Inox Wind

Operator: Hello, everyone. Good afternoon, everybody. This is the 3rd day of the Bharat Connect Conference 2026, September edition. I welcome you all to the call of Inox Wind Ltd. Today, from the management side, we have Shweta Sultania, Head of IR for Inox Wind. She is also associated with Inox Green Energy Services, but the focus of the discussion will be Inox Wind only.

Before I hand over the call to Shweta, I will lay out the flow of the event. We will start with the opening remarks by management and then move to the Q&A round. Any participant who would like to ask a question can raise their hand or put the question in the chat box. First, we will take questions from participants who have raised their hands and then move to the chat box. If time permits, we will take the questions that I have received from clients who have not been able to participate.

We will take the last question about 5 minutes before the end of this session, which is at 4:55. I am now handing over to Shweta. Please go ahead.

Shweta Sultania – Head IR: Thank you, Abhishek. Good afternoon, everybody, and thank you very much for taking the time to join today's session. I would like to share our company's presentation for your reference. Please let me know if you can see the screen. Please let me know if the screen is visible.

Operator: Yes, the screen is visible.

Shweta Sultania – Head IR: Okay, great. I do not know how many of you are aware of Inox Wind, so let me start by giving you some background on our group, and then we can go into Inox Wind and its subsidiaries.

We are part of the Inox GFL Group. It is a conglomerate that is largely present in 2 segments. One is chemicals and the other is renewables. As part of our DNA, we go deep and are vertically integrated in both our business verticals.

On the chemicals side, we start right from power and salt, and we manufacture fluorochemicals and fluoropolymers. We have also entered the manufacturing of advanced battery chemicals for batteries that can be used in utilities, EVs, and so on. We manufacture about 70%–80% of the chemicals, on a value basis, that go into batteries. We do not manufacture the batteries themselves, but we manufacture the chemicals.

GFL, which is our listed entity, is a very large company on the fluoropolymers and chemicals side, and its subsidiary GFCL EV is the entity that manufactures the battery chemicals.

Coming to the other business segment of our group, which is the renewables segment, that is the entire middle and right side that you see. We are completely integrated on the renewables side. We do everything, starting from project development to project execution and commissioning of a project, both on the solar and wind sides.

We are also involved in the manufacturing of equipment. We manufacture wind turbine generators and associated equipment. We are also involved in the manufacturing of solar cells and modules. We also undertake post-commissioning operations and maintenance of our plants. Now, we are

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

also into IPP, which involves owning and operating power plants, including wind, solar, hybrid, and BESS projects.

In terms of the structure for renewables, Inox Wind Ltd. is the listed entity and will be largely the focus of our discussion today. This company is involved in the manufacturing of wind turbine generators and has 2 main subsidiaries, Inox Green Energy Services and Inox Renewable Solutions.

Inox Green is listed and is involved in the O&M of renewable power plants, including wind and solar. Inox Renewable Solutions, which is currently unlisted, will be automatically listed in about 1.5 months or so. It is involved in project development, EPC, owning and operating power evacuation infrastructure, and has also recently entered the manufacturing of transformers. It will also start manufacturing inverters, ECS, and so on. That is part of the plan.

Coming specifically to Inox Wind, we are one of the 2 large domestic wind turbine manufacturers in India. We have manufacturing factories in Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, and Himachal Pradesh. We have been in this business for approximately 16 years.

We cater to all different types of customers. We have IPPs, PSUs, C&I customers, and retail customers. All of these are our customers. We supply equipment, undertake EPC for them, and also provide O&M after commissioning for our clients.

Today, we are sitting on a very good order book. We currently have an order book of approximately 4.5 gigawatts, which places us very comfortably for execution over the next more than 2 years, given that wind projects take a little longer. They take approximately 1.5–2 years to commission, so we are very well placed.

In terms of our credit profile, we are very well placed. We have very little debt. We are actually a net cash company, both on a standalone basis and on a consolidated basis. Our numbers are publicly available, and you can refer to our financials.

Largely, last year we had consolidated revenue of approximately 4,600 crores, with EBITDA of around 1,000 crores on a consolidated basis. Our subsidiary, Inox Green, is also expected to see very good growth in Q3 as well as Q4.

We are very close to completing a large transaction, which is a large acquisition in Inox Green. We are very close to completing the acquisition of the O&M portfolio of Enercon Wind World. This is a 4.5-gigawatt O&M portfolio. We expect to close it in the next few days.

We made announcements about it approximately 1 month ago, when we received the NCLT approval. Now, we are very close to closing that transaction. This will enable us to consolidate the financials of that portfolio into our books. They are currently reflected as investments.

The numbers will start to reflect from Q3 onwards. The business that we acquired generated revenue of 580 crores in FY26, with an annual escalation of approximately 5%. In FY27, we will be able to consolidate the entire H2. The numbers will start to reflect in our financials from Q3 onwards. There will be no impact in Q2.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

There is another acquisition that we had undertaken in Inox Green, which is currently reflected as an investment. We expect to conclude that transaction by the end of December. Therefore, in Q4, we hope to be able to consolidate that also in our financials.

Overall, FY27 looks quite strong to us, as does FY28, both for Inox Green and Inox Wind.

On Inox Renewable Solutions, just to touch upon that as well, we will be completing the listing through the automatic listing process resulting from the share swap between Inox Renewable and Inox Green. We should be able to complete it in approximately 1.5 months.

We also have very strong growth plans for this company, including its recent entry into manufacturing. We are finalizing the business plan for this company and, once we list it, we will be able to share more information.

Overall, for FY27 and FY28, we feel that we are very well positioned, both on a standalone and consolidated basis, for Inox Wind. With this, I would like to close my address and am happy to take questions from investors.

Operator: Participants are requested to raise their hands. I have a few questions that were sent earlier by investors. I will start with 1 or 2 questions that were received earlier.

The first question is: Q1 was largely flat. We have given guidance indicating that we will reach revenue of 7,800 crores, which is much higher than our best quarter. What gives management confidence in terms of the revenue bridge? Also, instead of giving guidance in megawatts, as we used to do earlier, we have now moved to revenue. What was the reason for this change? Can you explain the reason for the same?

Shweta Sultania – Head IR: Sure. Let me take the first question first. We have given guidance of 75% growth in revenue for FY27 and a consolidated EBITDA margin range of 20%–22%. I would like to reiterate that, as of today, we are not changing the guidance on either of these.

In fact, on the EBITDA margin side, I would like to add that we feel there will be an upward bias, but we are retaining the EBITDA margin range of 20%–22%.

Of course, I agree that Q1 was flat compared to Q1 of last year. Therefore, one is justified in saying that this adds to the burden, for want of a better word, on the remaining 3 quarters to achieve the stated targets. We are cognizant of that.

However, we feel that the current Q2 is expected to be much stronger compared to Q2 of last year. We will see the turnaround starting strongly from Q3.

As we have explained in our earlier calls and presentations, the company made a strategic pivot 2 quarters ago. Earlier, we were largely providing turnkey solutions, which basically involved equipment supply plus EPC. However, 2 quarters ago, we realized that a lot of working capital was getting stuck when we undertook turnkey projects for various reasons.

For example, the site may not be ready to take the equipment, and therefore we may not be able to commission it. Erection may not take place. There were various such reasons. As a result, a lot of

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

working capital was getting stuck.

What we realized was that if we moved as much as possible—I would say we cannot move entirely, but if we move as much as possible—towards equipment supply, we would be able to increase our asset turnover, and our receivables would not remain stuck. That is what we are doing.

We have also been somewhat selective in our order intake. Earlier, in FY24, we were doing 100% turnkey projects. Then we moved to 75% turnkey projects. The objective now is to become 75% equipment sales in the medium term.

However, I would add that we will continue to undertake EPC for projects executed by our group company, Inox Green. We will continue to undertake EPC work for PSU projects because they require turnkey solutions. For some of our select, relationship-based clients, we will also continue to undertake such work.

Therefore, it is not that we will stop undertaking turnkey projects altogether. However, as much as possible, we will try to take equipment supply orders because this will improve our overall turnaround time from start to finish and also improve our working capital cycle.

There was a transition period around this. Therefore, the Q4 and Q1 numbers were muted. I would also add that there was an impact from the war that started on February 28. That impact was felt for approximately 2-2.5 months. Therefore, the impact was visible in the Q4 FY26 numbers and the Q1 FY27 numbers.

However, from this quarter onwards, and especially from Q3 onwards, we feel that there will be a turnaround. As of now, we feel that we will be able to achieve our stated targets.

Just to add, in Inox Green, we will conclude the acquisition of Wind World's O&M portfolio in the next few days. For Wind World, we will not see line-by-line revenue addition in Q1 and Q2. It is being reflected under other income, and not all of it, obviously, as it is accounted for according to AS 109 standards.

From Q3, whenever we conclude the transaction, we will be able to undertake line-by-line consolidation. If the company generates approximately 600 crores of revenue in FY27, then approximately 300 crores will be added to our revenue line in H2 from Wind World alone.

The other transaction that I mentioned, which we hope to conclude by December, can also start being consolidated in our books from Q4 onwards.

As of now, there could be some small percentage of slippages here and there, which is never entirely in anybody's control. However, largely, we are retaining our full-year guidance in terms of revenue. On EBITDA margins, we feel there is an upward bias.

That was the answer to the first question. On the second question, regarding why we have moved away from giving guidance based on megawatts—

Shweta Sultania – Head IR: —to financial numbers, we felt that there was no problem with giving guidance in terms of megawatts. However, in turnkey projects, there are many milestones in a

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

contract, and we calculate megawatts when we actually supply the nacelles.

There are many other milestones, such as site preparation and various other activities. We can bill based on the achievement of those milestones. Whether the equipment has been supplied or not is not always within our control. It also depends on the readiness of the site and so on.

There could be scenarios in which we are not able to count the megawattage because those milestones have not been reached. However, we may still be booking revenue because other milestones have been achieved.

Therefore, we were finding that there was sometimes a mismatch between our financial numbers and the megawatts supplied. There were many questions and answers on these points. We thought about what shareholders ultimately want to see.

We want to see the company grow. We want to see profits grow. We want to see revenues grow. We want to see return ratios improve. Ultimately, that is what shareholders want.

Therefore, we thought that if we were giving our shareholders guidance in terms of financials, at least that would reflect what everybody wants. Megawatts are, of course, one of the inputs. I am not saying that they are not an important input, but there can sometimes be mismatches between the two.

That is the reason we made this change. We are still happy to explain the rationale to anybody who wants to understand the reason for this change. That is the reason.

Analyst1: Okay, thank you very much {? [unclear] ?} for explaining your answer. My second question is a follow-up on the same point. What is the supply chain situation right now? One of the reasons given by management for the delays in Q4 and Q1 was the supply chain. Has the supply chain returned to normal? We have also seen some fall in shipping {? freight ?} prices over the last 4-5 days. What is the impact of this?

Management: Yes, the supply chain issue has been normalized. Immediately, when a war of this scale starts, there are issues, and these were faced not just by us but by everyone.

There were shortages of trailers and fuel. Some of the equipment that we import by ship could not be received on time because of shipping delays and other issues.

Those issues have largely been addressed. I am not saying that everything has returned to normal, but at least we have all been able to find solutions to those issues. We have not reached the pre-war situation, but we have managed to find solutions.

For the new contracts that we are undertaking, we are pricing in the increase in commodity prices and so on.

Regarding shipping, as you mentioned, shipping prices have fallen over the last few days. In contracts, some elements are pass-through and some are not pass-through. These are long-term contracts of 1.5-2 years. If there are fixed-price contracts for certain items, we cannot make immediate, real-time changes to the contract. I hope you appreciate that.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

Whenever such things happen, we try to price them into and absorb them through subsequent contracts. That is the nature of these contracts.

To answer your question, these issues are now largely under control. Everybody has found solutions, in one way or another, to these issues.

Our next-generation turbine is the 4.45-megawatt turbine, which we will launch commercially very soon. The ECS component for that turbine will be sourced within the country. This was one of the components for which we faced challenges in obtaining shipments when the war started.

Once production of the new turbine starts, sometime in January or February, we will have addressed that major issue as well. The component will be procured domestically.

Operator: Thank you very much. We will now take a question from Rohit Priyadarshi. Rohit, you can go ahead.

Management: Hi, Rohit.

Rohit Priyadarshi: Hello, am I audible now?

Management: Yes, you are.

Rohit Priyadarshi: I have a couple of questions. You and all the other wind OEMs are expecting very strong growth in turbine demand this year. Going forward, I believe the windmill towers that we outsource are a large component and may also be a bottleneck for us. Can you share more on this and explain how we will grow despite this bottleneck?

Management: Sorry, what is being outsourced? I missed that part.

Rohit Priyadarshi: I believe windmill towers, which we outsource, are a large component and may be a bottleneck for us. I wanted some clarity on how we are going to grow in this area.

Management: I do not know why you are saying that it is outsourced. We actually manufacture the towers, rotor blades, hubs, and nacelles. Inox Wind manufactures all of these. Therefore, I do not know why you are saying that they are outsourced. We manufacture them.

Regarding your other question on the expected growth in the wind sector, you are absolutely right. In FY26, the country saw the highest-ever installation of wind capacity, at 6.05 gigawatts. This number is expected to increase to 7-10 gigawatts per year over the medium term.

There is a structural reason for this. Discoms now want renewable power as a source of firm power, which is essentially base-load power.

You cannot provide base-load renewable power only through solar or through solar and BESS. This is because you also need a nighttime source of generation. BESS is a source of storage, not a source of generation.

At present, BESS is not economically viable for more than 4 hours of storage. You have sunlight from, say, 6:30 AM to 6:30 PM, which is 12 hours, and you can have 4 hours of storage.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

However, the country has 2 peak-demand periods: 6 AM to 10 AM and 6 PM to 10 PM. Therefore, you need to address both these periods as well as base-load demand and base-load supply.

For this, you need nighttime generation, which at present comes from wind. Therefore, you need wind in your RTC or FDRE contracts.

Given the current level of BESS prices, wind forms approximately 15%-20% of an FDRE project. If BESS prices increase, the wind component also increases.

Eighteen to 24 months ago, the wind component was much larger, at approximately 30%-40% of an FDRE project, because BESS prices were higher. Given that BESS prices have reduced significantly, the wind component is currently approximately 15%-20%.

Therefore, structurally, there is a requirement for wind in the country, and demand will increase to 7-10 gigawatts per year over the medium term. It could also rise above 10 gigawatts, which would be a good scenario for the industry.

In terms of supply, we do not see a challenge in supplying this level of capacity. There is enough production capacity in the country to meet this kind of demand.

Rohit Priyadarshi: On my next question, are these towers widely manufactured products with multiple suppliers, or are there selected suppliers throughout India? Who are the key suppliers for us?

Management: We take supplies of the equipment, commodities, and other items that are required. We have our own established supply chain. As I mentioned earlier, we have been in this business for 16 years. We have factories in 3 states and an established vendor base.

Rohit Priyadarshi: Are we looking to increase the capacity for this?

Management: Given our current capacity, we are not looking to increase our nameplate capacity. Certainly, we are expecting a significant increase in our overall supplies in FY27 as well as FY28.

We will also be starting production of our 4.45-megawatt turbines. We expect to receive the RLMM certification in the next couple of months. Once that is in place, we will start production of those turbines as well.

Our current nameplate capacity is sufficient for the next 2 years. If demand increases significantly in the country, we can review it. However, right now, we are comfortably placed for the next few years with our current nameplate capacity.

Rohit Priyadarshi: How many windmills do we expect to erect this year? Based on our current order book, do we have any guidance?

Management: Our order book is sufficient for more than 2 years. In FY27, we may execute approximately 1-1.1 gigawatts. As a country, we expect to execute more than 7 gigawatts.

Rohit Priyadarshi: Thank you very much for answering my questions, and I wish you all the best.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

Management: Thank you.

Operator: The next question is from Akhilesh.

Akhilesh: Thank you for the opportunity. I hope I am audible.

Management: Yes, Akhilesh, you are.

Akhilesh: I had one question on the shift in strategy. I understand why we have done that, so that we are not affected by delays relating to ROU, ROW, and similar matters when we had a turnkey model.

However, do these issues not still exist at the ground level? They are only transferred to our customers. How are our equipment supply contracts with customers structured? Are customers required to take the turbines on a fixed schedule? If there are delays, is it their responsibility, or do those delays still come back to us?

They may say that they are not getting the land or are not able to move the project forward on time. I want to understand whether the purpose is being served by shifting from the turnkey model to the equipment supply model.

Management: That is a very good question, and thank you for asking it. Ultimately, the ground-level issues are the same, whether we undertake EPC or the customers themselves undertake EPC. You are correct that the ground-level issues do not change.

To answer your question, one of the reasons we are able to move away from turnkey is that some players have, over the last few years, either managed to tie up with or are partnering with people who can undertake EPC work, project development, and project execution.

You would have seen examples of this. They are partnering with people who have the wherewithal, experience, and resources to undertake project development and execution, which is challenging in our country.

They are therefore also able to address these issues, and that is the reason they are willing to take equipment supply contracts only. That is the first part of your question.

The second part is that if we are ready to supply but the customer's site is not ready for any reason, then, when we are undertaking equipment supply, we have the flexibility to supply to any of our other sites that may be in those vicinities. We retain that flexibility.

Also, in project development and EPC, our money gets stuck as well. If deliveries are not absorbed by customers in a timely manner, our funds also remain stuck. In equipment supply, at least, our working capital requirement will be significantly lower. Therefore, it benefits us in both ways.

Akhilesh: Out of the total gigawatts being ordered now, what percentage do you think would be equipment supply? I am trying to understand whether we have vacated a significant part of the market by not undertaking too much turnkey work, and whether our ambition also includes market share.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

Our larger peer had 4 times our revenue as of FY26. I understand that quality of revenue matters, but if there is such strong demand in the sector, could we not grow even faster?

A 75% growth rate, if achieved, would be excellent, but we have the capacity and the technology. Could we accelerate? I am trying to understand how we see our role in the market and whether we are being too selective in terms of the kind of business we want to undertake.

Management: This is again a very good and insightful question. We have also thought about it, to be honest, because while I will not say that we have a target market share, that is not how we operate.

As you rightly mentioned, we are focused on the quality of earnings and the profitability of the business rather than on simply achieving a target market share. That is not what drives us.

However, having said that, we do not think we are letting go of business. In fact, since June, in the last 3–4 months, we have won or received order inflows of 1.8 gigawatts already. We think that is excellent.

It is not that we are simply sitting with that order book. We are also continuing to bid for more orders, and there are more tenders that are open.

Of the 1,800 megawatts, 300 megawatts is turnkey. There are 2 PSU orders in this, and 1.5 gigawatts is from Inox Green. That is also turnkey. Therefore, the entire 1.8 gigawatts that we have won in the last 4 months is turnkey.

What I want to emphasize is that the strategy is to pivot towards equipment supply as much as possible. It does not mean that we will stop undertaking EPC.

One of the other questions you asked was about our current percentage. In our current order book, approximately 40% is turnkey and the balance is equipment supply. We want to take equipment supply to 75%.

However, as I mentioned, we will continue to undertake EPC for work relating to our group company and for PSU orders that require turnkey solutions. Some of our private customers may also require us to undertake EPC, particularly where we have a strong relationship with them. Therefore, it is relationship-based.

To the extent possible, we will try to move towards equipment supply. I am not saying that we are letting go of business. We have actually received order inflows of 1.8 gigawatts in the last 3–4 months. I think that is a very strong performance, and we are now focused on executing those projects.

The way we see it, in FY28, we are targeting equipment deliveries of anywhere between 1.3 and 1.5 gigawatts. Thereafter, in FY29, we may want to reach approximately 2 gigawatts of supplies.

If the country executes 8 or 8.5 gigawatts, then 2 gigawatts out of approximately 8 or 9 gigawatts would give us a market share of approximately 15%–20%. We are comfortable with that.

If the country executes more than 10 gigawatts in a year, we can certainly review our capacity. We are already very close to launching our 4.45-megawatt turbines, and we will also start applying for

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

the next generation of turbines.

We have already found a partner for the license because a new technology has a 3-year start-to-finish gestation period. We have already started working on the next generation of turbines beyond 4.45 megawatts.

Akhilesh, we are completely focused on growing the business. It is not that we are becoming complacent. As you rightly mentioned, if the company delivers 75% growth, it is not easy to deliver that kind of growth on an already decent revenue base.

Analyst1: I have one last set of questions. What is the current average realization?

Management: Current average what? Realization?

Analyst1: Average realization.

Management: Average realization depends on the mix of turbines and on whether the scope is EPC or equipment supply.

Normally, for a full EPC scope, it can be in the range of 6.5-7 crores per megawatt. It depends on the scope, the machines, and the other aspects of the work.

Operator: The next question is from Mr. Ujjwal {? SIL ?}.

Management: Hi, Ujjwal.

Operator: I think he is not there.

Management: I think Ujjwal is on mute.

Operator: Ujjwal, I have already given you permission to speak. I will take the next question from Sameer Chheda. Sameer, please ask your question.

Management: Hi, Sameer.

Sameer Chheda: I want to understand the previous question. I want to know the per-megawatt realization for the wind turbine only.

Management: I actually answered that. I answered it for an EPC contract.

Sameer Chheda: No, not EPC. I mean only the wind turbine that we supply.

Management: The difference between EPC and limited scope is approximately 1.1-1.3 crores per megawatt.

Sameer Chheda: Sorry, I did not understand what you mean.

Management: There is a difference of approximately 1.1-1.3 crores per megawatt between EPC and a limited scope of work.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

Sameer Chheda: Do we have a 20% margin on the wind turbine, on EPC, or is that the blended margin for the company?

Management: It is the consolidated margin for the company. We do not provide segment-wise EBITDA margins. We do not provide different margins for each business. We provide consolidated margins.

This is the consolidated margin for Inox Wind, including the 2 subsidiaries. That is why I mentioned that we are not officially changing it yet, but there is an upward bias to it. I can explain this further if you would like clarity.

Operator: The next question is from Mr. Darshil Jhaveri.

Management: Hi, Darshil.

Darshil Jhaveri: Thank you for taking my question, and thank you for such a detailed answer. I wanted to understand whether the 75% revenue growth that you mentioned factors in the acquisition-led consolidation, or whether it is on a standalone basis without the line-by-line consolidation of the acquisition.

Management: It is consolidated and includes the acquisition.

Darshil Jhaveri: That is helpful. Regarding the following year, we would have some part of the acquisition coming in for half of the year and the other acquisition coming in for nearly the full year. Could you help us understand what the following year could look like?

Management: Do you mean FY28 guidance?

Darshil Jhaveri: Yes.

Management: We have not released FY28 guidance yet, but I mentioned what we are targeting in terms of equipment supplies. Next year, in FY28, we are targeting supplies of approximately 1.2-1.5 gigawatts.

This is for the standalone business. We have not yet set out guidance for the subsidiary, but all I can say at this point is that the subsidiary, Inox Green, as well as Inox Renewable Solutions, are very strongly placed.

We do feel that FY27, particularly the exit quarter, Q4, will be a turnaround quarter for Inox Green Energy.

Inox Renewable Solutions generated approximately 600 crores of revenue in FY26. In Q1, Inox Renewable Solutions has already generated 200 crores of revenue.

Therefore, we certainly feel that FY27, and particularly the exit quarter, Q4, will be a very strong turnaround period for our companies.

Darshil Jhaveri: That is very detailed. That is all from my side. Thank you very much.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

Operator: The next question is from Mr. Shrikanth Reddy.

Management: Hi, Shrikanth.

Shrikanth Reddy: I have 2 questions. What kind of inquiries are we receiving for offshore wind installations?

Management: We do not undertake offshore supplies. We are a domestic supplier and undertake domestic business. We already have enough order book to keep us busy for more than 2 years.

Right now, for equipment supply, we are not looking at the offshore business. However, on the O&M side, we could consider undertaking offshore work. By offshore, did you mean exports?

Shrikanth Reddy: No. I was referring to Gujarat and Tamil Nadu, where there is a viability gap. That is what I meant.

Management: My mistake. I understood it as exports.

Regarding offshore wind, let it first happen. All of us have been hearing about offshore wind for the last 15-20 years. Let it first happen.

We already have significant greenfield capacity available in the country for wind—approximately 1,000 gigawatts, depending on which sector report you refer to. There are so many domestic onshore greenfield sites available. Therefore, let offshore wind first happen.

I have not seen any tenders from our clients looking for offshore wind turbines.

Shrikanth Reddy: One more question. As we mentioned, we are moving towards the backward integration of power electronics and inverter manufacturing. Will these components be sourced within India, or will we depend on Taiwan, Japan, or other countries? Since these are electronic components, will we be able to find vendors in India for this new initiative?

Management: We have a diversified vendor base for this, both domestically and offshore. For any parts that need to be imported, our team will identify the best sources of supply because commercial considerations will matter in identifying our panel of vendors.

Many factors will matter, including timely availability, timely supplies, pricing, commercial terms, and the strength of the counterparty. We have a panel of vendors, and our supply chain team will make the best decisions around this.

Operator: A question has been asked about the difference between organic and inorganic growth, referring to this year's numbers.

Management: In Inox Wind standalone, there is no acquisition. Inox Renewable also has no acquisition. The only acquisition in this umbrella is Inox Green.

As I mentioned, Wind World generated 580 crores of revenue. We acquired it through the NCLT process. It generated revenue of 580 crores in FY26, with an escalation of approximately 5% every year. Therefore, broadly, it would generate approximately 610 crores of revenue in FY27.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

Depending on the timing, we will not {? find ?} it possible to start consolidating it from the first day of H2, but the delay may be only a few days. Let us assume that the entire H2 will give us approximately 300 crores of revenue consolidation from Wind World.

From the other acquisition, 1 quarter should give us approximately 60-70 crores of revenue, in Q4 alone.

I would also like to add that once we become shareholders of these entities—we are not shareholders at present—our teams will identify significant opportunities for both cost reduction and increasing the revenue streams.

Once we become shareholders, we will start realizing the integration benefits. Therefore, our numbers will increase for both acquisitions, in terms of revenue as well as EBITDA. We will share more information on these aspects as we move forward.

Out of the total consolidated revenue of Inox Wind in FY27, we are not expecting more than approximately 400 crores of revenue contribution from acquisitions. This is less than 5%, or approximately 5%, of the projected consolidated revenue.

Operator: Thank you very much. The next question is from Mr. Aryan Kadam. Aryan, please ask your question. Please keep it to only 1 question because there are 2 more people whom I would like to accommodate.

Aryan Kadam: I wanted to know the amount for which we acquired these entities.

Management: We have already disclosed the first transaction. For Wind World O&M, we paid 550 crores as the acquisition value.

The EBITDA will be quite attractive. As we move forward, we will be able to disclose the details, possibly in the next analyst call or in the Q2-end analyst call that we will schedule.

It is a very attractive EBITDA multiple because we acquired it through the NCLT process.

Regarding the second transaction, we have not yet been able to disclose the value because the process is still ongoing. However, we can share that this transaction is also being undertaken through the NCLT process. We also expect this to have a very attractive multiple.

There is a lot of work to be done because both of these entities have been in the NCLT process.

Enercon was obviously a very well-regarded OEM at one time. Due to various reasons, including the change in the country's wind pricing regime from feed-in tariffs to an auction-based system, as well as other reasons, the company entered the NCLT process in February 2018.

The other entity has also been in the NCLT process for many years. Therefore, there is a lot of work to be done.

The fact that these entities are doing this much despite being in the NCLT process is commendable. These were good portfolios; otherwise, they would simply have remained stuck.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

Management: Many players went bankrupt when the regime changed for wind in 2017. As of now, I can only say that the multiple for the second acquisition is also very attractive in our view. We will share those details as we make progress. I hope that is fine.

Operator: The next question is from Mr. Jay Kumar Simbavasan. Jaya, please keep your question to only 1.

Jay Kumar Simbavasan: Thank you. Good evening, ma'am. Thank you for the explanation.

Over the last 2 quarters, year-on-year growth has been subdued, whereas orders have continued to increase, not only for you and your peers but across the industry. Everybody is reporting lower revenue.

Is this because the production cycle is longer and the impact will be reflected in subsequent quarters? Or could the reason be that we have heard that customers using wind power are not achieving their ROI and are therefore not willing to take more and more wind energy? I may be wrong, but these are the inputs I have. Please help us understand why this is not reflecting in the numbers.

Management: I have probably explained the reason for the sluggish growth in Q4 and Q1. At the beginning itself, I explained that in detail.

Jay Kumar Simbavasan: I joined late. I apologize.

Management: Okay. I will explain it very briefly because I want to take the second part of your question, which has not been discussed.

If you are okay with it, I will take the second part of your question first because we are short on time.

There is no situation in which customers are unwilling to take wind power because they are achieving lower ROI. We are one of the old OEMs in the country. We are one of the 2 OEMs that survived the pricing regime change in the country in 2017.

Our machines are very well accepted by customers. I have also been on the IPP side for many years, so I have a broad view of all the wind turbine generator vendors in the country, both domestic and foreign.

I have personally seen all the commercial terms, including both capex and opex. What I can tell you is that Inox Wind is very favorably placed and perceived by customers on an overall basis. By overall basis, I mean both capex and opex.

For wind IPPs, ROI depends on multiple factors, including plant PLFs, interest costs, and other factors, because interest and depreciation are the main expense items for an IPP.

O&M accounts for only approximately 8%-10%, and O&M is very important for the plant availability factor, or PAF, of the plants. PLF depends significantly on PAF.

If the plants are maintained and operated properly, then the PAFs will be maintained. If the wind resource is available, then PLFs will also be generated.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.

For an IPP, especially a wind IPP, a significant part of the ROI depends on the financing terms, financing structures, and how the capex and opex are negotiated.

There is not much scope on certain elements, but overall, everything matters, including PAF, financing terms, and the other factors.

Therefore, it is not that customers are taking less wind power because they are not achieving the ROI. If that were the case, we would never have reached 6 gigawatts of installations as a country.

The trajectory is very clear for the medium term, at 7–10 gigawatts annually. If the microeconomics were not good, the macroeconomics could not have been good.

Jay Kumar Simbavasan: So your customers are achieving their ROI?

Management: They do not share that information with us, but I have been on the IPP side, so I can share these insights with you.

Our customers will not tell us what ROI they are achieving. If they tell us that they are achieving excellent ROI, they would be giving away their negotiating leverage. They do not have to tell us, and there is no reason for them to tell us.

However, I happen to know this because I have been on the IPP side for 15–20 years. Therefore, I know the economics, which I am sharing with you.

If there are more points you would like to discuss, I am happy to have a separate discussion. I am just conscious of the time.

Operator: We will take one last question, with 1 minute remaining. The last question is from Amit Jain. Amit, you can ask the question, but please keep it very short. We have to close in 2 minutes.

Are you there, Amit? So, I think he is not there.

Thank you very much. On behalf of Arihant Capital, I would like to thank Ms. Sultania and wish her all the best for the future. I would also like to thank all the participants on the call.

We believe this is an interesting revival story, and I think we are going to see a good growth story for FY27 and FY28.

Thank you very much. On behalf of Arihant Capital, I would like to thank the management of Inox Wind Ltd. May we conclude the call now, please? Thank you.

Management: Thank you for the opportunity. Good evening.

Note: {? ... ?} indicates a figure or name where audio clarity was insufficient for confident transcription. Verify against the source audio or the company's published filings.

Report is AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies.