation sks and opportunities t significant ESG ris	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers.	features d between 0		
MSCI	regulatory filing information, correports, and quarter the ESG scopositioned to the principle helps explain over-weightis weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA BBB BB BB BCCCC	gs, news and oth mpany feedback uality & peer revie ore identifies s o outperform or of financial man future risk-ad- ing features with rolling quarter atings aim to in stry leaders and 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713 2.857-4.285 0.000-1.428	er media, NGO reports/weil (c, ESG controversies, issue- ews. ustainable companies to ver the long term. The noteriality including inform lijusted performance. Management of the long term and the long term and the long term and the long term. In the long term and the long term a	hat are better nethodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these nanagement of financially their exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in mation that significantly a mixed or unexceptional industry peers	0-10 The total ESG socres using mand 100 with hi relevant ESG ristsks and how well anaging the most si	10-20 score is calcul atteriality-base gher scores in a score in a	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better positives. It uses a those risks relatives at significant ESG risks and opportunities at significa	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based in ve to peers. es es et ESG risks	features di between 0 nethodology to		
MSCI Moody's ESG	regulatory filing information, correports, and questioned to the principle helps explain over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA BBB BB CCC Moody's ass believes that	gs, news and oth mpany feedback vality & peer review ore identifies so outperform of financial man future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to material straigs aim to material straight aim to materia	er media, NGO reports/wei k, ESG controversies, issue- ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The n ateriality including inforr lijusted performance. Ma th higher materiality and rly basis. neasure a company's m d laggards according to Leader: Average: Laggard: ree to which companies	hat are better methodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these management of financially is their exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in management a mixed or unexceptions industry peers lagging its industry base at take into account ESG of the its business model and	0-10 The total ESG: scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG rislsks and how well anaging the most sill all track record of manded on its high exposion bjectives in the discording to the state of the score of	10-20 score is calcul ateriality-base gher scores in as and opport they manage gnificant ESG ris anaging the mos ure and failure to	20-30 atted as a weight d weights. The s dicating better p unities. It uses a those risks relati sks and opportunitie t significant ESG ris o manage significan	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers. es eks and opportunt tests fisks	features dibetween 0 methodology to nities relative to		
MSCI Moody's ESG solutions Refinitiv ESG	regulatory filing information, correports, and questioned to the principle helps explain over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA BBB BB CCC Moody's ass believes that create susta	gs, news and oth mpany feedback vality & peer review ore identifies so outperform of financial man future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to material straigs aim to material straight aim to material straigs aim to material str	er media, NGO reports/well, (, ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies to ver the long term. The rateriality including informateriality and higher materiality and higher materiality and laggards according to Leader: Average: Laggard: ree to which companies tegrating ESG factors in a shareholders over the eand objectively measure.	hat are better methodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by direbalancing these management of financially to their exposure to ESG rise leading its industry in management of methodology to their exposure to their expos	0-10 The total ESG: scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG rists sks and how well anaging the most si all track record of mand and on its high exposed on its high exposed of relatively outpets.	ateriality-base gher scores in sand opport they manage gnificant ESG risuraging the mosure and failure to effinition and informing its percommitment a	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relation the significant ESG risk manage significant mplementation of ers is better posi and effectiveness	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers. es eks and opportune t ESG risks f their strategy itioned to mitig	features I between 0 methodology to nities relative to y policies. It gate risks and ain themes,		
MSCI Moody's ESG solutions Refinitiv ESG	regulatory filing information, correports, and questioned to the principle helps explain over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial AAA AA BBB BB CCC Moody's ass believes that create sustan	gs, news and oth impany feedback pality & peer revieure identifies is no outperform on of financial man future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to nistry leaders and 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713 2.857-4.285 1.429-2.856 0.000-1.428 esses the degic a company in inable value for transparently ablicity available of the province of the second contract of	er media, NGO reports/well (c, ESG controversies, issue ews. ustainable companies t ver the long term. The n ateriality including inforr lijusted performance. M th higher materiality and rly basis. neasure a company's m d laggards according to Leader: Average: Laggard: ree to which companies tegrating ESG factors in or shareholders over the and objectively measure and objectively measure and objectively measure	content of the conten	0-10 The total ESG scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG rists sks and how well anaging the most sital track record of material tracks and the materia	ateriality-base gher scores in scand opportute they manage gnificant ESG rise and failure to effinition and irreforming its percommitment a SG performant	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relation sks and opportunities t significant ESG ris o manage significan mplementation of ers is better posi and effectiveness ce and insufficie	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers. es t ESG risks t test risks t their strategy tioned to mitigate across 10 mant degree of times.	features I between 0 methodology to nities relative to y policies. It gate risks and ain themes,		
MSCI Moody's ESG solutions Refinitiv ESG rating S&P Global	regulatory filing information, correports, and questioned to the principle helps explain over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management of the management over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management over-weighting weighting management over-weighting weighting management over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentification over-weighting weights over-weights over-we	gs, news and oth impany feedback pality & peer review ore identifies is no outperform on future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to mistry leaders and 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713 2.857-4.285 1.429-2.856 0.000-1.428 esses the degic a company in inable value for transparently ablicity available terial ESG dates the control of	ustainable companies to the long term. The nateriality including information in the long term. The nateriality including information in the long term. The nateriality including information in the long term. The nateriality and the long term and the long term. It is a company's manager and company's manager and according to the long term in the	hat are better methodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these management of financially is better exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in mation a mixed or unexceptional industry peers lagging its industry base as take into account ESG of the into its business model and medium to long term. The acompany's relative ESG the score ranges from 0 to 1	0-10 The total ESG: scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG rists sks and how well anaging the most si all track record of mand and track rec	ateriality-base gher scores in a search and opportunity of they manage gnificant ESG risk and failure to effinition and informing its performing its performant of 5 = good; and management	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relation sks and opportunities t significant ESG ris o manage significan mplementation of ers is better posi nd effectiveness ce and insufficie 1-75 to 100 = exce	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers. es kks and opportune t ESG risks f their strategy itioned to mitting across 10 mant degree of to the core is supported to the core in the core is supported to mitting across 10 mant degree of to the core is supported to t	features I between 0 methodology to mities relative to y policies. It gate risks and ain themes, ransparency ir		
MSCI Moody's ESG solutions Refinitiv ESG rating	regulatory filing information, correports, and questioned to the principle helps explain over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management of the management over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management over-weighting weighting management over-weighting weighting management over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentification over-weighting weights over-weights over-we	gs, news and oth impany feedback pality & peer review ore identifies is no outperform on future risk-ading features with rolling quarter atings aim to mistry leaders and 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713 2.857-4.285 1.429-2.856 0.000-1.428 esses the degic a company in inable value for transparently ablicity available terial ESG dates the control of	ustainable companies to the long term. The nateriality including information in the properties. ustainable companies to the long term. The nateriality including inform iljusted performance. Math higher materiality and rely basis. neasure a company's maderiality and laggards according to the long term. Average: Laggard: ree to which companies tegrating ESG factors in a shareholders over the land objectively measure and auditable data. The lapublicly. (Score ratings in the same industry classing in the same	hat are better methodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these management of financially is their exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in mation that significantly their exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in mation industry peers lagging its industry base at take into account ESG of the its business model and are medium to long term. The e a company's relative ESG rescore ranges from 0 to are 0 to 25 = poor; >25 to 50 = the suring a company's performs a signification. The score ranguating the company's aggroupper's view of ESG fina	0-10 The total ESG: scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG risls sks and how well anaging the most sit all track record of mand and on its high exposed on its high exposed on relative E a satisfactory; >50 to the formance on and the state of the	ateriality-base gher scores in scalcul ateriality-base gher scores in scalcul ateriality-base gher scores in scand opportute they manage gnificant ESG risunaging the mosure and failure to effinition and informing its performant of 75 = good; and management the score is a sco	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better process unities. It uses a those risks relati sks and opportunitie t significant ESG ris manage significan mplementation of ers is better posi and effectiveness ce and insufficie t >75 to 100 = exce of ESG risks, opp and Governance a weighted gener	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based n ve to peers. es	features dependent of the second of the seco		
Moody's ESG solutions Refinitiv ESG rating S&P Global	regulatory filing information, correports, and questioned to the principle helps explain over-weighting weights on a MSCI ESG ridentify industrial management of the managemen	gs, news and oth impany feedback pality & peer review ore identifies is the outperform on future risk-ading features with rolling quarter attings aim to mistry leaders and 8.571-10.000 7.143-8.570 5.714-7.142 4.286-5.713 2.857-4.285 1.429-2.856 0.000-1.428 esses the degral of a company in inable value for transparently a blicity available terial ESG dates of the peers within th	ustainable companies to certificate and objectively measure and objectively measure and objectively measure and auditable data. The apublicly. (Score ratings to a relative score is based on Bloc of Pillar Scores, where	hat are better methodology considers mation that significantly ateriality is applied by d rebalancing these management of financially is better exposure to ESG ris leading its industry in materiality is a mixed or unexceptional industry peers lagging its industry base as take into account ESG of the into its business model and medium to long term. The accompany's relative ESI are 0 to 25 = poor; >25 to 50 = assuring a company's perfores usting the company's aggri	0-10 The total ESG: scores using m and 100 with hi relevant ESG rist sks and how well anaging the most si all track record of mand and track record of mand track record of the properties of the	ateriality-base gher scores in scalcul ateriality-base gher scores in scalcul ateriality-base gher scores in scand opport they manage gnificant ESG risunaging the mosure and failure to efinition and informing its performing its performing its performant of 5 = good; and management of the score is a ciority ranking.	20-30 ated as a weight d weights. The s dicating better po- unities. It uses a those risks relation sks and opportunities t significant ESG ris o manage significant mplementation of ers is better posi and effectiveness ce and insufficie ti >75 to 100 = exce of ESG risks, opportunities and Governance a weighted gener Values range from	30-40 ed sum of the core is scaled erformance. rules-based in ve to peers. ss t ESG risks t their strategy titioned to mitigate across 10 mant degree of to the cortuinties, ar (ESG) perfor alized mean of the cortuinties of the cortuinti	features dependent of the state		

Rating regarding the sustainable development of Thai listed companies, both on the SET and MAI, are publicly available on the website of the Securities and Exchange Commission of Thailand (SEC). Currently, ratings available are 1) "CG Score"; 2) "AGM Level"; 3) "Thai CAC"; and 4) THSI. The ratings are updated on an annual basis. FSSIA does not confirm nor certify the accuracy of such ratings.

Source: FSSIA's compilation

GENERAL DISCLAIMER

ANALYST(S) CERTIFICATION

Teerapol Udomvej, CFA FSS International Investment Advisory Securities Co., Ltd

The individual(s) identified above certify(ies) that (i) all views expressed in this report accurately reflect the personal view of the analyst(s) with regard to any and all of the subject securities, companies or issuers mentioned in this report; and (ii) no part of the compensation of the analyst(s) was, is, or will be, directly or indirectly, related to the specific recommendations or views expressed herein.

This report has been prepared by FSS International Investment Advisory Securities Company Limited (FSSIA). The information herein has been obtained from sources believed to be reliable and accurate; however FSSIA makes no representation as to the accuracy and completeness of such information. Information and opinions expressed herein are subject to change without notice. FSSIA has no intention to solicit investors to buy or sell any security in this report. In addition, FSSIA does not guarantee returns nor price of the securities described in the report nor accept any liability for any loss or damage of any kind arising out of the use of such information or opinions in this report. Investors should study this report carefully in making investment decisions. All rights are reserved.

This report may not be reproduced, distributed or published by any person in any manner for any purpose without permission of FSSIA. Investment in securities has risks. Investors are advised to consider carefully before making investment decisions.

History of change in investment rating and/or target price



Teerapol Udomvej, CFA started covering this stock from 27-Jun-2024

Price and TP are in local currency

Source: FSSIA estimates

Company	Ticker	Price	Rating	Valuation & Risks
Patrangsit Healthcare Group	PHG TB	THB 16.00	BUY	Downside risks to our DCF-based target price include 1) a slowdown in Thai patient volume due to economic slowdown; 2) regulatory risks from drug price and medical bill controls; and 3) SSO provision expenses following limited budgets from the SSO.

Source: FSSIA estimates

Additional Disclosures

Target price history, stock price charts, valuation and risk details, and equity rating histories applicable to each company rated in this report is available in our most recently published reports. You can contact the analyst named on the front of this note or your representative at Finansia Syrus Securities Public Company Limited.

All share prices are as at market close on 13-Aug-2024 unless otherwise stated.

RECOMMENDATION STRUCTURE

Stock ratings

Stock ratings are based on absolute upside or downside, which we define as (target price* - current price) / current price.

BUY (B). The upside is 10% or more.

HOLD (H). The upside or downside is less than 10%.

REDUCE (R). The downside is 10% or more.

Unless otherwise specified, these recommendations are set with a 12-month horizon. Thus, it is possible that future price volatility may cause a temporary mismatch between upside/downside for a stock based on market price and the formal recommendation.

* In most cases, the target price will equal the analyst's assessment of the current fair value of the stock. However, if the analyst doesn't think the market will reassess the stock over the specified time horizon due to a lack of events or catalysts, then the target price may differ from fair value. In most cases, therefore, our recommendation is an assessment of the mismatch between current market price and our assessment of current fair value.

Industry Recommendations

Overweight. The analyst expects the fundamental conditions of the sector to be positive over the next 12 months.

Neutral. The analyst expects the fundamental conditions of the sector to be maintained over the next 12 months.

Underweight. The analyst expects the fundamental conditions of the sector to be negative over the next 12 months.

Country (Strategy) Recommendations

Overweight (O). Over the next 12 months, the analyst expects the market to score positively on two or more of the criteria used to determine market recommendations: index returns relative to the regional benchmark, index sharpe ratio relative to the regional benchmark and index returns relative to the market cost of equity.

Neutral (N). Over the next 12 months, the analyst expects the market to score positively on one of the criteria used to determine market recommendations: index returns relative to the regional benchmark, index sharpe ratio relative to the regional benchmark and index returns relative to the market cost of equity.

Underweight (U). Over the next 12 months, the analyst does not expect the market to score positively on any of the criteria used to determine market recommendations: index returns relative to the regional benchmark, index sharpe ratio relative to the regional benchmark and index returns relative to the market cost of equity.