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## Company Description

## Ticker

B00T
Last close (181121)
US\$96.53
12M Target Price
US\$142.60
+/- Potential
+39.7\%
GICS Sector
GICS Subindustry
Consumer Discretionary
1Y Price Change vs. Relative Index (SPX)


## Company Description

Boot Barn Holdings, Inc. is a lifestyle retailer of western and work-related footwear, apparel, and accessories in the United States. The Company operates through two segments: retail stores and e-commerce. The Company carries an assortment of denim, western shirts, cowboy hats, belts and belt buckles, western-style jewellery, and accessories.

## Key Financials

Market Cap
US $\$ 2.82 b$
Basic Shares 0/S
29.67 m

Free Float
52-Wk High-Low 99.47\%

Fiscal Year End
US\$66.58 - US\$134.50

| (US\$ m) | FY20A | FY21A | FY22E | FY23E |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Store Count | 259 | 273 | 300 | 330 |
| Same-store <br> sales | 2.788 | 2.656 | 4.333 | 4.473 |
| Revenue | 845.6 | 893.5 | $1,487.9$ | $1,726.8$ |
| Gr Rate (\%) | $8.8 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ |
| EBIT Margin <br> (\%) | $8.7 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ |

Key Executives
Jim Conroy
Chief Executive Officer
Jim Watkins

We are initiating coverage of Boot Barn Holdings ("BOOT) with a BUY rating and a US $\mathbf{1 4 2 . 6 0} 12 \mathrm{M}$ price target.

## 3Q22 Earnings Highlights

- Net sales and operating income increased $60.7 \%$ and $5.2 \%$ YoY.
- Retail Stores generated third quarter net sales of $\$ 397 \mathrm{~m}$, implying YoY growth of $64 \%$.
- E-commerce generated record net sales of $\$ 90 \mathrm{~m}$, implying YoY growth of 49\%.
- Same store sales increased 54.2\% YoY, comprising an increase in retail same store sales of $55.7 \%$ and an increase in e-commerce same store sales of $48.4 \%$


## Investment Thesis

- BOOT's unique defensive growth business model and extensive supply chain is less susceptible to market shocks unique product mix of western and work wear and supply chain advantages relative to "mom-and-pop" competitors suggests that share price drag from negative sentiment on consumer discretionary sector is unjustified
- BOOT's position as the largest western wear retailer is a competitive advantage - enable BOOT to continue preferentially consolidating brand loyalty, drive its premium multi-brand development strategy, thus contributing to a stellar margin expansion story.
- BOOT's growth potential in the future is likely to be underestimated by the market - better same store economics alongside supportive macroeconomic conditions will enable BOOT's acquisition strategy to result in a sustainable competitive advantage, hedging against competition and new entry


## Catalysts

- Worsening macroeconomic pressures from supply chain bottle neck and inflationary pressures may boost BOOT expansion opportunities as "mom-and-pop" shops are unable to resist
- BOOT exceeding expatiations for same-store sales growth in spite of negative market sentiment towards the tough macroeconomic environment may counter existing overhang over BOOT share price
- Increased recognition of western fashion and its subcategories into mainstream fashion will augment future expansion into currently underpenetrated regions


## Valuations

Our 12M price target at the date of coverage is US\$142.60, which was derived from a bottom-up DCF valuation approach.

## Investment Risks

- Increase in cost pressures from tight labour market and sustained supply chain shortage may prevent aggressive store expansion
- Failure in BOOT geographical expansion arising from poorer new store economics might hamper store expansion strategy
- Inability to continuously capture consumer apparel preferences might erode existing comparative advantage in Western market

Figure 1: Customer Mix
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Figure 2: Brands Carried


Source: BOOT

Figure 3: Product Mix
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Figure 4: Sales Channel Mix
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## Company Overview

Founded in 1978, and based in Irvine, California, Boot Barn Holdings Inc ("BOOT") engages in the operation of retail stores of western and work-related footwear, apparel, and accessories for men, women, and children (Figure 1).

BOOT is the largest lifestyle retail chain, offering its loyal customer base a wide selection of work and lifestyle brands through 293 physical stores in 37 states. BOOT store environment, product offering, and marketing materials represent the aesthetics of the true American West, country music and rugged, outdoor work. The retail stores are typically freestanding or located in strip centres, averaging 10,500 selling square feet and feature a comprehensive assortment of brand and styles. BOOT carries both internal label and third-party western wear brands (Figure 2), offering a large selection of boots, shirts, jackets, hats, belts and belt buckles, handbags, western-style jewellery, rugged footwear, outerwear, overalls, denim, and flame-resistant and high-visibility clothing (Figure 3).

BOOT has expanded its distribution channel beyond brick-andmortar retail by providing e-commerce channels for its loyal customer base (Figure 4), most notable via www.bootbarn.com. BOOT has furthered its e-commerce capabilities through its strategic acquisitions of Sherplers, the nation's leading pure play online western and Country Outfitter, an e-commerce site selling to customers who live a country lifestyle.

BOOT majority shareholder are institutional investors that hold $88.74 \%$ of the outstanding shares ownership of BOOT. Out of the institutional investors, BlackRock holds the greatest number of shares at approximately $14 \%$ followed by $8.43 \%$ held by The Vanguard Group. The shareholder structure can be further broken down into $50.27 \%$ mutual fund holders, $38.47 \%$ other institutional holders and $24.49 \%$ held by individual stakeholders. Insider ownings account for $0.40 \%$ of the shares.

## 3Q22 Earnings Review

- Net sales increased from $\$ 302 \mathrm{~m}$ to $\$ 486 \mathrm{~m}$, implying YoY growth of 61\%
- Operating income increased from $\$ 50.6 \mathrm{~m}$ to $\$ 92.2 \mathrm{~m}$, implying YoY growth of 4.2\%
- Retail Stores generated third quarter net sales of $\$ 90 \mathrm{~m}$, implying YoY growth of 64\%
- E-commerce generated third quarter net sales of $\$ 18.3 \mathrm{~m}$, implying YoY growth of 49\%
- Same store sale sales increased $54.2 \%$ YoY, retail same store sales increased $55.7 \%$ YoY, E-commerce same store sales increased 48.4\% YoY
- Merchandise margin increased 2.7\% YoY
- GAAP Earnings Per Share was $\$ 2.27$, implying YoY growth of $127 \%$, representing a 4 year $42 \%$ CAGR

Figure 5: Casualization Trend


Source: Wall Street Journal

Figure 6: Companies Relaxing Work Wear
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Figure 7: Global Luxury Apparel Mkt (USD Bn)
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Figure 8: Porter's 5 Forces


Source: Team Estimates

## Industry Outlook

## COVID-19 accelerated casualization of work wear

Casualization of office wear was a growing trend since the 1990s, with casual wear evolving more of a daily occurrence rather than a mere "Casual Friday" occasion. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated such trends. With majority of working professionals working from home for more than 2 years, the pandemic has caused how workers consider their working clothing choices, with many indicating their intentions to dress more comfortably (Figure 5).

Companies have responded to such shifting preferences; with more companies intending to relax their dress code (Figure 6), with $40 \%$ of all companies expanding casual dress options in the last 3 years. Such a move is likely to be driven by the numerous benefits from casualization of workwear, enhancing employee morale, fostering camaraderie within the office, and ultimately increasing productivity.

However, companies are still concerned with maintaining professionalism and pristine company image. To strike a balance between formal and casual wear, companies have opted for a "presentable, not preppy" approach. The luxury wear market is poised to benefit from such a trend (Figure 7), whereby employees remain comfortable yet appear fashionable and professional.

## Porter's Five Forces

## Threat of competition - Low

There are "mom-and-pop" retailers in the western wear market that individually have insignificant market share. Additionally, BOOT has differentiated itself from adopting a premium positioning, making it resistant to competitor's price competition strategies.

## Threat of new entrants - Moderate to High

While there are little to no barriers to entry in the western wear industry, as seen in the high number of "mom-and-pop" retailers, new entrants will incur significant costs to achieve a comparable offline and online presence to truly compete with BOOT as a major retailer.

## Threat of substitutes - Low to Moderate

BOOT's in-house brands are sold exclusively via its internal distribution channels. BOOT's house of brand strategy also enables it to be a one-stop shop, an advantage that cannot be quickly replicated by competitors.

## Bargaining power of customers / payers - Low to Moderate

BOOT largely targets retail western wear enthusiasts that have limited bargaining power, especially when considering the niche market segments that BOOT solely addresses.

## Bargaining power of suppliers - Low

BOOT has the strongest offline and online presence in the western wear industry. BOOT also deals with numerous suppliers due to the homogenous nature of apparel goods.

Figure 9: BOOT's share price moves in tandem with consumer discretionary trends


## Source: Refinitiv

Figure 10: B00T's product line characteristics that allow it to benefit from both discretionary seasonality and defensiveness


Source: Refinitiv

Figure 11: B00T's product mix
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## Investment Thesis

1. BOOT has been dragged down by broader economic sentiment on consumer discretionary, but its unique defensive growth model and dominance over western retail wear suggests that sentiments are unjustified

Economic crises have proven to be periods of weakness, but BOOT's unique product mix allows them to hedge against such pressures while benefiting from discretionary growth

BOOT'S stock price movement has been consistently in line with the overall consumer discretionary index (XLY) (Figure 9). The fall in BOOT and the index were all attributable to similar negative macroeconomic factors such as the 1) Covid-19 lockdown, 2) inflationary pressures and supply chain bottlenecks.

However, we believe the market is underestimating BOOT's defensive nature and recovery potential significantly when compared to the overall consumer discretionary industry. BOOT has shown resilience even during periods of general economic weakness. While BOOT suffers the same seasonality as its peers as a result of its discretionary product mix during normal economic periods, its ability to defensively sell essential work wear allows it to hedge against downturns and periods of general retail weakness. During seasonal sale declines, BOOT's sales were generally on par with competitors at around -20\% quarter on quarter. However, while retail sales plunged $53 \%$ at around Q1 2020 due to the emergence of the pandemic, B00T's sales were affected less at a decline of $33.6 \%$. BOOT recovers slower than peers as a result of this, however, as we can observe with sustained declines in Q2 as well while general retail optimism recovered in that period, but these recoveries were typically accompanied by outsized revenue growth in the following quarter (Figure 10). This is testament to BOOT's ability to demonstrate both defensive and discretionary characteristics, that we believe will be a key advantage in outperforming during periods of economic weakness.

We can attribute this to the nature of the product mix that has approximately $33 \%$ of BOOT's revenue generated from work wear related products (Figure 11). These work wears are expected to remain in demand even during periods of economic weakness because they are often tied with industries that remain necessities.

Additionally, B00T's stores are also highly concentrated in California with 53 stores and another 58 stores in Texas. For Texas, most of the payroll belongs to the trade, transportation and utilities industry (Figure 12). As for California, a majority belongs to trade, transportation and utilities, education and health services and government (Figure 13). Due to these industries being classified as essentials and less cyclical in nature, we expect these states to be more resilient in periods of economic hardness. As a result, we believe that not only BOOT's business being more resilient, but the major areas it operates in are also less discretionary. This ultimately allows BOOT business to be relatively less discretionary despite operating in the retail industry.

Furthermore, they have still enjoyed significant growth after periods of retail weakness because their remaining product mix is discretionary fashion, which they are poised to shift to once the

Figure 12: BOOT's concentration in Texas tilts towards economically resilient industries, enabling its defensive characteristics


Source: US Bureau of Labor Statistics

Figure 13: B00T's concentration in California also enables its defensiveness at times


Source: US Bureau of Labor Statistics
recovery is seen. This is unlike retail players in the broader retail that have less of an ability to exhibit this hybrid defensive/discretionary nature. For example, Abercrombie and fitch which owns brands such as Hollister and Social Tourist that are focused on lifestyle wear with a carefree style. Likewise, company like Gap that owns brands such as Banana Republic and Athleta also focuses more on similar fashion styles and have no segments that are dedicated to work wear. As such, this provides BOOT a competitive advantage of being able to pivot their product mix to suit the current economic status to either cushion the drop in demand or to ride on the recovery.

Within the specialty retail western wear segment, BOOT's positioning as the largest western wear retailer gives them the ability to be nimbler in supply chain distribution vs competitors

BOOT main competitors are mom-and-pops, that has a much lesser presence in the United States. BOOT currently has 299 stores, more than $3 x$ the stores of its closest competitor Cavender with 91 stores attributable to its strong track records of acquisitions. With a larger retail presence, we expect that BOOT has a much larger bargaining power as compared to the rest of its competitors. This allows BOOT to be in a better position to form exclusive direct to store partnerships with their suppliers that their competitors will have less of due to their smaller size. This is evident whereby $75 \%$ of BOOT inventory are kept in stock through automated replenishment programs with the suppliers. This allows suppliers to deliver goods every day to ensure in-stock merchandise availability and a steady flow of new inventory for BOOT's customers. This competitive advantage that BOOT has is further reinforced in Q3 earnings call whereby management highlighted how BOOT can move their product through a supply chain at perhaps a better rate than the third-party brands in totality.

Moving forward, due to BOOT's unique product mix of having work wear, it allows BOOT to be less discretionary in nature reducing the negative implications during periods of retail weakness. Furthermore, with its relatively extensive supply chain, we expect BOOT to be less susceptible to supply chain shocks than its competitors.
2. BOOT's position as the largest western wear retailer is a competitive advantage that will enable them to continue preferentially consolidating brand loyalty, drive its premium multi-brand development strategy, thus contributing to a stellar margin expansion story.

A core lack of differentiability between product features in retail apparel suggest that there are limited dimensions that producers can compete on. With actual product features such as quality level, designs and packaging commoditizing among western retailers, traditional marketing theory points us to only core customer value and post-sales experience as a possible area to add value in. In these two aspects, BOOT has largely been able to cater towards the needs of customers.

There has been significant growth in previously underserved western wear markets, particularly in fashion-conscious women and in casual categories, which have been recognized by BOOT

Aside from serving its core demographic of men, BOOT has also expanded its exclusive labels targeting niche and growing demographics that remain underserved in larger markets. For example. BOOT has expanded beyond generalist and work wear into

Figure 14: BOOT's house of brands strategy


Source: BOOT

Figure 15: Core demographic of men, but women categories remain a rising star


Source: BOOT

Figure 16: Examples of BOOT's womenoriented SKUs under Shyanne and Idyllwind


Source: BOOT

Figure 17: Two-year sales growth as of Q3'21 show a bright spot in growth for women apparel


Source: BOOT ICR Conference Jan 2022
artist inspired, country and rodeo subsegments (Figure 14). More recently, there has been a recent trend that suggest growth in younger and more fashion-conscious female customers. While men's boots, clothing and work wear makes up nearly two-thirds of the company sales, women's fashion, with less than one-fourth of sales, represents a strong potential category that has recently emerged (Figure 15).

To address this, BOOT has created more fashion-forward and aspirational women fashion under the Wonderwest umbrella catering to the fast-growing women's fashion industry (Figure 16). Specifically, Shyanne offers SKUs of higher fashion, mixing in western and bohemian influences with a flair of fashion that speaks to aspirational country girl values. We can contrast this with Idyllwind, which is a lifestyle brand that targets young and casual "girl-next-door" female consumer in a fusion between modern and traditional western wear.

This rising segmentation comes at the intersection of the two crossroads of casualization and women fashion - evidenced by stellar metrics reported by BOOT. In BOOT's SKU mix, two years sales growth for ladies' boots and apparel at 95\% CAGR have outpaced total growth at $71 \%$ and other non-fashion SKUs at $63 \%$ (Figure 17). The significantly lower growth without fashion SKUs highlights the importance of this category.

## B00T has been ahead of its peers in recognizing these needs and expanding on its exclusive label driven house of brand strategy.

BOOT has specifically expanded its private in-house brands to cater to women under the Wonderwest umbrella. Its promotion strategy clearly highlights a clear intention to target the underlying aspirational and fashion-forward looking women - BOOT utilizes of elaborate poses and facial expression and imagery more common in high fashion luxury products, augmented with fashion shows showing off their luxury and women range. This falls in line with the previously identified need to target this higher growth segment.

The decoupling from the rugged "ranch girl" image is also clear, as evident in deliberate utilization of backgrounds that are distant from traditional "western badlands". (Figure 18)

For peers, female-targeted SKUs still use simple and relaxed poses, and even supposed fashion labels still appear to edge more towards casual than high fashion. For instance, Ariat's (one of top 5 brands that are not BOOT's) women western Spring 2022 collection supposedly targets fashion, but marketing collaterals only highlight (1) bachelorettes in (2) casual urban environments with (3) girl-nextdoor vibes. This is similar to Idyllwind's casual female consumer that have promotional strategies that are portray the same image, suggesting that Ariat has not truly targeted true female fashion. (Figure 19)

Note the contrast between the individualistic/ aspirational looks that BOOT's promotion strategy projects versus that of other peers. This seems to suggest that even though product lines do exist targeting the female consumer, they have not sufficiently recognized the rise of this new segmentation, and neither have they targeted it.

In contrast with legacy national brands that are slow in reacting to evolving shopper trends, BOOT is seen to be more agile in identifying

Figure 18: Marketing collaterals used in Wonderwest x Boot Barn Fall/Winter Collection


Source: BOOT

Figure 19: Marketing collaterals used in Ariat's Fall/Winter collection


Source: Ariat Autumn/Winter women's western fashion collection

Figure 20: Marketing collaterals used in Shepler's Black Friday Sales focus on discounting


Source: Cavenders
growing markets and has shifting their product mix accordingly through exclusive labels.

BOOT is thus well positioned to communicate value in line with needs and wants, allowing them to command a price premium. Swiftly addressing needs and wants is also pivotal in helping BOOT achieve greater brand loyalty, as customers are encouraged to continue purchasing products that they desire. This also explains why BOOT never offers discounts on its products and has committed to a full price selling model away from past marketing strategies that focused on price. In contrast, competing retailers and brands are more reliant on the presence of discounts and sales on the product itself. (Figure 20).

## B00T's retail advantage is critical to long term customer brand loyalty

BOOT's ability to segment and identify customers compounded by its strong offline presence. BOOT's traditional position as a retailer has been considered a key strength, having 299 stores in 36 states which dwarfs the competition, making BOOT the largest western retailer in the US (Figure 21). Additionally, BOOT has other offline channels such as BOOT barn hall, a 15000 sq ft music venue where BOOT conducts rodeos, stock shows and concerts (Figure 22). Such offline presence allow BOOT to become synonymous with western lifestyles and customers, enabling them to collect first party data and customer observations, deepening their understanding of the customer base as they further expand their exclusive labels into niche and underserved markets. For instance, BOOT will be able to use such data to perform segmentation analysis as certain western activities become more popular, identifying new customers segments to target before competitor brands become privy to such information.

Additionally, BOOT's retail advantage supports its omnichannel capabilities. With its acquisition of Sherplers and Country Outfitters, BOOT expanded its dominance beyond its retail advantage, becoming the leading wester e-commerce player, dwarfing its closest competitor Cavender's (Figure 23). BOOT is uniquely positioned to provide a superior omnichannel offering to its customers. BOOT's retail advantage supports its e-commerce capabilities by enhancing the feasibility of same day delivery, fulfilling online demand more efficiently. This translates into high customer satisfaction due to added convenience and delivery compared to e-commerce offerings from brands that have weaker retail presence.

Additionally, BOOT's B Rewarded Program serves as a flywheel to further consolidate brand equity by locking customers into the BOOT brand. Such loyalty programs present customers with an additional dimension of service that is associated with the broader Boot Barn brand. With value-added services such as cost savings, special birthday offers and early access to sales, customers are encouraged to continue purchasing from the BOOT, which indirectly translate to a greater opportunity to sell their own internal brands and therefore greater revenue in the long run. Note that the cost savings and discounts are separate concepts from selling at full-price - BOOT's products themselves are not discounted, and since customers attribute the decrease in price to their own repeated spend and not a decrease in base value of the product, the products are able to maintain their premium value. This loyalty program has seen significant traction in the past years and the member count has grown to be greater than

Figure 21: Number of stores of BOOT vs competitors emphasize its strong offline presence


Source: Various

Figure 22: Example of marketing collateral for Boot Barn Hall which is used as a channel to promote the western lifestyle


Source: BOOT

Figure 23: BOOT's website traffic vs competitors highlights superior omnichannel capabilities


[^0]4million. In addition, almost half of BOOT's transaction count come from recurring customers, showing the impact such loyalty programs have on top-line growth.

Lastly, BOOT's large retail presence together gives them the opportunity to consolidate their various high-quality brands under the "Boot Barn" brand equity. In comparison to the highly fragmented western retail market, consisting of mainly "mom and pop shops", this consolidated brand image is likely to invoke stronger long term marketing response from customers. As a retailer controlling the physical real estate of products within their store, BOOT is also able to position its products better, in a way that occupies more premium instore real estate than competitor brands can. This will be beneficial in helping BOOT to effectively project the image that they want their core customers to identify with in purchasing their products. For instance, TV screens that showcase a western fashion show using their products can be placed beside their own brands to give off the image of luxury fashion, versus competing products that are simply displayed on a rack. BOOT is also able to position their products where there is more foot traffic.

## Fundamental differentiation will lead to outsized growth and margin expansion

We believe that BOOT's in house lines will see continued success because of its ability to generate brand loyalty in the long run by targeting customers effectively. This loyalty will also enable BOOT to adopt a full price selling model with greater bargaining power due to its differentiated offering, allowing BOOT to pass down costs to consumers even in an inflationary environment. Furthermore, better customer targeting and BOOT's ability to promote in-house brands preferentially will also result in both same-store sales growth and a margin expansion. This is because no commissions are paid on these in-house brands, and when a greater proportion of the per-store sales mix shifts to such internal brands, more revenue is generated per store assuming each customer spends the same. Operating costs are also spread across a larger revenue base, leading to improved margins.

## 3. The market has likely underestimated BOOT's growth potential in the future

Better-than-expected in-store economics suggest greater-thanexpected store expansion opportunities for BOOT

As a result of its stellar brand positioning in an already fragmented western work wear market, BOOT has managed to deliver robust growth metrics, even during the pandemic where there was a larger retail weakness. With the same quality of preferential brand positioning and customer loyalty expected to continue being key drivers for same-store growth.

The same qualities of preferential brand positioning and customer loyalty are expected to continue being key drivers for same-store growth, which would also catalyse further store expansions in the future. Given management's own long-standing guidance of 3-5\% long term same store sales growth, and a $10 \%$ target long-term store count growth, the market has likely already recognized an investment thesis

Figure 24: Summary of assumptions used to calculate expected store growth


Source: Team estimates

Figure 25: Management-declared store economics figures are consistent with our modelled assumptions

| Metrics | Current FY goal | New Stores <br> opened after <br> March 2020 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Store Size (sq.ft) | $\sim 10,000$ | $\sim 10,000$ |
| Y1 Net Sales | $\$ 1.7 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\$ 4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Net Capital <br> Investment | $\$ 0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\$ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Net Inventory <br> Investment | $\$ 0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\$ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Cash on Cash <br> Return | $30 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Payback period | $\sim 3$ years | $\sim 1$ year |

Source: BOOT ICR Conference Jan 2022
from BOOT's ability to capture more market share through store expansions.

However, we believe that it is likely that the market has under-priced the true expansion potential that BOOT is able to deliver even under management guidance. More specifically, taking the $3-5 \%$ sales algorithm that management has provided us, our analysis of unit economics and CAPEX requirements suggest that there is actually significantly more room for stores to be added, such that it is likely that BOOT will still surpass the target $10 \%$ algorithm for store count growth.

Our analysis begins with an estimation of the average CAPEX investment into a new store, which can be estimated using the change in year-on-year leasehold improvements, divided by the number of stores added that year. This gives us an average CAPEX per new store of approximately $\$ 545 \mathrm{k}$, which is also consistent with BOOT's 3Q comments about average investments per store at around $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$. To account for the uncertainty in range, we estimated $500-600 \mathrm{k}$ per store.

The estimated cost per store was multiplied by the number of stores in a particular quarter to obtain the total CAPEX on new stores. This number was subtracted from total CAPEX for that quarter to derive the "maintenance CAPEX", which represents other CAPEX used to maintain the remaining properties that BOOT owns. Next, we projected seasonal total CAPEX and seasonal maintenance CAPEX spend in line with historical averages percentages of revenue, where the difference between the two numbers would be the CAPEX amount that can be allocated to new stores ("store CAPEX"). Finally, dividing store CAPEX by the average store cost gives us the number of stores that can be added that quarter.

Our findings suggest that when assuming a target 3-5\% average growth in same-store sales, the growth in the number of stores is actually closer to $11-13 \%$ rather than $10 \%$. At the bear base low range of $3 \%$ same-store growth and $\$ 600 \mathrm{mn}$ per store, store count growth rate works out to be $10.65 \%$, which accounts for 12 more stores by FY26 than the assumed $10 \%$ growth rate. 12 stores may seem minute, but the difference will translate to a net revenue difference of approximately $\$ 840 \mathrm{mn}$. In comparison, 3 Q 22 revenues were only $\$ 397 \mathrm{mn}$. In management's upper range of $5 \%$ store growth and taking the bull case of $\$ 500 \mathrm{mn}$ store cost, the store count growth rate is now a staggering $13.27 \%$, implying a store count difference of 63 by $4 Q 26$. Net revenue difference under the bull case is $\$ 1,714 \mathrm{mn}$. Therefore, we believe that the street has underestimated the growth potential of BOOT by at least $\$ 840 \mathrm{mn}$ at the top line, which augments our buy case (Figure 24).

Management has maintained a target of a 3-year cash payback period for its new stores, but payback periods for new stores that have opened after March 2020 have declined to less than a year. Per our math, the average new BOOT store will also continue to payback in at least 3 quarters: net operating cash flows earned in excess of CAPEX requirements after accounting for inventory needs provide sufficient cash to have an average payback period of within a year. The findings from our model thus support the consistency of this payback period through to fiscal year 2026, which further augment our argument that store expansions will likely be overshot. (Figure 25)

Figure 26: BOOT physical store penetration superimposed on a US map highlight incremental expansion opportunities in northeastern regions


Source: Team analysis

## Macroeconomic conditions are supportive of our findings

Our model outlined significant opportunity for BOOT to capitalize on. While the potential for unit store expansions may be in reality limited by the real estate that can be acquired, we believe near-term macroeconomic forces will present even more opportunity for BOOT to realize the $11-13 \%$ unit growth, above the guided $10 \%$.

BOOT has reiterated in its Q3 earnings call that its main competitors are largely smaller independent retailers that few that cater to western and work wear. In fact, the next largest specialty western retailer only has a third of the total number of stores that BOOT has. As a result of their relatively small size as compared to BOOT, we believe that nearterm pressures of (1) inflation, (2) persistent pandemic conditions and (3) supply chain pressures will impact business of these small local business significantly. Economic pressure on these small retailers will likely create more opportunities for BOOT to acquire either real estate from closing stores, or the brand entirely, just it had in the past.

For one, as elaborated on earlier, many competitors are unable to consistently adopt a full-price marketing strategy and are rely instead on discounts to generate sales. In the midst of an inflationary environment, their inability to pass down costs to price-sensitive consumers suggest weakening business prospects.

In addition, the persistent pandemic conditions have led to continued pressures on the supply chain, where many competitors were also unable to push required inventory onto shelves and deliver orders. Similarly, this is expected to contribute to weakening business fundamentals.

Further, our analysis of geographical penetration shows that there is indeed a very low level of penetration in the northeast region with close to 0 stores. These states, such as west Virginia and new jersey have similar workforce characteristics as north-eastern states such as Pennsylvania, which have outperformed sales expectations, but have 0 stores, further supporting expansion. Given the human density of these states, a $30-50$ store count expansion by 2026 is reasonable (Figure 26).

With the small businesses unable to hedge against such pressure, we see incremental real estate acquisition opportunities for BOOT, both from unprofitable stores closing down as well as unprofitable brands ceasing operations.

## Acquisition and unit growth will result in a sustainable competitive advantage, hedging against competition and new entry

BOOT's expanding geographical coverage is expected to be a key competitive advantage that allows it to hedge against competition even more effectively. Here, we see little threat of new entry or for substitutes because BOOT is still the top western wear player in the US.

Against other retailers and brands, its command over retailing space creates fulfilment capacity and logistics capability that will allow them to outcompete on delivery speed in the ecommerce front, which differentiates their service from other competitors. Having a physical storefront can also be a point of differentiation against exclusively ecommerce retailers since they are able to be closer to the end
consumer and outperform through customer service, and through the provision of a more comprehensive western wear experience. BOOT's larger geographical presence also suggests a greater level of brand awareness for its in-house brands, versus competing brands that either sell via a smaller western wear retail, or through BOOT but take up less prime real estate.

Moving forward, competitors would likely find expansion to be a herculean task. Given BOOT's already deep brand penetration in the western wear space and large real estate control, significant amounts of resources have to be driven towards overcoming such barriers. This lowers the payoff for aggressive competition against BOOT, allowing it to maintain its competitive advantage.

## Catalysts

- The worsening macroeconomic pressures such as supply chain bottle necks, inflationary pressures may help boost BOOT expansion opportunities due to reduced competition from "momand pop" shops who lack economies of scale as mentioned in thesis 3 above. BOOT's ability to ride the storm will provide it with incremental acquisition opportunities, serving to further its retail advantage versus peers.
- So far, BOOT has demonstrated excellent store economics, in terms of both sales growth and payback periods in recent quarters. However, our model still assumes that same-store-sales growth will fall between the guidance. Thus, BOOT exceeding expectations for its same-store sales growth will be a significant catalyst that will further enable store expansion especially in underpenetrated areas. In addition, stellar sales in the light of tough macroeconomic environments may serve to counter the prevailing market sentiment of challenging forward conditions for BOOT.
- The increased recognition of western fashion and its subcategories into mainstream fashion into the US will augment BOOT's expansion into underpenetrated regions in the US. This helps to diversify its earnings base away from traditionally western/country-associated areas, while also reducing the risk of poor in-store economics in an expansion towards unexplored territories.

Figure 27: Key Financials

| USD <br> Thousands | FY20A | FY21A | FY22E | FY23E | FY24E |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Revenue | 845,575 | 893,491 | $1,487,941$ | $1,726,781$ | $2,038,727$ |
| Revenue <br> Growth | $8.8 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ |
| Gross Margin | $32.7 \%$ | $33.0 \% \mathrm{cp}$ | $38.4 \%$ | $36.9 \%$ | $37.9 \%$ |
| EBIT Margin | $8.7 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ |
| Profit Margin | $9.2 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | $36.9 \%$ | $37.9 \%$ |
| Store Count | 259 | 273 | 300 | 330 | 363 |
| Same-store <br> sales | 2,788 | 2,656 | 4,333 | 4,473 | 4,735 |

*FY22 consists of 3 quarters of actual data and 1 quarter of projected data

Figure 28: B00T's stellar in-store economics leads to greater-than-expected store count growth


Source: BOOT (1Q and 3Q numbers elided for brevity)

Figure 29: BOOT is forecasted for improved profitability on both top and bottom lines 1,200,000


Source: BOOT (1Q and 3Q numbers elided for brevity)

## Strong branding reflects in stellar same-store revenue growth, which imply greater-than-expected unit store expansion opportunities

Consistent with discretionary retailers, we used a bottom-up construction of revenues that multiplied same-store sales, number of stores, and finally by an adjusting ecommerce mix factor to reconcile total retail revenues to total revenue to account for non-retail ecommerce sale figures.

As discussed above, management has currently guided for an average of 3-5\% same-store-sales-growth. We believe that BOOT's preferential ability to cater towards shifting customer trends and position its product lines better than its western retail peers will allow it to achieve the upper end of management estimates towards 4Q26 at 5\% same-store sales growth per quarter. In our revenue model, quarterly growth rates were calculated using historical quarterly average growths in that quarter, adjusted upwards by a constant factor. While using historical quarterly averages builds in seasonality into our revenue model, solving for the adjustment factor allows us to target the $5 \%$ growth rate as guided by management.

As discussed earlier, BOOT's management has recently guided for $10 \%$ store count growth. However, our analysis of in-store economics shows that this is likely to be a conservative estimate of the actual expansion opportunities that BOOT has. Its severe under-penetration of stores in the eastern coast of US, where there have been signs of customer receptiveness to western fashion, further supports our point. Per our base case algorithm, targeting revenue growth at $5 \%$, and store CAPEX at 0.545 mn (average of new leasehold liabilities/ new stores added) gives us QoQ store count expansion of around 12.23\% instead, outperforming the $10 \%$ guidance.

Finally, the ecommerce sales mix percentage was estimated to be $17.5 \%$ (historical average quarterly ecommerce sales mix) $+0.2 \%$ growth per quarter. The slight decrease from previous quarter's ecommerce mix of $18 \%$ reflects our expectation of a temporary decline after COVID-19 reopening in the US, while the $0.2 \%$ growth builds in a gradual improvement in sales towards ecommerce in line with ongoing digital trends.

In all, we expect BOOT's stellar positioning to translate to $26.8 \%$ revenue CAGR from FY22 to FY26. (Figure 27) At the end of Q4 in the final projection year, we expect approximately 440 stores, a yearly sales total of $\$ 6.740 \mathrm{mn}$ per store, as well as an ecommerce sales mix of $20.7 \%$. (Figure 28)

## Improving sales mix leading to margin expansion on top and bottom lines

We expect BOOT's improving sales mix to also lead to margin expansion at the top and bottom lines.

BOOT's characteristic as both the retailer and the brand opens up opportunities to position its in-house brand names better than competing third party brands, and as a greater portion of its sales mix come from in-house brands that is inherently less costly than purchasing third-party brand apparel for sale, its gross margin is

Figure 30: Current CAPEX levels are supportive of debt-free expansion given large FCFO and cash balance


Source: BOOT (1Q and $3 Q$ numbers elided for brevity)

Figure 31: Blended target price

| Blended Target Price |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valuation Method | Weight | Value |
| DCF | $70 \%$ | 152.11 |
| +1FY EV/EBITDA | $10 \%$ | 117.71 |
| +1FY P/E | $10 \%$ | 119.82 |
| +1FY EV/Sales | $10 \%$ | 101.61 |
| Target Price | $\mathbf{1 4 0 . 3 9}$ |  |

Source: Team estimates

Figure 32: Football field valuation


Source: Team estimates
expected to increase. Moreover, its pivot towards more luxury fashion items and economies of scale in production as store count increases will further contribute to improving gross margins. Therefore, in our cost model, we expect COGS to continue decreasing gradually by a factor of $-0.7 \%$ QoQ from $56.9 \%$ in the latest quarter, in line with the historical average decline since 1Q17.

In addition, greater economies of scale also suggest greater cost savings in general and administrative expenses as centralised cost functions are spread over a larger level of output. BOOT's growing online western wear presence coupled with physical brand awareness has also contributed to improved ROAS on ecommerce marketing spend, which is a sentiment that management has reiterated in its 3Q21 earnings call. As such, we forecast SG\&A expenses to decrease from $20.1 \%$ of sales by a factor of $-1.2 \%$ QoQ.

On a quarterly basis, we expect COGS to decrease from $56.9 \%$ to $53.65 \%$ by 4 Q26, while GAAP operating profit is forecasted to increase from $16.0 \%$ towards $24.1 \%$ in the same period (Figure 29)

## Current levels of CAPEX supportive of debt-free inorganic growth

In 3Q21, BOOT paid off the last remaining tranche of long-term debt. Moving forward, we also believe that its current capital structure is supportive of the growth rates discussed above, without the need to raise any additional debt, even with the prospect of significant inorganic growth from store acquisitions in the future. BOOT's increasingly profitable stores explain this phenomenon: while we are forecasting negative free cash flow from operations in 4Q22 and 1Q23 consistent with a historical Q4 and Q1 seasonal slump in revenues, growing top lines and margin expansion supports a positive FCFO inflow from 2Q23 onwards, at an average of $\$ 104 \mathrm{mn}$ per quarter (Figure 30). This is seen to be more than sufficient to cover for cash to be used in investing activities, particularly in purchases of property and equipment in CAPEX - the sum of CAPEX needed for maintenance and new store expansion as per our assumptions above after accounting for seasonality only averages out at $\$ 24 \mathrm{mn}$ per quarter, at around one quarter that of operating cash flows. With significant free cash flow remaining after deducting CAPEX, we believe that there is no real requirement to raise debt or further equity financing.

The above will also likely lead to an accumulation of cash on the balance sheet. While we are not forecasting any acquisitions apart from potential acquisition of real estate from smaller mom-and-pop retailers that relate to regular planned store expansions, the increase in cash balance likely poises the firm the purchase of either (1) another retailer, (2) other brand names to expand into other western fashion categories, or (3) fulfilment capacity in warehouses and transportation to further differentiate on ecommerce, again without the usage of debt.

## Valuation

Valuation Price Target: \$140.39
We issue a buy recommendation for BOOT with a blended target price of $\$ 140.39$, representing a material upside of $+45.4 \%$ from the closing price of $\$ 96.53$ (Figure 31). This was derived from a blend of valuation

Figure 33: Comparable firms

| Company Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { +1FY } \\ \text { EV/EBITDA } \end{gathered}$ | +1FY P/E | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{+ 1 F Y} \\ & \text { EV/S } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boot Barn Holdings Inc | 10.41 | 17.40 | 1.81 |
| Ross Stores Inc | 10.40 | 17.51 | 1.47 |
| Bath \& Body Works Inc | 7.30 | 10.60 | 1.83 |
| Carter's Inc | 6.51 | 10.23 | 1.08 |
| Tapestry Inc | 6.38 | 9.57 | 1.44 |
| Victoria's Secret \& Co | 4.35 | 7.56 | 0.72 |
| DICK'S Sporting Goods Inc | 4.12 | 8.53 | 0.65 |
| Academy Sports and Outdoors Inc | 3.96 | 5.72 | 0.52 |
| Urban Outfitters Inc | 3.95 | 8.36 | 0.41 |
| American Eagle Outfitters Inc | 3.59 | 8.19 | 0.50 |
| Peer Average | 5.62 | 9.59 | 0.96 |
| 25th percentile | 3.96 | 8.19 | 0.52 |
| 50th percentile | 4.35 | 8.53 | 0.72 |
| 75th percentile | 6.51 | 10.23 | 1.44 |
| 90 th percentile | 7.92 | 11.98 | 1.54 |
| 99th percentile | 10.15 | 16.95 | 1.80 |

Source: Team estimates, Refinitiv

Figure 34: WACC Inputs
WACC Inputs

| Input | Value | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Risk Free Rate | $2.50 \%$ | US 10-YR treasury yield |
| Market Risk <br> Premium <br> Beta | $4.7 \%$ | Professor Damodaran |
| Income Tax Rate | $22.9 \%$ | Re-levered peer average <br> unlevered beta <br> Historical average |
| Debt-to-capital <br> ratio <br> Cost of Debt | $0.00 \%$ | Team estimates |
| Average WACC | $6.04 \%$ | Team Estimates |

Source: Team estimates, Refinitiv

Figure 35: Sensitivity analysis on Exit Multiple and WACC

| WACC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 142.9316 | 4.10\% | 4.60\% | 5.10\% | 5.60\% | 6.10\% | 6.60\% | 7.10\% |
|  | 7.00 | 224.2349 | 213.5593 | 204.8804 | 197.5687 | 191.2404 | 185.6481 | 180.6249 |
|  | 6.00 | 207.8306 | 197.5048 | 189.1668 | 182.1871 | 176.1823 | 170.9052 | 166.1892 |
|  | 5.00 | 191.4262 | 181.4503 | 173.4532 | 166.8055 | 161.1242 | 156.1624 | 151.7536 |
|  | 4.00 | 175.0218 | 165.3959 | 157.7396 | 151.4239 | 146.0661 | 141.4195 | 137.3179 |
|  | 3.00 | 158.6174 | 149.3414 | 142.0259 | 136.0424 | 131.0080 | 126.6766 | 122.8822 |
|  | 2.00 | 142.2131 | 133.2870 | 126.3123 | 120.6608 | 115.9500 | 111.9338 | 108.4465 |
|  | 1.00 | 125.8087 | 117.2325 | 110.5987 | 105.2792 | 100.8919 | 97.1909 | 94.0109 |

Source: Team estimates, Refinitiv
methodologies: DCF (70\%), +1 FY EV/EBITDA (10\%), +1 FY P/E (10\%) and +1 FY EV/Sales (Figure 32)

## DCF Valuation (70\% of overall weightage)

DCF was taken to be the primary driver of target price at $70 \%$ weightage, which reflects the greater confidence that we have in using a more granular bottom-up valuation method. The terminal value was a $50 / 50$ blend of implied terminal values from the Gordon Growth Method at $1.00 \%$ growth rate, and an exit +1 FY EV/EBITDA exit multiple of 4.00 x . We are of the opinion that these core assumptions are reasonable because (1) $1.00 \%$ growth rate is already a conservative estimate of perpetual growth given historical developed nation GDP growth at 2-3\% and because (2) BOOT currently trades at a +1 FY EV/EBITDA of 10.41 x vs the peer median of 4.35 x , suggesting an already outsized discount priced in.

## Relative valuation (30\% of overall weightage combined)

The target price derived from the DCF valuation was also blended with $10 \%$ weightage each from +1 FY EV/EBITDA, +1 FY P/E as well as +1 FY EV/Sales. The comparatively low weightage reflects a lower confidence in deriving BOOT's intrinsic valuation from peers, given that BOOT operates in a niche segment of retail with a unique hybrid sales mix that can exhibit both defensive and discretionary characteristics. For all three relative valuation metrics, the 99th percentile of the peer distribution was used to derive the intrinsic value.

Given that there were no listed direct peers in the same niche industry that BOOT operates in to compare to, comparable firms were obtained after passing the universe of stocks through certain filters that selects for firms that display similar operating characteristics as BOOT. The universe of stocks passed through the filter if they fell in the categories of (1) consumer discretionary stocks, (2) physical retailers (nonwholesale, non-commerce), (3) apparel or footwear or specialty stores, (4) firms with revenue concentration within the US and (5) firms with market cap similar to BOOT's. (Figure 33)

## Discount Rates

Our DCF model discounts revenues using the weighted average cost of capital through the projection period (3Q22 to 4Q26), using the capital asset pricing model to derive the discount rate (Figure 34). Under CAPM, the risk-free rate was taken to be $2.5 \%$, which was the US 10year T-bill yield at the time of writing; the beta used was the re-levered peer average unlevered beta; equity risk premium of $4.7 \%$ was the implied equity risk premium from sovereign debt ratings as per Professor Damodaran's research; and the corporate tax rate of 22.90\% was consistent with the historical average tax rate of BOOT. The cost of equity of $6.04 \%$ derived above was also taken to be the WACC, because we expect BOOT to have no debt moving forward. In the latest quarter, BOOT paid off all of its existing long term and short-term debt. Our analysis also shows that current levels of CAPEX and assumed level of store economics are supportive of the current growth projected without the use of any debt financing.

Figure 36: Sensitivity analysis on Terminal Growth and WACC

| WACC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 142.9316 | 4.10\% | 4.60\% | 5.10\% | 5.60\% | 6.10\% | 6.60\% | 7.10\% |
|  | 1.60\% | 187.3006 | 174.0639 | 164.1570 | 156.3474 | 149.9494 | 144.5509 | 139.8891 |
|  | 1.40\% | 199.3782 | 182.0621 | 169.8139 | 160.5407 | 153.1692 | 147.0920 | 141.9392 |
|  | 1.20\% | 207.3205 | 187.0596 | 173.2268 | 163.0069 | 155.0266 | 148.5357 | 143.0896 |
|  | 1.00\% | 207.3205 | 187.0596 | 173.2268 | 163.0069 | 155.0266 | 148.5357 | 143.0896 |
|  | 0.80\% | 199.3782 | 182.0621 | 169.8139 | 160.5407 | 153.1692 | 147.0920 | 141.9392 |
|  | 0.60\% | 187.3006 | 174.0639 | 164.1570 | 156.3474 | 149.9494 | 144.5509 | 139.8891 |
|  | 0.40\% | 175.0218 | 165.3959 | 157.7396 | 151.4239 | 146.0661 | 141.4195 | 137.3179 |

Source: Team estimates, Refinitiv

Figure 37: Investment Risks


Source: Team estimates, Refinitiv

## Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity analysis was performed on key variables that the model was particularly sensitive to, namely the terminal growth rate and WACC as well as exit multiple. The two sensitivity tables (Figure 35 and 36) show that the model is largely resistant to parameter variance, lending strength to our recommendations. On our sensitivity analysis of exit multiple and WACC, a recommendation change would require a -3.00 x in exit multiple and a +150 bps change in WACC. It should also be noted that the base case exit multiple of 4.00 x is already accounting for significant levels of multiple compression from current +1 FY EV/EBITDA multiples of 10.00 x . On the sensitivity analysis with Gordon Growth rates, despite the low terminal growth rates assumed already, the recommendation appears consistent even under +150bps in WACC and $-0.60 \%$ in terminal growth rate.

## Investment Risks

## Market Risk 1(M1)

Cost pressures from tight labour market conditions and sustained supply chain shortages: Many of the stores that BOOT operates are manned by part-time workers, and inflationary pressures combined with tight labour market conditions are likely to be key contributors to cost pressures moving forward. We have seen firms like Amazon likewise struggle with cost pressures on the fulfilment side as a result of worker shortages and the need to increase payrolls to retain talent. Furthermore, similar to Amazon, BOOT may need to pay in advance for many of its suppliers in order to procure sufficient inventory in the event of sustained supply chain shortages, which may stem from large COVID-induced lockdowns of ports, like what we have seen in Shanghai recently. The combination of the above reduces BOOT's working capital and cash availability to pursue store expansion.

## Business Risk 1 (B1)

Failure of geographical expansion: BOOT's share price may face pressures if negative news about its geographical expansionary plans surface, especially because much of its investment thesis hinges on this idea. Factors such as poorer than expected new store economics may hinder BOOT's ambitions to expand across the region. However, BOOT's past expansion plans have all so far exceeded expectations even in the midst of the pandemic and supply chain disruptions, which we believe is testament to the management's ability to weather the storm. In addition, store expansion opportunities in some underpenetrated north-eastern parts of US are more likely to be effective than not because of the similarity in workforce demographics to BOOT's traditional consumer base in Texas and California.

Business Risk 2 (B2)
Failure to capture the right shift in customer preferences: Likewise, a failure in BOOT ability to rightly capture and ride the trend in consumer apparel preferences may drive its demand and share price down, while providing peers with the opportunity to outcompete BOOT in the long run. However, BOOT's extensive store presence, coupled with the operation of Boot Barn Hall gives it the preferential ability to accurately identify trends before peers do.
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Appendix A: Financial Model (Yearly consolidation)

| Boot Barn |  | Annual > |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FYE Mar 31 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { 31-Dec-18 } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { 31-Dec-19 } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2020 \\ \text { 31-Dec-20 } \\ 2020 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { 31-Dec-21 } \\ 2021 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2022 \\ \text { 31-Dec-22 } \\ 2022 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { 31-Dec-23 } \\ 2023 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2024 \\ \text { 31-Dec-24 } \\ 2024 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2025 \\ \text { 31-Dec-25 } \\ 2025 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2026 \\ \text { 31-Dec-26 } \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ |
| Income Statement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total GAAP Sales |  | 677,949 | 776,854 | 845,575 | 893,491 | 1,487,941 | 1,726,781 | 2,038,727 | 2,790,789 | 3,841,893 |
| COGS |  | $(470,034)$ | $(525,420)$ | $(569,084)$ | $(598,612)$ | $(916,904)$ | $(1,089,732)$ | $(1,266,840)$ | $(1,677,092)$ | $(2,240,584)$ |
| of which SBC |  | (400) | (400) | (900) | $(1,300)$ | $(1,549)$ | $(1,572)$ | $(1,855)$ | $(2,540)$ | $(3,496)$ |
| of which Depreciation of which Amortization |  | 16,000 | 18,256 | 21,211 | 24,059 | 27,300 | 34,811 | 41,456 | 50,100 | 63,602 |
| \% of sales |  | -69.3\% | -67.6\% | -67.3\% | -67.0\% | -61.6\% | -63.1\% | -62.1\% | -60.1\% | -58.3\% |
| COGS excl. SBC and D\&A |  | $(451,307)$ | $(504,883)$ | (514,764) | $(538,049)$ | $(846,470)$ | $(1,002,538)$ | $(1,162,441)$ | (1,550,228) | $(2,079,142)$ |
| \% of sales |  | -66.6\% | -65.0\% | -60.9\% | -60.2\% | -56.9\% | -58.1\% | -57.0\% | -55.5\% | -54.1\% |
| GAAP GP |  | 207,915 | 251,434 | 276,491 | 294,879 | 571,037 | 637,049 | 771,886 | 1,113,697 | 1,601,309 |
| Non-GAAP GP |  | 226,642 | 271,971 | 330,811 | 355,442 | 641,471 | 724,243 | 876,285 | 1,240,562 | 1,762,751 |
| GAAP GP margin |  | 30.7\% | 32.4\% | 32.7\% | 33.0\% | 38.4\% | 36.9\% | 37.9\% | 39.9\% | 41.7\% |
| Non-GAAP GP margin |  | 33.4\% | 35.0\% | 39.1\% | 39.8\% | 43.1\% | 41.9\% | 43.0\% | 44.5\% | 45.9\% |
| Opex items with SBC: | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selling, General and Administrative Expenses |  | $(161,659)$ | $(187,112)$ | $(202,823)$ | $(208,553)$ | $(310,109)$ | $(363,992)$ | $(411,472)$ | $(536,922)$ | $(704,665)$ |
| \% of sales |  | -23.8\% | -24.1\% | -24.0\% | -23.3\% | -20.8\% | -21.1\% | -20.2\% | -19.2\% | -18.3\% |
| Total Opex with SBC |  | $(161,660)$ | $(187,113)$ | $(202,824)$ | $(208,554)$ | $(310,110)$ | $(363,993)$ | $(411,472)$ | $(536,923)$ | $(704,666)$ |
| QoQ Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YoY Growth |  |  | 』. | 8\% | 3\% | 49\% | 17\% | 13\% | 30\% | 31\% |
| Opex items excl SBC: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SGA SBC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selling, General and Administrative Expenses |  | $(159,659)$ | $(184,812)$ | $(198,723)$ | $(203,653)$ | $(301,696)$ | $(355,994)$ | $(402,029)$ | $(523,995)$ | $(686,871)$ |
| \%total sales |  | -23.6\% | -23.8\% | -23.5\% | -22.8\% | -20.3\% | -20.6\% | -19.7\% | -18.8\% | -17.9\% |
| Total Opex excl SBC |  | $(159,659)$ | $(184,812)$ | $(198,723)$ | $(203,653)$ | $(223,649)$ | - | - | - | - |
| Operating profit - GAAP |  | 46,255 | 64,321 | 73,667 | 86,325 | 260,927 | 273,055 | 360,414 | 576,774 | 896,643 |
| Margin |  | 6.8\% | 8.3\% | 8.7\% | 9.7\% | 17.5\% | 15.8\% | 17.7\% | 20.7\% | 23.3\% |
| QoQ Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YoY Growth |  | \MAM, | 39.1\% | 14.5\% | 17.2\% | 202.3\% | 4.6\% | 32.0\% | 60.0\% | 55.5\% |
| Operating profit - Non-GAAP |  | 48,256 | 66,622 | 77,768 | 91,226 | 347,388 | 637,049 | 771,886 | 1,113,697 | 1,601,309 |
| Margin |  | 7.1\% | 8.6\% | 9.2\% | 10.2\% | 23.3\% | 36.9\% | 37.9\% | 39.9\% | 41.7\% |
| QoQ Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YoY Growth |  | » | 38.1\% | 16.7\% | 17.3\% | 280.8\% | 83.4\% | 21.2\% | 44.3\% | 43.8\% |
| EBITDA |  | 64,582 | 84,458 | 127,087 | 145,588 | 329,813 | 358,678 | 462,957 | 701,099 | 1,054,588 |
| Other Income (expense),net |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Expense |  | $(15,076)$ | $(16,331)$ | $(12,521)$ | $(8,647)$ | $(4,805)$ | - | - | - | - |
| Interest Expense on Finance Lease Liabilities |  | - |  | (789) | (795) | (760) | (677) | (642) | (606) | (569) |
| Other Income, net |  | - | 5 | (45) | 366 | 161 | - | - | - | - |
| Total other income (expense) |  | $(15,076)$ | $(16,326)$ | $(13,355)$ | $(9,076)$ | $(5,404)$ | (677) | (642) | (606) | (569) |
| \%total sales |  | (2.2)\% | (2.1)\% | (1.6)\% | (1.0)\% | (0.4)\% | (0.0)\% | (0.0)\% | (0.0)\% | (0.0)\% |
| Income before income tax |  | 31,179 | 47,995 | 60,312 | 77,249 | 255,523 | 272,378 | 359,772 | 576,168 | 896,074 |
| EBT Margin |  | 4.6\% | 6.2\% | 7.1\% | 8.6\% | 17.2\% | 15.8\% | 17.6\% | 20.6\% | 23.3\% |
| QoQ Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YoY Growth |  | \AMAMA. | 53.9\% | 25.7\% | 28.1\% | 230.8\% | 6.6\% | 32.1\% | 60.1\% | 55.5\% |
| Income Tax Expenses |  | $(2,301)$ | $(8,974)$ | $(12,364)$ | $(17,864)$ | $(57,795)$ | $(58,142)$ | $(69,410)$ | $(126,716)$ | $(197,995)$ |
| Effective tax rate |  | -7.4\% | -18.7\% | -20.5\% | -23.1\% | -22.6\% | -21.3\% | -19.3\% | -22.0\% | -22.1\% |
| Net Income After Tax |  | 28,878 | 39,021 | 47,948 | 59,385 | 197,728 | 214,236 | 290,362 | 449,452 | 698,078 |


| Balance sheet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash and Cash Equiv alents | 9,016 | 16,614 | 69,563 | 73,148 | 76,250 | 162,530 | 334,421 | 662,530 | 1,228,160 |
| Accounts Receivable | 4,389 | 8,095 | 12,087 | 12,771 | 17,934 | 22,038 | 28,283 | 37,555 | 51,509 |
| Inventories | 211,472 | 240,734 | 288,717 | 275,760 | 434,647 | 508,154 | 618,536 | 796,082 | 1,098,528 |
| Prepaid Expenses and Other Assets | 16,250 | 11,900 | 14,284 | 12,777 | 33,519 | 38,084 | 47,344 | 65,148 | 89,808 |
| Total Current Assets | 241,127 | 277,343 | 384,651 | 374,456 | 562,351 | 730,805 | 1,028,584 | 1,561,315 | 2,468,003 |
| PPE, net | 89,208 | 98,663 | 109,603 | 110,444 | 144,093 | 172,450 | 205,540 | 258,474 | 331,305 |
| ROU Assets, net | - | - | 170,243 | 186,827 | 239,733 | 290,102 | 348,392 | 439,115 | 563,169 |
| of which Capital Finance Lease ROU Assets | - | - | 10,444 | 8,036 | 10,142 | 8,881 | 7,996 | 7,606 | 7,668 |
| of which Operating Lease ROU Assets | - | - | 159,799 | 178,791 | 229,592 | 281,221 | 340,396 | 431,509 | 555,501 |
| Goodwill | 193,095 | 195,858 | 197,502 | 197,502 | 197,502 | 197,502 | 197,502 | 197,502 | 197,502 |
| Intangible Assets, net | 63,383 | 62,845 | 60,974 | 60,885 | 60,813 | 60,751 | 60,706 | 60,691 | 60,691 |
| Other Assets | 1,128 | 1,366 | 1,738 | 3,467 | 3,152 | 3,581 | 4,451 | 6,125 | 8,444 |
| Total Noncurrent Assets | 346,814 | 358,732 | 540,060 | 559,125 | 645,292 | 724,385 | 816,591 | 961,907 | 1,161,110 |
| Total Assets | 587,941 | 636,075 | 924,711 | 933,581 | 1,207,643 | 1,455,190 | 1,845,175 | 2,523,222 | 3,629,114 |
| Liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line of Credit | 21,006 | - | 129,900 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accounts Payable | 89,958 | 104,955 | 95,334 | 104,641 | 190,708 | 216,355 | 254,430 | 333,667 | 465,429 |
| Accrued Expenses and Other Current Liabilities | 40,034 | 46,988 | 52,612 | 77,615 | 108,635 | 130,988 | 162,975 | 217,699 | 286,836 |
| Short term lease liabilities | - | - | 34,779 | 39,400 | 45,707 | 49,655 | 58,540 | 82,467 | 87,446 |
| of which Capital Finance Lease Liabilities | - | - | 1,019 | 1,164 | 896 | 915 | 925 | 1,007 | 505 |
| of which Operating Lease Liabilities | - | - | 33,760 | 38,236 | 44,811 | 48,740 | 57,615 | 81,460 | 86,942 |
| Current Portion of Notes Payable | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Current Liabilities | 150,998 | 151,943 | 312,625 | 221,656 | 345,050 | 396,998 | 475,945 | 633,833 | 839,711 |
| LT Deferred Taxes | 13,030 | 17,202 | 19,801 | 21,993 | 17,878 | 20,313 | 25,252 | 34,748 | 47,900 |
| Long term portion of notes payable | 183,200 | 174,264 | 109,022 | 109,781 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Lease Obligation | 7,303 | 6,746 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Long Term Lease Liabilifies | - | - | 160,935 | 181,836 | 235,541 | 204,155 | 207,284 | 250,666 | 414,889 |
| of which Capital Finance Lease Liabilities | - | - | 12,954 | 13,507 | 16,270 | 15,368 | 14,456 | 13,466 | 12,985 |
| of which Operating Lease Liabilities | - | - | 147,981 | 168,329 | 219,270 | 188,787 | 192,828 | 237,200 | 401,903 |
| Other Liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Non-current Liabilities | 222,337 | 219,968 | 290,393 | 317,034 | 257,147 | 228,704 | 237,802 | 292,660 | 472,778 |
| Total Liabilities | 373,335 | 371,911 | 603,018 | 538,690 | 602,197 | 625,701 | 713,747 | 926,493 | 1,312,489 |
| Equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shareholder's Equity: | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Common Stock | 148,127 | 159,137 | 169,249 | 183,815 | 199,351 | 209,157 | 220,735 | 236,583 | 258,401 |
| Additional paid-in capital | 66,670 | 105,692 | 153,641 | 213,027 | 410,756 | 624,992 | 915,354 | 1,364,807 | 2,062,885 |
| Retained Earnings | (194) | (668) | $(1,200)$ | $(1,954)$ | $(4,664)$ | $(4,664)$ | $(4,664)$ | $(4,664)$ | $(4,664)$ |
| Common Stock held at treasury | 214,606 | 264,164 | 321,693 | 394,891 | 605,446 | 829,488 | 1,131,428 | 1,596,729 | 2,316,625 |
| Total Shareholders' Equity - Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 587,941 | 636,075 | 924,711 | 933,581 | 1,207,643 | 1,455,190 | 1,845,175 | 2,523,222 | 3,629,114 |


| Net Income | 28,878 | 39,021 | 47,948 | 59,385 | 197,728 | 214,236 | 290,362 | 449,452 | 698,078 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depreciation | 16,000 | 18,256 | 21,211 | 24,059 | 27,300 | 34,811 | 41,456 | 50,100 | 63,602 |
| Amortization of Intangible Assets | 1,128 | 646 | 172 | 89 | 72 | 62 | 46 | 15 | - |
| Amortization of ROU Assets | - | - | 31,091 | 34,231 | 39,680 | 50,749 | 61,041 | 74,210 | 94,343 |
| Amortization and write-off of debt issance fees and debt discol | 1,199 | 1,235 | 946 | 884 | 1,834 | - | - | - | - |
| Stock Based Compensation | 2,248 | 2,873 | 4,908 | 7,158 | 9,982 | 9,806 | 11,578 | 15,849 | 21,818 |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Excess Tax Benefit | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Loss on disposal of assets | 252 | 35 | 447 | 214 | - | - | - | - | 948 |
| (Gain)/Loss on adjustment of right-of-use assets and lease liabilit | - | (193) | 302 | (258) | - | - | - | - | (149) |
| Damaged asset write-off | 2,357 | 312 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,669 |
| Insurance recovery receivable | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accretion of Above Market Leases | (2) | (28) | - | - | - | - | - | - | (30) |
| Store impairment charge | 83 | 242 | 575 | - | - | - | - | - | 900 |
| Deferred Taxes | 1,860 | 2,731 | 3,184 | 4,031 | 2,434 | 6,535 | 10,399 | $(10,591)$ | 11,806 |
| Insurance settlement | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amortization of inventory fair value adjustment | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accounts Receivable | (35) | $(1,043)$ | 7,537 | 9,605 | $(4,103)$ | $(8,386)$ | $(6,931)$ | $(14,597)$ | 16,064 |
| Inventories | $(24,598)$ | $(49,773)$ | 40,797 | $(139,634)$ | $(73,507)$ | $(167,508)$ | $(213,908)$ | $(142,004)$ | $(173,208)$ |
| Inventories purchased in asset acquisitions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Prepaid Expenses and Other Current Assets | $(3,281)$ | 4,179 | $(2,351)$ | 1,382 | $(20,857)$ | $(4,564)$ | $(9,260)$ | $(17,804)$ | $(24,659)$ |
| Other Assets | (167) | (254) | (548) | $(1,729)$ | (235) | (429) | (871) | $(1,674)$ | $(2,318)$ |
| Accounts Payable | 13,062 | 14,191 | $(13,810)$ | 12,360 | 85,890 | 25,647 | 38,075 | 79,237 | 131,762 |
| Accrued expenses and other current liabilities | 3,977 | 6,882 | 6,310 | 25,003 | 24,724 | 22,353 | 31,987 | 54,723 | 69,137 |
| Other Liabilities | 1,238 | 2,704 | $(3,611)$ | 2,789 | 304 | 508 | 1,030 | 1,980 | 2,743 |
| Cash paid for operating lease assets | - | - | - | - | $(23,637)$ | $(100,367)$ | $(118,446)$ | $(163,708)$ | $(216,775)$ |
| Operating leases | - | - | $(30,070)$ | $(33,655)$ | $(8,232)$ | $(26,555)$ | 12,916 | 68,218 | 170,184 |
| Finance leases | - | - | - | - | (53) | (883) | (902) | (909) | (983) |
| Net cash provided by operating activities | 44,199 | 63,259 | 25,316 | 155,921 | 167,145 | 150,199 | 247,325 | 432,368 | 703,684 |
| Cash From Investing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchases of property and equipment | $(24,418)$ | $(27,525)$ | $(37.195)$ | $(28,424)$ | $(54,802)$ | $(63,919)$ | $(75,433)$ | $(104,259)$ | $(138,055)$ |
| Insurance recoveries for property and equipment | 865 | 184 | 717 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Acquisition of business, net of cash acquired | - | $(4,424)$ | $(3,688)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net cash used in investing activities | $(23,553)$ | $(31,765)$ | $(40,166)$ | $(28,424)$ | $(54,802)$ | $(63,919)$ | $(75,433)$ | $(104,259)$ | $(138,055)$ |
| Cash from Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payments on line of credit - net | $(12,268)$ | $(21,006)$ | 129,900 | $(129,900)$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Equity Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proceeds from loan borrowings | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Repayments on debt and finance lease obligations | $(10,448)$ | $(10,554)$ | $(65,553)$ | (667) | $(112,085)$ | - | - | - | - |
| Debt issuance fees paid | (520) | - | $(1,221)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tax withholding payments for net share settlement | (125) | (474) | (532) | (754) | (2,710) | - | - | - | - |
| Excess tax benefits from stock options | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Proceeds from the exercise of stock options | 3,695 | 8,137 | 5,204 | 7,408 | 5,554 | - | - | - | - |
| Net cash provided by financing activities | $(19,666)$ | $(23,897)$ | 67,798 | $(123,913)$ | $(109,241)$ | - | - | - | - |

## Appendix B: Pro-forma income projections (quarterly)



## Appendix C：Other schedules（quarterly）

| Boot Barn |  | 4Q22 | 1 Q23 | 2Q23 | 3 C 23 | 4Q23 | 1Q24 | 2Q24 | 3Q24 | 4Q24 | 1 Q25 | 2Q25 | 3Q25 | 4Q25 | 1 Q26 | 2Q26 | 3 Q 26 | 4Q26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FYE Mar 31 |  | 31－Mar－22 | 30－Jun－22 | 30－Sep－22 | 31－Dec－22 | 31－Mar－23 | 30－Jun－23 | 30－Sep－23 | 31－Dec－23 | 31－Mar－24 | 30－Jun－24 | 30－Sep－24 | 31－Dec－24 | 31－Mar－25 | 30－Jun－25 | 30－Sep－25 | 31－Dec－25 | 31－Mar－26 |
|  |  | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 | 2023 | 2023 | 2023 | 2023 | 2024 | 2024 | 2024 | 2024 | 2025 | 2025 | 2025 | 2025 | 2026 |
| DRA Schedule |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property and Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAPEX |  | $(15,053)$ | $(15,376)$ | $(15,748)$ | $(17,172)$ | $(15,624)$ | $(16,677)$ | $(18,380)$ | $(20,707)$ | $(19,669)$ | $(22,532)$ | $(24,560)$ | $(29,090)$ | $(28,077)$ | $(32,054)$ | $(32,710)$ | $(37,339)$ | $(35,952)$ |
| Sales |  | 382，993 | 367，970 | 376，445 | 547，220 | 435，146 | 391，494 | 439,889 | 666，392 | 540,952 | 531，489 | 603．561 | 911,356 | 744，383 | 736．374 | 826，342 | 1，253，035 | 1，026，142 |
| CAPEX \％sales |  | （3．5）\％） | （4．2）\％； | （4．2）\％： | （3．1）\％； | （3．6）\％； | （4．3）\％： | （4．2）\％： | （3．1）\％ | （3．6）\％； | （4．2）\％ | （4．1）\％） | （3．2）\％； | （3．8）\％ | （4．4）\％； | （4．0）\％） | （3．0）\％） | （3．5）\％ |
| CAPEX to PPE |  | （14．876） | $(15,195)$ | （15．563） | （16，970） | （15，440） | （16，481） | $(18,164)$ | $(20.464)$ | $(19.438)$ | $(22,268)$ | （24，271） | $(28,748)$ | $(27,747)$ | $(31,677)$ | $(32,326)$ | $(36,901)$ | $(35.530)$ |
| CAPEX to Finance Leases | － | （177） | （181） | （185） | （202） | （184） | （196） | （216） | （243） | （231） | （265） | （288） | （342） | （330） | （377） | （384） | （439） | （422） |
| PPE Beginning Balance |  | 136,716 | 144，093 | 151，210 | 158，279 | 166，347 | 172，450 | 179，185 | 187，235 | 197，159 | 205，540 | 216，225 | 228，364 | 244，324 | 258，474 | 275，689 | 292，650 | 313，203 |
| （＋）CAPEX |  | 14.876 | 15，195 | 15.563 | 16，970 | 15，440 | 16，481 | 18，164 | 20，464 | 19，438 | 22，268 | 24，271 | 28，748 | 27，747 | 31，677 | 32，326 | 36，901 | 35，530 |
| （－）Depreciation | ， | （7．500） | （8．077） | （8．494） | （8，902） | （9．338） | （9，745） | （10．115） | （10．540） | （11．057） | （11，583） | （12．132） | $(12,788)$ | （13．596） | （14．463） | $(15.365)$ | $(16.348)$ | （17，427） |
| （＋／－）Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPE Ending Balance |  | 144，093 | 151，210 | 158，279 | 166，347 | 172，450 | 179，185 | 187，235 | 197，159 | 205，540 | 216，225 | 228，364 | 244，324 | 258，474 | 275，689 | 292，650 | 313，203 | 331，305 |
| Implied Useful Life | － | 4.80 | 4.68 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.62 | 4.60 | 4.63 | 4.68 | 4.65 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.78 | 4.75 | 4.77 | 4.76 | 4.79 | 4.75 |
| Depreciation \％Average Balance |  | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％｜ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％； | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％｜ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％ | －5．75\％； | －5．75\％； | －5．75\％ |
| Depreciation waterfall |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing |  | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | （4，703） | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | （4，703） | $(4,703)$ | （4，703） | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | $(4,703)$ | （4，703） |
| 4Q22 |  | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） | （736） |
| 1Q23 |  | － | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） | （752） |
| 2Q23 |  | － | － | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） | （770） |
| 3Q23 |  | － | － | － | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） | （840） |
| 4Q23 |  | － | － | － | － | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） | （764） |
| 1Q24 |  | － | － | － | － |  | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） | （816） |
| 2Q24 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） | （899） |
| 3Q24 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | ， | （1，013） | （1，013） | （1，013） | $(1,013)$ | $(1.013)$ | （1，013） | $(1.013)$ | $(1.013)$ | $(1.013)$ | $(1.013)$ |
| 4Q24 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | ． | （962） | ${ }^{(962)}$ | （962） | ${ }^{(962)}$ | ${ }^{(962)}$ | （962） | （962） | （962） | （962） |
| 1Q25 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | （1） | $(1,102)$ | $(1,102)$ | $(1,102)$ | $(1,102)$ | $(1,102)$ | $(1,102)$ | $(1,102)$ | $(1,102)$ |
| 2Q25 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | $(1,201)$ | $(1,201)$ | $(1,201)$ | $(1,201)$ | $(1,201)$ | $(1,201)$ | $(1,201)$ |
| 3Q25 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | $(1,423)$ | $(1,423)$ | $(1,423)$ | $(1,423)$ | $(1,423)$ | $(1,423)$ |
| 4Q25 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | $(1,373)$ | $(1,373)$ | $(1,373)$ | $(1,373)$ | $(1,373)$ |
| 1Q26 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | $(1,568)$ | $(1,568)$ | $(1,568)$ | $(1,568)$ |
| 2Q26 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | ． | － | ） | $(1,600)$ | $(1,600)$ | $(1,600)$ |
| 3Q26 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | $(1,827)$ | $(1.827)$ |
| 4Q26 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | －－ | － | － | － | $(1,759)$ |
| Total Depreciation |  | $(5,440)$ | $(6,192)$ | （6，962） | $(7.802)$ | $(8,566)$ | （9，382） | $(10,281)$ | $(11,294)$ | $(12,256)$ | $(13,359)$ | （14．560） | $(15,983)$ | $(17,357)$ | （18．925） | （20．525） | （22，351） | （24，110） |
| Intangible Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Intangible Assets |  | 60.831 | 60.813 | 60.798 | 60.782 | 60，767 | 60.751 | 60.738 | 60.724 | 60.711 | 60.706 | 60.701 | 60.696 | 60.691 | 60.691 | 60.691 | 60.691 | 60.691 |
| （＋）Purchase of Intangibles |  | ， | －- | － | － |  | － | ， |  | － | － | $\square-60,7$ | $\square-1$ |  |  |  | $\square-$ |  |
| （－）Amortization |  | （18） | （16） | （16） | （16） | （16） | （14） | （14） | （14） | （5） | （5） | （5） | （5） | $\square-$ | $\square-$ | $\square-$ | $\square-$ | $\square-$ |
| （＋／－）Others，acquisitions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － 0 － |  | － 0.6 |  |
| Ending Intangible Assets |  | 60，813 | 60，798 | 60，782 | 60，767 | 60，751 | 60，738 | 60，724 | 60，711 | 60，706 | 60，701 | 60，696 | 60，691 | 60，691 | 60，691 | 60，691 | 60，691 | 60，691 |
| Declared intangible asset schedule |  |  | \} |  |  |  | 疗 |  |  | 疗 |  | U． | 疗迷 | ） | U | \} |  |  |
| Beginning year |  | 【【．．． | ．．．．．． | W．．．．． |  |  |  |  | ！．．．．． | ！． |  | II． | W．．．． | \．．．． | I．．．．． |  |  | \．．．．． |
| FY22 |  | 18 |  | ， |  |  | － |  | ， |  | － | － | －${ }^{\text {a }}$ | － |  | － | － |  |
| FY23 |  | － | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |
| FY24 |  | － | － | － | － | － | 14 | 14 | 14 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |
| FY25 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | － | － | － | － | － |
| FY26 |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |

Leases

## Operating lease assets

Beginning Operating Lease Assets （＋）Additions under operating leases （－）Amortization
Ending Operating Lease Assets

Average op lease term
Additions of ROU Op leases \％capex Amortization \％of Average Balances

## Finance lease assets



| New operating leases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expected quarterly lease repayments from new leases | 13,747 | 15.219 | 17.059 | 18.795 | 20.607 | 22.623 | 24.881 | 27,372 | 30,454 | 33,951 | 38.090 | 43.005 | 48.971 | 56.314 | 64,484 | 74,313 | 85.988 |
| Q 0 Q Growth -> benchmark to net new stores ädded | 5.0\%\| | 10.7\%. | 12.1\% | 10.2\% | 9.6\%; | 9.8\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 11.3\% | 11.5\% | 12.2\% | 12.9\% | 13.9\%\| | 15.0\%; | 14.5\%. | 15.2\%. | 15.7\% |
| New lease rollovers " | 5.086 | - | - | 843 | 1.812 | 2,463 | 2,258 | 2,490 | 3,082 | 5.081 | 4,139 | 4.915 | 5.966 | 9.073 | 8.170 | 9.828 | 11,675 |
| Lease rollovers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4Q22 | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5.086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5.086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5.086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ |
| 1Q23 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2Q23 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 3Q23 | - | - | - | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) | (843) |
| 4Q23 | - | - | - | - | $(1.812)$ | $(1,812)$ | $(1,812)$ | $(1,812)$ | $(1,812)$ | $(1.812)$ | $(1.812)$ | (1,812) | (1,812) | $(1,812)$ | $(1.812)$ | $(1,812)$ | $(1,812)$ |
| 1Q24 | - | - | - | - | - | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ | $(2,463)$ |
| 2Q24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ | $(2,258)$ |
| 3Q24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ | $(2,490)$ |
| 4Q24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $(3,082)$ | (3,082) | $(3,082)$ | $(3,082)$ | $(3,082)$ | $(3,082)$ | $(3,082)$ | $(3,082)$ | $(3,082)$ |
| 1Q25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | (5,081) | $(5,081)$ | $(5,081)$ | (5,081) | $(5,081)$ | (5,081) | (5,081) | (5,081) |
| 2Q25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $(4,139)$ | $(4,139)$ | $(4,139)$ | $(4,139)$ | $(4,139)$ | $(4,139)$ | $(4,139)$ |
| 3Q25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | (4,915) | (4,915) | (4,915) | $(4,915)$ | $(4,915)$ | (4,915) |
| 4Q25 | - | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  | $(5,966)$ | $(5,966)$ | $(5,966)$ | $(5.966)$ | $(5,966)$ |
| 1Q26 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $(9.073)$ | $(9,073)$ | $(9,073)$ | (9,073) |
| 2Q26 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $(8,170)$ | $(8,170)$ | (8,170) |
| 3Q26 | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  | $(9.828)$ | (9,828) |
| 4Q26 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | $(11,675)$ |
| Total new lease rollovers | $(5,086)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5.086)$ | (5.929) | (7,741) | $(10,204)$ | $(12,462)$ | (14,952) | (18.034) | (23,115) | $(27,254)$ | $(32.169)$ | $(38.135)$ | $(47,207)$ | $(55,377)$ | $(65.206)$ | (76,881) |
| Estimated new lease rollovers | 5.086 | 5.086 | 5.086 | 5.929 | 7,741 | 10,204 | 12,462 | 14,952 | 18,034 | 23,115 | 27,254 | 32,169 | 38,135 | 47,207 | 55,377 | 65,206 | 76.881 |
| Interest rate | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | $-1.2 \%$ | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% | -1.2\% |
| Assumed lease term | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| New lease liabilities | 26,390 | 26,390 | 26,390 | 30,766 | 40,168 | 52,948 | 64,665 | 77,588 | 93,581 | 119.946 | 141,423 | 166,927 | 197,886 | 244,965 | 287,360 | 338.361 | 398,944 |
| Additions to Curent Portion | 4,478 | 4.675 | 4.896 | 5.994 | 8.242 | 11,134 | 13,970 | 17,269 | 21,528 | 28,207 | 34,085 | 41,359 | 50,586 | 85,025 | 86,096 | 82,549 | 70,953 |
| Additions to NC Portion | 21,912 | 21,715 | 21,494 | 24,772 | 31.926 | 41.814 | 50,696 | 60,319 | 72,053 | 91,740 | 107,338 | 125,568 | 147,299 | 159,940 | 201,263 | 255,812 | 327,991 |
| Finance lease liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New+existing lease liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance leases - current portion | 896 | 900 | 905 | 911 | 915 | 918 | 921 | 925 | 925 | 946 | 966 | 989 | 1,007 | 1.242 | 998 | 755 | 505 |
| Finance leases - nc portion | 16,270 | 16.048 | 15.823 | 15,596 | 15,368 | 15,144 | 14.916 | 14,686 | 14,456 | 14,211 | 13.965 | 13.714 | 13,466 | 12,989 | 12,988 | 12,984 | 12,985 |
| Total finance lease liabilities | 17,166 | 16,948 | 16,729 | 16,507 | 16,283 | 16,061 | 15,837 | 15,610 | 15,382 | 15,158 | 14,932 | 14,703 | 14,473 | 14,231 | 13,986 | 13,739 | 13,490 |
| Cash paid for existing finance leases | 403 | 390 | 390 | 390 | 390 | 386 | 386 | 386 | 386 | 379 | 379 | 379 | 379 | 388 | 388 | 388 | 388 |
| Beginning balance finance lease liabilities | 17,219 | 17.166 | 16.948 | 16.729 | 16,507 | 16,283 | 16,061 | 15,837 | 15.610 | 15,382 | 15,158 | 14.932 | 14,703 | 14,473 | 14,231 | 13,986 | 13.739 |
| capex | 177 | 181 | 185 | 202 | 184 | 196 | 216 | 243 | 231 | 265 | 288 | 342 | 330 | 377 | 384 | 439 | 422 |
| Interest paid on finance lease liabilities | 173 | 172 | 171 | 168 | 166 | 164 | 162 | 159 | 157 | 155 | 153 | 150 | 148 | 146 | 144 | 141 | 139 |
| $(-)$ Principal repayment | (230) | (218) | (219) | (222) | (224) | (222) | (224) | (227) | (229) | (224) | (226) | (228) | (231) | (242) | (244) | (247) | (249) |
| Ending balance op lease liabilities | 17,166 | 16,948 | 16.729 | 16.507 | 16,283 | 16,061 | 15,837 | 15,610 | 15,382 | 15,158 | 14.932 | 14.703 | 14,473 | 14.231 | 13,986 | 13.739 | 13,490 |
| Weighted average discount rate yearly -> interests rate | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\%; | -1.0\%. | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\%. | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% | -1.0\% |
| Weighted average remaining lease term | 18.68 | 19.43 | 19.06 | 18.62 | 18.19 | 18.08 | 17.65 | 17.23 | 16.81 | 16.93 | 16.51 | 16.10 | 15.69 | 14.69 | 14.30 | 13.91 | 13.52 |
| Declared op lease repayment schedule |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning year FY22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FY22 | 403 | 390 | 390 | 330 | 390 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| FY23 | - | 3 | 3 | 3 | - | 386 | 386 | 386 | 386 | - | - | - | $:$ | - | - | - | - |
| FY25 | : | - | - | - | - | 386 | 386 | 38 | 38 | 379 | 379 | 379 | 379 | - | - | - | - |
| FY26 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 388 | 388 | 388 | 388 |
| Finance lease CAPEX into current portion | 13 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 21 | 25 | 24 | 27 | 28 | 32 | 31 |
| Finance lease CAPEX into NC portion | 164 | 167 | 172 | 187 | 170 | 182 | 200 | 226 | 214 | 245 | 268 | 317 | 306 | 349 | 356 | 407 | 392 |


[^0]:    Source: Various

