# stek

# **GEOTHERMIE NEDERLAND Geothermal projects: project finance documentation** 31 October 2023 Katinka van den Brink & Herman Wamelink



### 1. Introduction Stek

2. Typical geothermal project financing structure

stek

- 3. Documentation phase
- 4. Structural risks
- 5. Resulting financing challenges
- 6. Bespoke finance structuring
- 7. Key take aways

# **INTRODUCTION STEK**

- Independent law firm based in Amsterdam
- Gradually expanded to around 70 attorneys
- Four main practice areas: Corporate, Finance, Dispute Resolution & Regulated Markets
- Strong sector focus on energy
- Experience with a number of geothermal projects  $\rightarrow$



### **TYPICAL GEOTHERMAL PROJECT FINANCING STRUCTURE**



### **DOCUMENTATION PHASE**



## **DOCUMENTATION PHASE**

- <u>Documentation phase can be lengthy Financial Close will only be reached if all CPs are satisfied</u>
- Finance documents, project documents, irrevocable permits & subsidies to be in place
- Due diligence:
  - Technical DD
  - Legal DD
  - Insurance advice
  - Financial advice (financial model, prepared/diligenced by an external expert party)
- Legal DD specifics:
  - Large number of project documents with variety of contract terms (i.e. not one EPC Agreement)
  - Adaptation to the market: difficulty to obtain a fixed price, security and penalty structure
  - Permits
  - Structuring / ownership

### **TYPICAL PROJECT FINANCING STRUCTURE**

### Cashflow

- Cashflow is 'fixed' on financial close on the basis of signed project documents
- Project costs are based on long term fixed price contracts with penalties on performance/timing
- Revenue is based on long term fixed price contracts (and subsidy)

### **Debt structuring**

- Investors provide their funds on an 'equity first' basis
- Bank debt is based on a maximum gearing (bank debt as a % of total project costs) and a minimum DSCR (cashflow to debt service)
- Repayments are often sculpted to match the income streams

# **STRUCTURAL RISKS**

- Geological risk: uncertain whether bankable capacity will be found
  - Capacity uncertainty impacts planning for project costs (both for the well and the network)
  - Capacity uncertainty also impacts planning for off-takers
- **Drilling risk**: uncertain what the drilling costs will be
- **Permitting framework** (new): requiring separate permits for exploration, drilling and operation of the well
- Regulatory: uncertainty on ownership of heat network mandatory public ownership? Role of EBN?





### **RESULTING FINANCING CHALLENGES**

- Uncertain drilling outcome & related costs → uncertainty on bankability
- Not all project documents are entered into pre-financial close
- Not all project costs are fixed pre-financial close
- Not all project cash flows are fixed pre-financial close
- Not all permits are obtained pre-financial close
- Interdependency well and network → separate ownership and separate financings?
- How can this be made to work?

Addressing the geological risk and drilling risk:

#### To be structured as equity risk

- Or (RNES) insurance
- Or guarantee from the drilling company

#### Equity to fund contingencies

- Impact 'funding shortfall'
- With equity true up?

#### Debt quantum conditional on well capacity

- For the well borrower and (if a separate financing also) for the network borrower
- Amount to be drawn dependent on well capacity
- Lenders have a say on continuation of drilling on the basis of a well test (GO / No GO)
- Lenders have a say on capex once the well capacity is known both for the well and network

Addressing uncertainty on project documents and permits:

#### **Restrictions on termination rights in key contract documents**

- Also in contacts between the well and network what if the well borrower can no longer fulfil its payment obligations under the heat transport agreement?
- What if the heat that can be transported by the network is less than the geothermal power?

#### Documentation

- Off-take contacts to be flexible: whereas off-taker is bound to pay for supply, no obligation for the SPV to supply (minimum) capacity
- Project documents signed after Financial Close to be satisfactory to the lender (based on a pre-agreed format)
- Obtaining remaining project documents as a drawdown condition

#### **Permitting framework**

• Obtaining remaining permits (and subsidies) as a drawdown condition

#### <u>Required security structure:</u>

#### Day 1 security package as a CP for Financial Close

- Share security SPV
- Mortgage over the installation/network
- Security over receivables, movables, bank accounts
- Guarantees from project parties

#### Step in rights / direct agreements

• May not be available for all contracts, most important contracts to be determined

# Security over the relevant part of the network as a condition subsequent



Mitigation of interdependency risks in separate financings for the well and network:

#### **Continued alignment of the financiers of the well and the network:**

- Restrictions on transfer by the financiers
- Restrictions on refinancing by the borrower

#### **Continued alignment of the investors of the well and the network:**

• Change of control linked to investors in both the well and network

#### **Cross-over information undertakings:**

 As long as financiers are the same – information provided under either the well or network financing is available

### **KEY TAKE AWAYS**

- 1) Documentation phase can be lengthy
- 2) Availability of debt dependent on well capacity
- 3) Not all project documents and permits available at Financial Close
- 4) Remaining uncertainties to be addressed as a drawdown condition
- 5) Interdependency risks well and network to be addressed





#### Katinka van den Brink



katinka.vandenbrink@stek.com +31 6 1872 0338 +31 20 530 5267

#### Herman Wamelink



herman.wamelink@stek.com +31 6 1375 6471 +31 20 530 5214



# Thank you for your attention!

+31 20 530 52 00 | Leidseplein 29 | 1017 PS Amsterdam www.stek.com

AN EAST