

Fuel for Thought

Subject experts Arvind Sanger, Stan Majcher and Cale Smith describe how they're navigating the – to put it mildly – evolving global energy-investing landscape, how they think about what's "normal," and why they believe the market is mispricing Vista Energy, BKV Corp., California Resources, Ovinitiv, Devon Energy and Enterprise Products Partners.



Arvind Sanger
Geosphere Capital

"My preference for high-conviction bets is always on bottom-up ideas with unique company-specific characteristics."

Volatile commodity cycles have always made investing in energy-related stocks challenging, but for a long time the supply and demand dynamics impacting the cycles were at least relatively well understood and recurring in nature. The global energy transition has fundamentally changed that, as has the war in Ukraine, the rise of AI and now the war in the Mideast.

To understand the current risks and opportunities involved in energy-stock investing, we recently spoke with three experts on the subject, Arvind Sanger of Geosphere Capital, Hotchkis & Wiley's Stan Majcher and Cale Smith of Bastion Fiduciary. Areas they're finding of particular interest today include non-U.S. shale, power generation, U.S. natural gas, pipelines, and non-"major" exploration and production.

Having closed your natural-resources fund in 2018, you started it up again in late 2021 as the Sensible Energy Transition Fund. Explain the rationale behind that.

Arvind Sanger: We need energy for human activity and human progress so there's always an element of growth, but this is a business with very long cycles. You want to invest in energy when an extended cycle of excess investment in supply is over. Business is terrible and CEOs promise capital discipline even if commodity prices were to go up, planning to return surplus cash to shareholders rather than throw money away by sinking it down holes. In 2018 I couldn't see when the sector would stop destroying shareholder value. In late 2021 I could see the beginning of a new cycle and thought it could provide investment opportunity for some time to come.

With constraints on supply, we saw the potential for a demand kick coming out of Covid and believed that fossil fuels as an energy source would have to play a more important role in the energy transition than advocates for alternative energy envisioned or wanted. Since then we've had an added kicker from artificial intelligence and its related data centers' hunger for energy. Over the last 12 years 90% of the increase in global oil demand was met from increased U.S. shale production, but even there the easiest-to-find oil is running low and production is plateauing. Putting aside the hopefully short-term impact of the war in Iran, we believe for the foreseeable future the supply/demand dynamics support higher rather than lower prices for oil, natural gas and some critical minerals. We're still at a point in the cycle for

energy, metals and mining where we see opportunity.

What do you typically look for in prospective ideas?

AS: I come at new ideas in two main ways. One is more thematic where I may have a very bullish view on uranium, say, and I'm going to look for the best uranium companies I can find to express that view. The other is looking where there appears to be the most significant misvaluation and then working bottom up to understand what the market might be overlooking. It is important in these cases to identify advantages or aspects of the company's business that can make it work as an investment even if our view on the underlying commodity isn't panning out.

We've spoken about Warrior Met Coal [HCC], for example, where a key part of the thesis was that the company was one of the few players in its industry that was investing in new capacity at its Blue Creek development, which if it came in on time and on budget would significantly expand the company's earnings power [VII, April 30, 2024]. So there was a growth angle, not just a bet on the commodity price. In fact, because Blue Creek did successfully come online, the shares have done well since we spoke even though global prices for metallurgical coal have come down.

We always have ideas that fall into both buckets. My preference in terms of high-conviction bets is always on bottom-up ideas with unique company-specific characteristics, overlaid with an assumption that the commodity price either trades in a range or trends higher over time.

Explain how you approach valuation in energy, metals and mining names.

AS: In the last few years – for the first time in my 35 years in the business – we’ve been focusing on free-cash-flow yields. Because they are not reinvesting every penny back into the ground, many companies are generating a lot of free cash flow and based on our mid-cycle assumptions have 10% or better free-cash-flow yields on current share prices. They’re returning most or all of that free cash back to shareholders in dividends and share buybacks, so the free-cash-flow yield can set a floor on what you as a shareholder can earn.

Before we talk about some current ideas, describe your general view on the market-clearing level of oil prices.

AS: Before the war in Iran, Brent crude-oil prices were in the mid to high-\$60s per barrel. Our general view was that with U.S. shale production seeming to plateau, global oil supplies were sufficiently tight that global demand growth would meaningfully exceed supply growth over the next couple of years. To us that implied upward pressure on prices and we generally expected a \$70-plus oil price to be the level at which demand and supply could be in relative balance.

The war has obviously thrown all that out the window in what we can only hope is the short term. Any lasting supply shocks would force painful demand adjustments, but barring a recession we now believe the floor could be \$75-80 per barrel for the rest of the decade because of the political risk premium.

With that overall backdrop, what’s your bottom-up investment case today for Vista Energy [VIST]?

AS: Vista is a South American oil and gas producer operating primarily in a shale play called Vaca Muerta in Argentina. Unlike most shale basins in the U.S., this is a young basin where production can increase rapidly and where all-in finding and development costs are currently in the

\$25-per-barrel range, one-third less than what you see now in U.S. shale. The current reserve life is almost 15 years and that will likely grow as they prove out more acreage.

So this is a cost-advantaged producer at an early stage in its lifecycle with significant growth potential. There’s still additional pipeline infrastructure that needs to be built, but we think the company can grow production organically by about 10% per year, with another 5% or more likely from M&A. There’s plenty of marginal acreage to buy and not many scale players to buy it, so we expect there will

be more deals done at attractive prices like Vista’s recent acquisition of Equinor’s Vaca Muerta portfolio for \$1.1 billion. On the cost side, while we aren’t counting on it, as they grow they should generate greater cost efficiencies through the application of technology, driving production costs even lower.

How are you looking at the political risk of investing in Argentina, where political risk has been an issue in the past?

AS: The biggest risk that is not in our control is the Argentinian presidential election

INVESTMENT SNAPSHOT

Vista Energy
(NYSE: VIST)

Business: South American oil and gas producer whose primary assets are located in the large but early-in-its-lifecycle Vaca Muerta shale basin in southwest Argentina.

Share Information (@3/30/26):

Price	76.55
52-Week Range.	31.63 – 79.20
Dividend Yield	0.0%
Market Cap	\$7.08 billion

Financials (TTM):

Revenue	\$2.47 billion
Operating Profit Margin	53.3%
Net Profit Margin	29.1%

Valuation Metrics

(@3/30/26):

	VIST	S&P 500
P/E (TTM)	11.5	23.7
Forward P/E (Est.)	8.8	20.4

Largest Institutional Owners


(@12/31/25 or latest filing):

Company	% Owned
Capital Research & Mgmt	8.7%
T. Rowe Price	3.8%
J.P. Morgan Asset Mgmt	3.5%
Abu Dhabi Inv Council	2.8%
Ninety One UK Ltd	1.7%

Short Interest (as of 3/15/26):

Shares Short/Float	2.6%
--------------------	------

VIST PRICE HISTORY



THE BOTTOM LINE

While he considers the South American firm a cost-advantaged producer at an early stage in its life with significant growth potential, Arvind Sanger believes the market is judging it as "just another mature U.S. shale company." Assuming \$75-per-barrel oil, on his 2027 estimates the shares trade at a 14-16% free-cash-flow yield and only 2.5x EV/EBITDA.

Sources: S&P Capital IQ, company reports, other publicly available information

expected in late 2027. The current Milei administration is generally pro-business and pro-development – positive for a company like Vista – and the most recent legislative elections indicated that the body politic is for now at least supportive of his political and economic agenda. There doesn't appear to be much appetite to return to the bad days of Peronism, but you can never say never. It's something we have to watch closely.

How is the corporate governance here?

AS: Management is quite solid, with strong capital discipline, a value-creation mindset and significant equity ownership in the company. They've been willing to invest in the business and have generally done it on a countercyclical basis at attractive prices. There is some leverage, which I don't normally like in a cyclical business, but net debt to normalized EBITDA is only 1.2-1.4x so I don't consider it at all excessive.

The stock has done quite well over the past year. How inexpensive do you consider it at a recent price of \$76.50?

AS: We consider this a growth business, but the shares have been trading more like it's just another mature U.S. shale company. Assuming \$75 oil, on our 2027 estimates the stock trades at a 14-16% free-cash-flow yield and 2.5x EV/EBITDA. That for a company that we think from increased production can grow free cash flow over the medium term at 15% annually. And the risk to me on oil prices is to the upside. For a company so directly tied to oil, higher prices would have an important incremental impact.

For another off-the-radar idea, describe your interest in BKV Corp. [BKV]?

AS: This is our largest position. BKV was founded ten years ago by Chris Kalnin, the CEO, in partnership with an Asian company called Banpu that mines coal and operates thermal and renewable power plants in Thailand. B stands for Banpu, K stands for Kalnin, and V is for Ventures. The idea

was to buy natural-gas assets in the U.S., starting in the Barnett Shale, and then mirror the model in Thailand by buying an independent power producer in Texas in 2021. They've also set up de novo carbon capture and sequestration operations in the Barnett Shale and in Louisiana.

Last year they made an accretive acquisition of a private competitor in the Barnett and now 75% of EBITDA comes from the natural-gas exploration and production business. The reserve life is currently 10 years and with a break-even cost for natural gas of under \$1.75 per Mcf they make good money with prices currently in what

we consider at least a medium-term trading range of between \$3 and \$4 per Mcf. I should probably say a bit more about that: While demand is growing strongly for U.S. natural gas, supported by rising export demand for liquefied natural gas [LNG] and baseload-power demand for data centers, our view is that over the next few years the U.S. market is going to be well supplied by natural-gas production growth. As a result we're not making a big directional bet on gas prices.

The real excitement here is in the power business. They're actively discussing with hyperscalers to dedicate a portion of

INVESTMENT SNAPSHOT

BKV Corp.
(NYSE: BKV)

Business: Natural-gas exploration and production, with reserves mostly located in the U.S.'s Barnett Shale; also owns independent power production facilities in Texas..

Share Information (@3/30/26):

Price	29.27
52-Week Range	15.00 – 32.81
Dividend Yield	0.0%
Market Cap	\$3.20 billion

Financials (TTM):

Revenue	\$893.8 million
Operating Profit Margin	22.8%
Net Profit Margin	19.4%

Valuation Metrics

(@3/30/26):

	BKV	S&P 500
P/E (TTM)	14.8	23.7
Forward P/E (Est.)	14.9	20.4

Largest Institutional Owners

(@12/31/25 or latest filing):

Company	% Owned
Banpu Public Co	63.4%
Bedrock Energy Partners	4.8%
Boston Partners	1.9%
BlackRock	1.6%
Goldman Sachs Asset Mgmt	1.6%

Short Interest (as of 3/15/26):

Shares Short/Float	25.9%
--------------------	-------

BKV PRICE HISTORY



THE BOTTOM LINE

The real excitement in this business comes from the company's existing and future power-generation capacity in Texas that is likely to be in high demand from energy-intensive data-center projects tied to AI, says Arvind Sanger. Assuming an 8x EV/EBITDA multiple on his 2029 estimates, the share price would more than double from its current level.

Sources: S&P Capital IQ, company reports, other publicly available information

their current 1.5-gigawatt capacity for a new data center, while adding up to 750 megawatts of added capacity to meet new grid and data-center demands. They've also acquired several thousand acres of land near their Barnett properties for a greenfield power project using natural gas from their fields, and have placed orders for turbines and other power-generation equipment for 1.2 gigawatts in capacity.

Texas is the #1 destination for new data centers in the U.S. and state regulators there are focused on making sure those centers don't unduly take power away from the grid on very hot or cold days when retail customers need it. As a result the state is encouraging data centers to set up their own power projects to avoid straining the grid. BKV is well-positioned to offer power with attractive economics that could be further bolstered by tying in carbon sequestration in ways that make the electricity generation "greener." That could have added appeal to hyperscaler customers.

What upside do you see in the shares from today's price of around \$29.25?

AS: If we assume 3-5% annual growth in natural-gas production and that the company by 2029 has at least 1 gigawatt in

power generation dedicated to one or more AI hyperscalers, we estimate that EBITDA can almost double from today's \$550 million level. Putting an 8x EV/EBITDA multiple on that higher level of EBITDA – up from less than 6x today – would translate into a share price of around \$65. With the potential of a second power location coming on line by end of the decade, there is likely to be even more upside as that project progresses.

One last thing I'd add is that the company is only covered by E&P analysts. As the power-generation part of the business becomes more important, we would eventually expect that to drive the valuation higher because power companies produce steadier, more predictable cash flow.

Is your competition as an energy-stock investor more limited than it once was?

AS: I was not the only investor to walk away from the sector seven or eight years ago. While I came back, a lot of sector-dedicated investors have moved away and generalists probably found more exciting things to invest in. That means there are probably fewer investors with long experience doing what I'm doing. Smart young people in the sector are mostly at the multi-strat hedge funds running market-

neutral strategies. That to me is a very restrictive way to invest in such a long-cycle business. They're trying to pick up alpha by marrying one E&P or oil-field-services company against another and it doesn't matter what part of the cycle you're in.

I think the real opportunity in a cyclical industry is when the wind is in your sails but nobody's paying for that. I believe that's the case today and it's what makes the value investor in me very excited.

If you turn out to be wrong investing in the sector, why is that most likely to be?

AS: I'm less concerned about supply shocking me in the various commodities. The surprises would likely be on the demand side from a serious economic slowdown, for example, tied to the war or otherwise. The biggest concern I'd have is if the situation in the Middle East drags on and the world concludes we need to reduce our reliance on oil and gas flowing through the Strait of Hormuz. This could cause renewables to get a second burst of momentum, which they have lost in the last couple of years. Would it make a meaningful dent in demand in the next two or three years, no, but in four or five years it could. **viii**

Important Disclosures

The foregoing is a reprint of an article that appeared in Value Investor Insight's March 31, 2026 issue. This interview expresses Geosphere's views as of the date of the interview. Nothing contained herein should be construed as an offer to sell or solicitation of an offer to buy or sell any security or investment strategy or a recommendation to invest in, purchase or sell any security or investment strategy, which may be made only in a formal Confidential Private Placement Memorandum and other related offering documents (the "Offering Documents"). The Offering Documents, which include information as to certain risks, supersede the information contained herein and should be requested and carefully reviewed by interested persons, as they are the sole documents on which a potential investor is entitled to rely in evaluating such investment. Further, nothing contained herein is intended to constitute investment advice or a recommendation to make (or refrain from making) any kind of investment decision and may not be relied on as such. This has been prepared by Geosphere Capital Management, LLC ("Geosphere") for informational purposes only and is intended for distribution only to the person to whom Geosphere originally provided it. Distribution of this document to any person other than the person to whom this information was originally delivered and/or to such person's advisors is unauthorized and any reproduction of these materials, in whole or in part, or the disclosure of any of the contents, without the prior consent of Geosphere in each such instance is prohibited. Securities in the Fund's Geosphere oversees shall not be offered or sold in any jurisdiction in which such offer, solicitation or sale would be unlawful until the requirements of the laws of such jurisdiction have been satisfied. This document is not intended for public use or distribution. No securities commission or regulatory authority in the United States or in any other country has in any way passed upon the merits of an investment in the Fund or the accuracy or adequacy of the information or material contained herein or otherwise.

Unless otherwise noted, this information is current as of the date indicated. The delivery of this information does not imply that the information contained herein is correct as of any time after such date. There are risks associated with investing in securities. Investing involves risk of loss, including possible loss of principal. Investments in foreign securities may underperform and may be more volatile than comparable U.S. securities because of the risks involving foreign economies and markets, foreign political systems, foreign regulatory standards, foreign currencies and taxes. Trades executed may take place on non-U.S. exchanges. Leverage may be employed in the portfolio, which can make investment performance volatile. An investor should not make an investment, unless it is prepared to lose all or a substantial portion of its investment.

The information contained herein is for discussion purposes only and is not intended to be relied upon as a forecast, research or investment advice, and is not a recommendation, offer or solicitation to buy or sell any securities or to adopt any investment strategy. The specific securities identified and described herein do not represent all of the securities purchased or sold for the fund and the reader should not assume that investments in the securities identified and discussed were, or will be, profitable and may result in a loss

The article contains examples of portfolio investment due diligence and analysis solely as a reflection of Geosphere's analysis and due diligence process regarding portfolio investment decisions. The information provided about these portfolio investments is intended to be illustrative and is not intended to be used as an indication of the current or future type or performance of the Fund's portfolio investments. References to specific securities are provided for informational purposes only and do not constitute a buy, sell or hold recommendation for any security. Investments referenced within this material are pieces of a

larger portfolio. Investors should consult with their investment and tax advisers to obtain investment advice and should not rely upon information published by Geosphere for investment advice with respect to specific securities.

Certain information contained in this presentation constitutes "forward-looking statements" that can be identified by the use of forward-looking terminology such as "may," "will," "should," "expect," "anticipate," "target," "project," "estimate," "intend," "continue," or "believe" or the negatives thereof or other variations thereon or comparable terminology. Due to various risks and uncertainties, actual events or results or the actual performance of any Geosphere investment may differ materially from those reflected or contemplated in such forward-looking statements. No person or entity should rely on these forward-looking statements when making any investment decision. There is no obligation for Geosphere to update or alter any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. All forward-looking statements contained herein are qualified in their entirety by the foregoing cautionary statements.

Past performance is not a guarantee of future results. Any projections, outlooks or assumptions should not be construed to be indicative of the actual events which will occur. Other events which were not taken into account may occur and may significantly affect the returns or performance of the Fund. Any projection, outlooks, or assumptions should not be construed to be indicative of the actual events which will occur.

Indices are presented herein for illustration purposes only. Investment results and volatility will differ from those of the benchmarks. Indices are unmanaged and have no fees or expenses. An investment cannot be made directly in an index. Investment portfolios managed by the Geosphere may consist of securities which vary significantly from those in the benchmark indexes listed above. Accordingly, results shown herein compared to those of such indexes may be of limited use.

For more information on Geosphere please contact Brett Yarkon, Head of Business Development & IR at brett@geospherecap.com.